K M Baba

ECPER JOURNAL of SOCIAL STUDIES

Vol. IX No.1 Price: N500.00, ($US 10.00) Third Quarter, 2004

Published by:
EMWAI CENTRE FOR POLITICAL & ECONOMIC RESEARCH (ECPER) KADUNA
ISSN-1117-2096 NIGERIA

GLOBALISATION AND THE NIGERIAN FARMER

By K.M. Baba*

Abstract

This paper examines the possible effects of globalization (characterised by liberalisation and market reforms) on Nigerian farmers. It is argued that due to their small sizes of holdings and relatively inefficient technologies, coupled with the removal of subsidies and other price supports, Nigerian farmers will have difficulty competing in the international market. This situation is worsened by the protectionist practices of the industrial countries which restrict the import of agricultural products from Africa, while at the same time flooding African markets with their own cheap products. These have the likelihood of stifling domestic production. It is further argued, on the basis of experiences of other countries, that agricultural globalization has a tendency to divert attention of farmers from the production of food crops in favour of export crops and to dispossess small farmers of their lands, and that it usually promotes farming practices that destroy the environment. In view of these risks, the paper suggests that Nigeria should adopt guided (selective), as against blanket liberalisation and market reform, and should push for regional integration in order to increase agricultural trade among African countries and to increase their bargaining power in the international market. There is also the need for the emergence of stronger civil society to create awareness on globalization and to serve as watch-dog against the negative effects of globalization on farmers and the environment. Furthermore, Nigeria needs to provide higher value-added on its products to meet international standards. It is concluded that unless steps are taken to mitigate the risks, exposure of Nigerian farmers to open international competition may indeed be bad news for them.

*K.M. Baba (Ph.D) is a Professor of Agricultural Economics in the Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Usmanu Danfodiyo University, Sokoto.

Introduction

Prior to the advent of colonialism, the Nigerian farmers produced primarily for domestic consumption. The colonial administration, however, introduced market-oriented agriculture by promoting the production of cash crops meant mainly for export. The production of cash crops for export has continued since then. This suggests that the Nigerian agricultural sector has for long interacted with the international market for agricultural commodities.

The integration of the country's agricultural sector into the international market, however, took a new turn, with the signing of the Agreement on Agriculture (AoA) in 1994. The AoA, enforced by the World Trade Organization (WTO), is only a part of the economic globalization process that has occurred in the last two to three decades. The AoA requires member nations to liberalise and remove barriers to trade in agricultural commodities, with the strong conviction that such procedures offer the best route to increased prosperity for all (Editorial, 2001). Accordingly, Nigeria, like most other developing countries, has opened up her borders for the exchange of agricultural commodities. But there is a lack of consensus regarding the benefits of globalization to poor countries. Some proponents of globalization maintain that it is a vehicle for closing the gap between the industrial countries and the rest of the world, pointing out that through globalization, some parts of the world have broken-out of poverty and improved their living standards (Nsouli and Le Gall, 2001). Calamitsis (2001) has also extolled the virtues of globalization, indicating that its intensification has brought great benefits in terms of worldwide economic and social development, as evidenced by unprecedented growth in global output and per capita income and, more generally by major improvements in human welfare. Yet, he concedes that those benefits have not been evenly distributed and that income disparities between the rich and poor countries, as well as within many countries, have increased. In apparent agreement with this latter view, Daouas (2001) has indicated that in the least developed countries, particularly Africa, a worsening of existing imbalances has impeded development and aggravated poverty, leading to marginalisation of these countries. Furthermore, although benefits of globalization are expected to accrue mainly through enhanced international trade and global capital flow, available evidence suggests that Africa's share of world trade has decreased over the past decade and foreign direct investment has remained low (Gondwe, 2001; Nsouli and Le Gall, 2001).

There is ample evidence, therefore, to suggest that the benefits of globalization to Africa are not certain. Focusing on the case of the Nigerian farmers and employing some arguments of economic theory and experiences of other countries, this paper is a contribution to the debate on the likely impacts of globalization. The remainder of the paper is divided into five sections. The next section introduces the concept of globalization and the forces behind it, while the second section examines the mechanisms through which countries are generally expected to benefit from globalization. The possible effects of globalization on Nigerian farmers are discussed in the third section. The fourth section suggests ways of handling globalization, while the final section concludes the study.

The Concept of Globalization

Globalization can be viewed as the increasing economic integration among nations of the world (Calamitsis, 2001). Ajayi (2001) similarly defined globalization as the increasing interaction among, and integration of, the activities - especially economic activities - of human societies around the world. Daouas (2001) viewed globalization as a multi-dimensional process affecting all aspects of life - economic, cultural, environmental, and social - as well as relations between governments and nations on the five continents. The globalization process is characterised by increased flow of trade, capital, money, direct investment, technology, people, information, and ideas across national boundaries (Streeten, 2001) and it has been facilitated by rapid liberalisation and advances in information technologies (Daouas, 2001; Ajayi, 2001; Dollar and Kraay, 2001).

In pursuance of trade liberalisation, several agreements, including the Agreement on Agriculture (AoA), have been signed by many countries. In addition to trade liberalisation, member countries are also expected to pursue structural and institutional reforms, particularly with respect to redefining the roles of the state and the market in the economy. Specifically, a withdrawal of government from the economy (in the form of privatization of state-run enterprises, elimination of subsidies and price controls, as well as abolition of marketing boards), in order to give room for market-led growth is prescribed, in addition to others such as reform of regulatory framework, maintenance of macroeconomic stability and good governance. While most of these reform measures have traditionally been prescribed by the international financial institutions as pre-requisites for free-trade and economic growth, emphasis on good governance is relatively recent. Good governance, as conceptualised by international financial institutions, is one that is participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive, and follows the rule of law (UNESCAP, 1997). Perhaps, the proponents of free trade and market reforms have increasingly recognised that all the other reform measures are ineffective, in the absence of good governance, as indeed they are.

The forces behind globalization are the Transnational Corporations (TNCs) acting through the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and more recently, the WTO. The WTO was formed in 1995 by 125 countries, although the membership later increased to 134 (Mander and Barker, undated). It was formed in the final round (Uruguay Round) of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) negotiations. It is a local culture, social justice, national sovereignty, and democracy. The Organization has been given the power to compel even the most powerful countries to comply with its rules or agreements.

Anticipated Benefits of Globalization

Apart from generating huge profits for the TNCs, globalization is expected to usher in growth and development to various countries of the world, leading to increased growth in per capita GDP, reduction in poverty and reducing inequality among and within countries. Globalization is expected to achieve these through a number of mechanisms. One of these is the anticipated increase in capital flows across national borders. Capital flows could be in the form of portfolio equity flow, debt flow or foreign direct investment (FDI) (Loungani and Razin, 2001). But globalization is especially expected to increase the flow of FDI. As far as host or recipient countries- such as Nigeria and most other African countries- are concerned, the benefits of FDI have been listed (Feldstein, 2000; Loungani and Razin, 2001; Razin and Sadka, forthcoming) to include the following:

FDI allows the transfer of technology particularly in the form of new varieties of capital inputs- that cannot be achieved through financial investments or trade in goods and services. FDI can also promote competition in the domestic input market,

Recipients of FDI often gain employee training in the course of operating the new businesses, which contributes to human capital development in the host country,

Profits generated by FDI contribute to corporate tax revenues in the host country.

Through these processes, FDI is supposed to contribute to investment and growth in the host countries. But it has been cautioned that FDI may not always be beneficial to the host country because it is not only a transfer of ownership from domestic to foreign residents, but also a mechanism that makes it possible for foreign investors to exercise management and control over host country firms (Loungani and Razin, 2001).

Another avenue through which globalization is expected to promote growth and reduce poverty is by increasing trade. In other words, increase in international trade is expected to increase growth and to reduce poverty. To be able to achieve increase in trade, countries are required to pursue trade liberalisation measures. Several mechanisms through which liberalisation could benefit the poor have been suggested (Bannister and Thugge, 2001). First, it is argued that trade liberalisation will help lower the prices of imported goods and their domestic substitutes, thus increasing people's real incomes. This applies both to consumer goods and production technologies and processes. Furthermore, people may also benefit from reduction in export taxes resulting from liberalisation.

Second, it is expected that trade liberalisation will benefit the poor by creating incentives for investment, innovation and thereby growth. In other words, increase in market opportunities (in the international market) will promote both domestic and foreign investment and create incentive for innovation and technology transfer, and these will then lead to growth. Third, it is argued that the economic integration with the rest of the world occasioned by liberalisation, will help an economy to diversify its exports in line with its comparative advantages and to become less dependent on single export markets or products. In addition, integration with foreign markets helps an economy become less dependent on the domestic market, so that domestic economic downturns are offset by growth in the international economy.

On the other hand, trade liberalisation could affect the poor negatively through lower government revenues - due to reduction in trade taxes - and cut in government social expenditures. Furthermore, lowering of prices of domestic products due to liberalisation has the possibility of reducing wages or employment, particularly in the unprotected informal sector, where most of the poor in Africa are employed. In addition, openness may also make an economy more vulnerable to external shocks, such as abrupt changes in the terms of trade, especially if they affect agriculture.

Globalization and the Nigerian Farmers

Nigeria is a member of the WTO and has signed many agreements controlled by the Organization, including the AoA. Therefore, she
is under obligation to reduce or eliminate protectionist policies and to remove barriers to trade, in addition to implementing market reforms. Some of the possible effects of trade liberalisation and market reforms on Nigerian farmers are discussed as follows.

Removal of Agricultural Support Services and Production Costs

A feature of the liberalisation and reform processes has been the withdrawal of government subsidies on agricultural inputs. This has raised the farm level prices of agricultural inputs, most of which are imported. It could be argued that opening up the borders for the importation of the inputs would ultimately lower their prices. But this is unlikely to occur because of the heavy devaluation of the local currency (the naira) which has accompanied the structural reform and has increased the prices of imported commodities generally. The high costs will likely discourage local production especially given that the marketing boards which complete replacement of GATT with a different character. It is the primary rule-making regime of the globalization process and has more than 20 international agreements under its control. One of these agreements is the Agreement on Agriculture (AoA). The aim of the AoA is to establish a fair and market-oriented agricultural trading system through substantial progressive reductions in agricultural support and protection. The Agreement contains specific binding commitments of WTO members in the areas of market access, domestic support, export competition as well as sanitary and phytosanitary issues. Market access commitments in the Agreement consist of reduction of tariffs on imports of specific agricultural products. The commitments on domestic support specify limits which the total Aggregate Measurement of Support - a measure in monetary terms, of annual level of support provided by a member country, to producers of basic agricultural commodities (e.g. through a price support programme) or non-product-specific support (e.g. fertilizer subsidy) - must not exceed. The export competition commitments aim at reducing export subsidies on agricultural products. In the agreement, each member undertakes not to provide export subsidies beyond those specified. The agreement on the application of sanitary and phytosanitary measures outlines rules for applying trade measures necessary to protect human, animal or plant life or health, and thus for avoiding possible misuse of these measures in restricting trade (WTO, 1997; Sharma, 2000).

The WTO does not only establish the rules, adjudicate in trade disputes, but also enforces agreements and rules established. According to Mander and Barker (undated), the principal operating principle of the WTO is that global commercial interests supercede all others, and obstacles to the smooth operation and rapid expansion of global corporate activity are routinely suppressed, even if those "obstacles" are national, provincial, state and community laws and standards that are made on behalf of labour rights, environmental protection, human rights, consumer rights, gave price support to farmers were abolished in the mid-1980s as part of the market reform programme.

The adjustment and market reform programme has also reduced public expenditure on agricultural support services. For instance, the proportion of federal government's budgetary allocation to the agricultural sector has declined from 2.43% in 1997 to 1.59% in 2000, rising only to 1.88% in 2001 (FOS, 1999; Alade, 2001). This decrease in funding of the sector has deleterious consequences for the effective operation of agricultural support services such as research and extension. In fact, it is reported that as a result of the dwindling financial allocations from the federal and state governments, the activities of the World Bank-assisted Agricultural Development Projects (the key providers of agricultural extension services) in all states of the country are almost stagnated (Okoro, 2000). This has long-term negative implications for the productivity and growth of the agricultural sector with dire consequences for food security and competitiveness of the sector.

Access to Foreign Markets: The Exclusion Tactics

There appears to be some element of contradiction in the pursuit of global economic integration. The United States, Europe and other industrial countries are at the fore-front of the globalization campaign, pushing for liberalisation and market reforms in other countries. But some of their own practices do not conform with liberalisation and the principles of the free market. This is particularly evident in their policies toward agricultural production and trade. Governments of these countries continue to subsidise agricultural production and to raise tariff and non-tariff barriers against free trade in agricultural products. These practices are especially harmful to African countries, including Nigeria, whose non-oil exports are mainly agricultural products. Sharer (2001) captured the harmful agricultural trade practices of the industrial countries, noting:

Although, overall, the trade regimes of the European Union, the United States, and other industrial countries are open, agriculture is a major exception ---Tariffs on agricultural raw materials in the European Union (EU) average 5 percent, and those for processed agricultural goods average more than 10 percent, while the average EU tariff on other goods is only about 2 percent. These figures understate the true level of protection, however, because tariffs in the European Union are low or zero on agricultural products that the European Union does not produce and much higher on imports that might compete with domestic products --- Furthermore, significant escalation is built into the European Union's tariff structure, which discourages imports of higher-value-added processed products from Africa. The industrial countries have also erected many non-tariff barriers - in the form of price supports, subsidies, and special marketing arrangements - that keep out agricultural products from Africa.

With these protectionist practices, it has been difficult for African countries to capture any reasonable share of the international trade. In fact, it has been pointed out that while African countries constitute 29 percent of the membership of WTO (Sharer, 2001), it controls less than 2 percent share of world trade (N'Diage, 2001; Daouas, 2001; Gondwe, 2001). As far as African countries are concerned, therefore, globalization has, so far, been a process of exclusion from, rather than integration into the world economy. The way things stand, it is doubtful if Nigerian farmers would obtain easy access to the international markets.

Levels of Technologies, Vertical Integration and Economies of Scale

A common feature of the globalization process is the tendency toward merger and vertical integration of firms across national borders. This is an attempt by corporate organizations to achieve better coordination of business activities, reduce transaction costs and enjoy economies of scale, all geared toward profit maximization. It has been suggested that for African countries, including Nigeria, to benefit from globalization, FDI is inevitable (Daouas, 2001; Ajayi, 2001; N'Diaye, 2001; Mishra *et al*, 2001). In the agricultural sector, this translates to direct involvement of TNCs, either acting on their own or in collaboration with large-scale domestic businesses, in agricultural production, processing, marketing and financing. FDI by profit-driven TNCs is likely to promote large-scale production and vertical integration of farms, to take full advantage of economies of scale and the use of efficient technologies.

On the other hand, the agricultural sector in Nigeria is dominated by small-scale farmers who cultivate, in most cases, less than 5 ha of land. This, coupled with the low levels of technologies employed, prevents the farmers from benefiting from economies of scale and places them at a disadvantage compared to their foreign counterparts.

Given this contrast between domestic producers and the TNCs, if they eventually choose to invest directly in Nigeria's agriculture, the loser would most probably be the domestic producers. As the large-scale farms, with their capital and efficient technologies, continue to expand and integrate, it is obvious that small-scale producers would eventually be "priced-out" of the farming business, thereby losing their jobs. This problem is already being experienced in some developing countries where the TNCs operate. For instance, it is reported that between 1970 and 1991, Brazil's poultry industry grew from small backyard farms to a multinational mechanised industry, becoming almost entirely vertically integrated. Initially, the small family businesses were turned into contract farmers for big businesses. Eventually, however, they were taken over by financial interest groups and foreign companies (Garcés, 2002).

It is also reported that in India, small holders have been turned into contract-farmers by the large-scale TNCs which dictate rigid conditions regarding what, how and how much is grown by every farmer (Vasavi, 2001). Thus, the farmers have lost control over their production and have virtually been reduced to tenants on their own farms while others have lost their jobs as farmers altogether. Overall, it is estimated that at least 30 million farm jobs have been lost to liberalisation in developing countries (Madeley, 2000)

Cheap Imports, Local Production and Food Self-Sufficiency

With trade liberalisation, various cheap food products are allowed into the country mostly from industrial countries. These products are coming both through commercial channels and through dumping - food sold below the cost of production to dispose of surpluses (Editorial, 2001). As pointed out earlier, the industrial countries use price supports, subsidies and special marketing arrangements to protect their own agricultural sectors. These practices facilitate dumping of foods and other agricultural products. Even without dumping, their large-scale of operation and efficient technologies allow them to produce and export at low prices and subsidies, as well as other forms of support to farmers, only worsen the situation.

The availability of cheap imports will most certainly suppress domestic production. The experience of Ghana is instructive here. It has been reported (Editorial, 2001) that having produced maize, rice, soybeans, rabbits, sheep and goats, the Ghanaian small farmers could not obtain economically viable prices for them, even in village markets. As should be expected, the farmers have become demoralised and this has placed domestic food production at risk. Since Nigeria's agricultural sector is also dominated by small-scale farmers, just as Ghana's, there is ample probability of a similar scenario being enacted here. The implication of reduced domestic production is not only that farmers will become unemployed, but also that the country cannot attain its desired food self-sufficiency. This will certainly impinge on the dignity and sovereignty of the country.

Priority for Export Crops

Recognising the volatility of foreign exchange from oil, Nigeria has for long been making attempts to diversify its economy with particular emphasis on agricultural exports. Government may, therefore, view the global trade liberalisation process as an opportunity to encourage the production of export crops. But what would be the effect of such a policy on food production? Experiences of other developing countries might be helpful. In Benin Republic, it is reported that government incentives have led to an increase in land under cotton at the expense of food production and food security (Editorial, 2001). A shift to export crop production in Uganda is also reported to have caused a decline in the production of food consumed locally both in quantity and in variety (Editorial, 2001). In India, most of the farmers have been forced to grow cash crops instead of food crops due to the process of globalization and liberalisation and because the government wants more export earning (Hindmarsh, 2001)

Although empirical data are not yet available for the case of Nigeria, this shift in emphasis is predictable. But such a shift toward the production of export crops, apart from its negative implication for food self-sufficiency, does not guarantee increased earnings from exports because of the problems of competitiveness and industrial countries' protectionist practices mentioned earlier.

Environment

According to Suzuki (2002), economic globalization is based on the idea of growth going on indefinitely. When applied to agriculture, it implies that yields and profits from farming will continue to grow. To maximise profits, large-scale production using high-yield varieties (or breeds) of crops (or animals) including genetically modified types, application of high doses of inorganic fertilizers and agro-chemicals as well as production mechanization are favoured (Suzuki, 2002). While these measures might lead to increases in yields and incomes in the short-term, they are likely to cause environmental degradation in the long-run. For instance, it is a well-known fact that extensive use of chemicals, inorganic fertilizer and mechanised implements destroy several plant and animal species and are harmful to man and the soil. In other words, these practices are not only unsustainable, but they cause serious environmental degradation problems.

Another feature of globalization of agriculture is the tendency towards mono-culture, which is consistent with mechanised production and profit maximisation. It has been observed that whenever farmers focus on market production and adopt the agro-chemical model, high-input mono-cultures become predominant (Editorial, 2000). But monoculture (defined as the spreading of a single genetic strain or a single species over a wide area), has been described as the fundamental threat posed by globalization because it eliminates biodiversity (Suzuki, 2002). The whole idea of modern large-scale commercial monoculture farming using chemicals and other external inputs is to make large quantities of agricultural products available. But there is increasing evidence that if this farming mode is continued, its negative impact on food security, rural poverty, and the conservation of natural resources will outweigh the benefits (Torres *et al*, 2000; Editorial, 2000). For instance, it is reported that Asian countries, in general, are suffering from a collapsing agricultural sector and that much of this has to do with the use of Green Revolution farming practices, underpinned by monoculture cropping and the use of chemicals and fertilizers (Hindmarsh, 2001). Should the factory farming powered by globalization take hold in Nigeria, similar eventual collapse of the agricultural sector is quite possible.

Land Availability

In areas where agricultural production has gone global, TNCs and other big business farmers usually press the government for market-oriented land reforms. In other words, land becomes a commodity that is available for the highest bidder. This allows the foreign capitalists (TNCs) in partnership with landlords, to appropriate land for export crop production. Lands appropriated usually include those formerly held by small-scale farmers. For instance, landlessness is said to be rising among the poor farmers in Asia. This is particularly evident in the Philippines whose government has been criticised for its commitment to WTO in promoting the World Bank's imposition of market-assisted land reform (Hindmarsh, 2001). Given that Nigeria's agriculture is dominated by poor small-scale farmers, an imposition of similar land reforms, which is usually demanded as precondition for FDI in agriculture, will likely dispossess millions of Nigerian farmers of their most valuable resource - land.

Handling Agricultural Globalization

Given the gloomy picture regarding globalization and its effects on the Nigerian small-scale farmers, the question then arises: is it wise for Nigeria to continue its membership of WTO? The answer is obviously "yes", since Nigeria cannot progress in isolation from the world economy, which has become highly interdependent. The opposite would be for Nigeria to opt out of WTO, adopt restrictive trade regimes through protectionist policies and reverse its market reforms. Such inward-looking policies, by providing incentives to producers, may improve domestic production in the short-run. But they would hurt exports, which have been shown to be closely associated with economic growth. Sharer (1999), invoking results of empirical research, has noted that no country with a closed economy and inward-looking policies has been able to achieve or sustain high economic growth rates. Nigeria has to be a part of the globalising process. But Nigeria, and indeed all African countries, have to take steps that will ensure that they benefit from world integration. As far as the agricultural sector is concerned, some of the steps that could be taken are highlighted as follows:

Regional Integration

The economic globalization drive has seen the emergence of regional free trade blocs such as the North American Free Trade Agreement, Mercosur (Common Market for the South), the Association of South East Asian Nations, etc. Some regions, such as Europe, have even moved a step further to form unions of countries. Creation of such free trade zones has not only facilitated trade among members, but has also increased their bargain power. Unfortunately, although several regional associations (such as the Economic Community of West African States, East African Community, Common Market for East and Southern Africa, Southern African Development Community and Southern African Customs Union) exist in Africa, their impact on trade within Africa and between Africa and the rest of the world, has remained marginal, perhaps because the level of integration has been superficial. Consequently, intra-regional trade in Africa is less than 10% of total trade (Sharer, 2001) and Africa's share of world trade remains dismal.

Better integration among African countries could be attained through measures such as streamlining of customs procedures and regulations, integrating financial markets, simplifying transfer and payments procedures, and tax system harmonization (Sharer, 2001). Gondwe (2001) has assured that closer trading links among African countries would strengthen their capacity to participate in world trade. He noted that the benefits of achieving economies of scale in production and distribution, particularly lower transaction costs and increased reliability, will enhance the efficiency and competitiveness of domestic producers. It would also increase trade for member states and will allow member countries to assert their interests in the international arena from stronger and more confident positions, particularly when it comes to trade negotiations.

Agricultural commodities are the major non-oil exports of most countries in Africa. Therefore, regional integration will especially benefit the agricultural sector. With a major proportion of her population depending on agriculture, and given its vital position in Africa, Nigeria has the responsibility to push for greater trade links among African countries through effective regional integration. The recent moves toward greater regional integration in Africa, as seen in the proposed establishment of a monetary union and common currency by six members of the Economic Community of West African States (namely Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Nigeria and Sierra Leone) seems to be a move in the right direction. So also, is the establishment of the African Union (AU) and the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD). Nigeria should continue to push strongly for their actualisation by pressing for political will among African leaders. A reason for the lukewarm attitude of the leaders toward regional integration is perhaps, the fear of loss of sovereignty of individual states. But if loss of some sovereignty would lead to greater integration into the world economy, control of larger share of world trade, higher levels of growth and development, reduction in poverty and increase in the living standards of most of African citizens, it must be considered a fair trade-off.

Civil Society

Globalization goes with requirement for massive market reforms that normally include the retreat of governments from the economy. In Nigeria, it has seen the withdrawal of subsidies on agricultural and other inputs and reduced funding of public services including agricultural research and extension. To fill the gap left by government, there is the increased need for emergence of civil societies both within farming communities and outside, to support the provision of these services. Farmers' associations, especially cooperative societies, are needed now, more than ever. If small farmers are to compete with foreign and local commercial farmers, they need to be able to pool their resources together in order to enjoy some economies of scale.

Furthermore, civil society (such as consumers' associations, farmers' associations and non-governmental organisations) could serve as a watch-dog against the excesses and negative effects of agricultural globalization, such as those described earlier. For instance, a conglomerate of non-governmental organisations have been creating awareness on globalization and mobilising people to resist the unfavourable and destructive consequences of agricultural globalization in Asia (Hindmarsh, 2001). As Nigeria globalizes her agriculture, there is the need for emergence of civil society to play greater role in regulating the activities of government and private capital and serving as negotiator between government and the rural farmers, in order to mitigate the negative effects of the process.

Land Reform

Land is, perhaps, the most important asset for most poor farmers who dominate Nigeria's agricultural sector. As earlier indicated, globalization has resulted in landlessness in some developing countries particularly in Asia. Government must, therefore, ensure that foreign and local businesses do not dispossess poor Nigerians of their land. Government and civil society must resist any pressure aimed at market-oriented land reform. To ensure that public officers are denied the chances of invoking the Land Use Act (which vests land within a state in the governor) and colluding with domestic and foreign big businesses to dispossess farmers of their land, it may be necessary to review the Act to ensure that it confers more permanent title to land held by the farmers.

Guided Liberalisation

While trade liberalisation may be inevitable, total liberalisation of trade in agricultural commodities may be harmful to local production. The industrial countries use both tariff and non-tariff barriers to protect domestic production, as indicated earlier. This strategy, which is coming from the countries which are architects of the liberalisation process, suggests that total or blind liberalisation may not be in a country's interest. To protect domestic production, trade should be liberalised only for commodities which are not produced in required quantities domestically, and some form of support (such as subsidy or price support) targeted at poor farmers may be needed. This is particularly important considering the fact that high production and transaction costs negatively affect the competitiveness of small farmers' production and marketing systems.

Product Processing and Value Added

One factor that limits the international competitiveness of Nigeria's agricultural products is the fact that they are exported with little processing. Selling the commodities in their primary form implies high transportation costs relative to value. This is particularly important considering the geographical location of the country far away from major international markets. To make Nigeria's agricultural exports more competitive, the value-added to its products must be increased through further processing of products exported to meet international standards. But to do that would require technologies which are presently lacking. It is necessary, therefore, for government to invest heavily in research and development in the area of agricultural products processing. It is also important that foreign businesses permitted to operate in the country should be those that could benefit the country in terms of technology transfer.

Another problem that the country may encounter in attempting to export high value-added products, is the reluctance of the industrial countries to import such products, as earlier indicated. But if there is greater regional integration that allows African countries to negotiate trade terms as a bloc, they stand a good chance of winning concessions that would guarantee easier access to international markets.

Conclusion

The paper reviewed the likely impact of globalization on Nigerian farmers. It has shown that the risks of globalization to the Nigerian small-scale farmers are high. High costs of inputs, inefficient production technologies and small scales of operation, put them at a disadvantage compared to their foreign counterparts and render their production uncompetitive. Furthermore, protectionist policies of the industrial countries precludes the farmers' adequate access to international markets. Unless Nigerian government adopts policies of guided liberalisation (rejecting aspects that are harmful) and pushes for regional integration, globalization would be really bad news to the farmers. Furthermore, there is a major role for the civil society to raise awareness on globalization and to serve as a watch-dog to resist some of the negative policies associated with the process.

Bibliography

Ajayi, S.I. (2001). What Africa needs to do to benefit from globalization. *Finance and Development*, 38(4): 6-8.

Alade, S.O. (2001). Analysis of the year 2001 Federal Government budget. *Bullion*. 25(1): 18-25.

Bannister, G.J. and K. Thugge (2001). International trade and poverty alleviation. *Finance and Development*, 38(4): 48-51.

Calamitsis, E.A. (2001). The need for stronger domestic policies and international support. *Finance and Development*, 38(4): 10-13.

Daouas, M. (2001). Africa faces challenges of globalization. *Finance and Development*, 38(4): 4-5.

Dollar, D. and A. Kraay (2001). Trade, growth, and poverty. *Finance and Development*, 38(3): 16-19

Editorial (2000). Monocultures towards sustainability.
Editorial, *LEISA*, 16(4): 4-5.

Editorial (2001). Go global or stay local? Farmers return to the local economy. Editorial, *LEISA*, 17(2): 4-5.

Feldstein, M. (2000). Aspects of global economic integration: Outlook for the future. *NBER Working Paper*, No. 7899. Cambridge, Massachusetts: National Bureau of Economic Research.

FOS (1999). *Annual Abstract of Statistics*. Abuja: Federal Office of Statistics.

Garcés, L. (2002). The 'livestock revolution' and its impact on smallholders. *LEISA*, 18(1): 7-9.

Gondwe, G.E. (2001). Making globalization work in Africa. *Finance and Development*, 38(4): 31-33.

Hindmarsh, S. (2001). People's caravan 2000. *LEISA*, 17(2):

11.

Loungani, P. and A. Razin (2001). How beneficial is foreign direct investment for developing countries? *Finance and Development*, 38(2): 6-9.

Madeley, J. (2000). Trade and hunger: The impact of trade liberalisation on small farmers. *LEISA*, 17(2): 6-8.

Mander J. and D. Barker (undated). The World Trade Organization: Processes and Rulings. Internet: http://www.ifg.org/aboutwto.html

Mishra, D., A. Mody and A.P. Mushid (2001). Private capital flows and growth. *Finance and Development*, 38(2): 2-5

N'diaye, S. (2001). The role of institutional reforms. *Finance and Development*, 38(4): 18-21

Nsouli, S.M. and F. Le Gall (2001). Globalization and Africa: Overview of the main issues. *Finance and Development*, 38(4): 2-3.

Okoro, F. (2000). Sustaining agricultural extension service through private participation: Issues and policy implications. In Nwosu, A.C., C.U. Nwajiuba and J.A. Mbanasor (eds) *Agricultural Transformation in Nigeria*. Owerri: Novelty Industrial Enterprises Ltd. Pp.89-94.

Razin, A. and E. Sadka (forthcoming). *Labor, Capital and Finance: International Flows*. New York and Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Sharer, R. (1999). Trade: Engine of growth for Africa. *Finance and Development*, 36(4): 26-29.

Sharer, R. (2001). An agenda for trade, investment, and regional integration. *Finance and Development*, 38(4): 14-17.

Sharma, R. (2000). The Uruguay Round and WTO 2: A resume and outlook for the developing countries in agriculture. *Agriculture + Rural Development*, 7(1): 47-49.

Streeten, P. (2001). Integration, interdependence, and globalization. *Finance and Development*, 38(2): 34-37.

Suzuki, D. (2002). Ecological millennium: Setting the bottom line. *Supplement to LEISA Magazine*, Summary Report of a Consultation Hosted by IDRC and UNEP, pp. 9-14.

Torres, F., M. Piñeiro, R.M. Nogueira, and E. Trigo (2000). Agriculture in the early XXI Century: Reflections on its evolution and nature, and their implications for a global research agenda.

Issues paper commissioned by the Global Forum on Agricultural Research.

UNESCAP (United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific) (1997). What is good governance? Internet: http://www.unescap.org/huset/gg/governance.htm.

Vasavi, A.R. (2001). Loss of the local and spectres of the global. *LEISA*, 17(2): 9-11.

WTO (World Trade Organization) (1997). Agreement on Agriculture. Internet: http://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/14-ag.pdf.

BOOK REVIEW

Book Title: The 9/11 Commission Report (Authorised Version)

Publisher: Government of United States of America

No. of Pages: 567

Reviewer: Dr. Mahmoud Yahya

On 27 November 2002, the United States Congress passed Public Law 107-30 of the same date which empowered the Congress and the President to create the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States.

The 10 – member Commission, headed by Thomas S. Kean as Chairman and Lee Hamilton as Vice Chairman was mandated to investigate "facts and circumstances relating to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001". It was directed to investigate the roles and performances of intelligence and security agencies, law enforcement agencies, boarder control, the diplomatic service, immigration, customs, commercial aviation, the role of congressional oversight functions, the flow of assets and finance to terrorist organizations, etc

In its report, which it calls a "Narrative" spanning 567 pages, the Commission revealed it had held 19 days of hearings and took testimony from 160 witnesses, including the President, George W. Bush himself, and present and past Secretaries of State, Secretaries of Defence, Directors of CIA and the FBI.

During the period of investigation, the Commission said in reference to al Qaeda, "it had learnt about an enemy who is sophisticated, patient, disciplined and lethal" .The Commission in what seems to be an indirect attack on Islam, says the enemy's purpose "is to rid the world of plebiscite, and equal rights for women". (Preface, Page xvi). The reference to lack of freedom and equal rights for Moslem women is the Western stereotype about Islam which is also given as the main purpose for al Qaeda's (Bin Laden's) campaign to create a new Caliphate of Islam over the entire world. The Commission, like other US Government sponsored statements, had attempted to walk the tite rope in their effort to differentiate between fundamentalist Islam, as represented by al Qaeda and the more liberal type, as represented by the pro-Western Arab Governments.

In Chapter 1, "We have some planes", the report describes in minute-by minute details, how the four planes used in the 9/11 attacks were hijacked and crashed into the two World Trade Centre towers in New York and the Pentagon in Washington. The 4th plane, flight UA93 failed to reach its target (ostensibly the White House) and crashed in a field in Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

This is the most dramatic part of the book showing maps of the US with illustrations of the routes taken by the planes under the control of the hijackers, from take-off points at Boston, Dulles and Newark to crash points after sharp U-turns at New York, Washington and Shanksville. Photographs of the 19 hijackers are shown on page 238-9.

In Chapters 2 and 3, the Commission documented the genesis of the war with al Qaeda and the justification for counter terrorism attacks on its members and assets. It published Bin Laden's **fatwa** on behalf of a "World Islamic Front" justifying war against America and her interests anywhere in the World because America had declared war against God.

The Commission referred to the oft-repeated questions by Americans – "Why do they hate us? What can we do to stop these attacks?" – and found the answers in al Qaeda's own statements thus: "America should abandon the Middle East; convert to Islam and end the immorality and godlessness of its society and culture". The statement went on: "If the US does not comply, it would be at war with the Islamic nation that desires death more than you desire life…" (Pages 51-2)

The book reviewed the activities of all agencies charged directly with domestic security and those whose duties compliment the security se[illegible]ces and concluded that the effort was not all together successful. All previous terror attacks at home and abroad were reviewed and recommendations were made for the re-organisation of the security and intelligence services.

In Chapter 11,("Foresight and Hindsight"), the Commission reviewed and learnt lessons from past terrorist or surprise attacks such as Pearl Harbour, and contrasted them with the latest attacks, such as 9/11. While in the case of Pearl Harbour, it was a nation (Japan) that deployed its huge military resources against the US, in the case of 9/11, it was carried out by a tiny group of people, not enough to man a platoon, who did it. Measured on Governmental scale, the resources behind it were trivial. The Group came from one of the poorest and backward nations of the world (Afghanistan) – P.340.

The Commissioners came to the conclusion that America was now facing a new kind of enemy who could be crushed only through the co-operation of World Governments. There was the need for an International Strategy. "Now is the time for reflection and re-evaluation". In the post 9/11 world, say the Commissioners, "threats are determined more by the fault lines within societies than by the territorial boundaries between them. From terrorism to global disease or environmental degradation, the challenges have become Transnational rather than

International. That is the defining quality of World politics in the 21st Century".

The report consisting of 13 Chapters, three appendices and notes, does not have an index to facilitate references to important names, places and events in this massive book. The Price of the book is not stated.

Further information can be obtained from W.W.Norton & Company, Inc. 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10110 www.wwnorton.com