

# **Globalization and Public Policy Decision-Making In Nigeria: The Challenges in The Privatization Of Nigerian Telecommunication (Nitel)**

*Chris. I. Nwagboso (Ph.D In-View)*

*Department Of Political Science, University Of Calabar, Calabar*

*P.M.B. 1115, Unical., Cross River State – Nigeria*

*Phone: +234 8037992274*

*Email: [Nwagboso@Gmail.Com](mailto:Nwagboso@Gmail.Com)*

*Harrison Chukwuma Ajebon*

*Department Of Political Science, University Of Calabar, Calabar*

*P.M.B. 1115, Unical., Cross River State – Nigeria*

*Phone: +234 8063015696*

*Email: [Chuksharris@Yahoo.Com](mailto:Chuksharris@Yahoo.Com)*

## **Abstract**

This paper attempts a critical examination of globalization and public policy decision-making in Nigeria using the challenges in the privatization of Nigerian Telecommunication PLC as a point of departure. The paper adopts descriptive analytical framework as its methodology. The result of the study reveals that globalization as a political, social, cultural and economic phenomenon affects the decision-making process and apparatus of all nation-states, Nigeria inclusive. It further reveals that most economic prescriptions by World Bank and IMF to Nigeria such as privatization, emanated as a result of the contemporary global trajectory that is always in the best interest of the western world. The paper, therefore, argues that the challenges in the privatization of the Nigeria's Telecommunication PLC (NITEL) is a clear indication that globalization is not an 'economic Messiah' to salvage the current developmental problems confronting policy makers and the Nigerian people. In view of this, the paper recommends among others, the imperative for consideration of the history and socio-cultural environment of the Nigerian state by policy - makers before adopting/implementing the Euro-centric policy prescriptions in Nigeria.

**Key words:** Globalization, Public policy, Decision-making, Privatization.

## Introduction

The penchant for accumulation of wealth by the western capitalist-driven economies has hitherto resulted in the profound and unimaginable integration of the world economy into the orbit of global capitalism. That most economies and states are currently facing politico-economic crises are clear indication that capitalism as a mode of production championed by the West has abysmally failed to provide evidence-based prognosis for action to the perennial challenges cascading the world economy, particularly the third world countries. In spite of this ugly trend, the advocates/apologists of globalization have continued to propagate and defend their exploitative ideological orientation across the contemporary globe.

Thus, globalization as the last stage of capitalism as argued by some Scholars, is therefore a process of re-structuring, Organizing, and re-ordering the world economy to ensure the maximum development of the capitalist system. This party explains why Onuoha (2008:87) argues that globalization is intended to generate propensity and peace for the multinational corporations and advanced capitalist societies. Thus, it further aimed at maximizing both production and marketing of goods and services worldwide with little or no hindrance. The above view on this unpredictable global trend is properly captured in the words of Toyo (2007:1):

*Globalization has to do with imperialist rivalry, collusion, and stagnation beginning from 1970. ... Globalization continues the story in world history of West European mercantilism and expansionism that began with Roman mercantilist expansionism from the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C...*

From Toyo's position, it follows however, that globalization is not new in the world history. This is because, as Boff and Herman (1997:29) rightly pointed out, "globalization represents a continuation of this historical process - the global economy suppressing the national economy as the most relevant economy for finance and production". As a political and economic concept that originated from western world, the question arises as to the benefits of the third world countries in the contemporary globalization process. Thus, the question is, does globalization has any benefit to the third world social formations, Nigeria inclusive? Also, can globalization benefit all countries equally?.

However, the third world countries, Nigeria inclusive, have been caught in the web of this 'exploitative' and 'vampiristic' economic mode of production. Hence, the Nigerian government seems to have foolishly joined the league of countries that have adopted economic policies and programmes that promote globalization. Thus, the implementation of some Bretton Woods economic policies and programmes in Nigeria such as privatization, commercialization, deregulation, liberalization, import substitution and concession of some dynamic sectors of the Nigeria's economy by the government is a clear indication that Nigeria is purely a promoter' of globalization.

Consequently, globalization as a "wind that blows no good to the third world economies" has adverse effect on public policy decision-making in Nigeria. This is succinct because, globalization demands that countries must obviously open their borders to allow easy flow and movement of goods and services. This condition, therefore, demands that Nigeria must adjust her public policy decision-making mechanism and apparatus to accommodate the movement of these goods and services which could likely subject Nigeria to dumping grounds for foreign manufactured products as in the case of the ugly situation in some African countries like Benin Republic, Cameron, Togo, among others.

It is, therefore, pertinent to note that globalization according to its apologists brings the world together as a global village. By this, the role of information technology is therefore strategic. Perhaps,

this resulted to several attempts to privatize the telecommunication industry (NITEL) in Nigerian. Thus, the aim according to Nigerian government is to enhance efficiency and further restricts government's involvement in economic activities as it is the case in the western world (US, Britain, France, Germany, etc). The question therefore arises as to what extent has the acclaimed efficiency been achieved in the telecommunication industry in Nigeria since the implementation of privatization- related programme like deregulation policies or what the Nigerian government refers to as the reform programme in telecommunication sector?

In view of the forgoing, this paper attempts a critical exposition of the implications of globalization trajectory on public policy decision-making in Nigeria with the privatization of Nigerian Telecommunication (NITEL) as a point of departure. The paper exposes how the selfish and parochial urge by the Nigerian leadership to participating in the contemporary globalization process has adversely affected the lives of the people and the Nigerian economy, since the deregulation of the telecommunication industry as well as several failed attempts by the federal government to sale her 51% equity share in NITEL (full Privatization).

The paper seeks to expose the hidden agenda behind government's position in achieving efficiency in the industry over the years and evidence-based recommendations advocated to reposition the industry for better results in Nigeria.

### **Globalization: MEANING AND UNSETTLED DEBATES**

Globalization according to scholars in the field of International Relations is often difficult to define. This difficulty is occasioned by ideological orientation of scholars, environmental factors, and different experiences of scholars on situations in the contemporary world. According to Goldstein and Pevehouse (2009:18), globalization:

*...encompasses many trends including expanded international trade, telecommunications, monetary coordination, multinational corporations, technical and scientific cooperation, cultural exchange of new types and scales, migration and refugee flows, and relations between the world's rich and poor countries...*

A cursory look at the above components of globalization indicates that the concept touches virtually every aspect of human existence. Thus, this particular scenario most times makes it very difficult if not impossible for the concept (globalization) to be properly situated and explained by a single theory. Consequently, this has resulted in intense debate and polarization of scholars on this intellectual discourse.

In spite of this definitional problematique as well as problem of conceptualization, attempts have been made by some scholars to paint a picture of what globalization stands for and how its origin and dynamics could be concretely understood. Admittedly, globalization is the widening, deepening and speeding-up of worldwide interconnectedness in all aspects of contemporary social life (Goldstein and Pevehouse, 2009:19). Thus, it is a process which breaks down barriers between nations and encourages closer economic, political and social integration among nations (Owugah, 2004:119).

Globalization as an imperialist policy hinges on dismantling domestic constraint for unfettered integration and interaction of global capital and labour. For Akani (2004: 11), "globalization emphasizes the liberalization of closed or restricted system, deregulation of controls and privatization of public industries and utilities, the creation of a favourable investment climate and an investor-friendly environment".

Consequently, as a historical process of profit maximization, some scholars argue that globalization has converted the world to a battle field for the sole advantage of the core or developed

countries. Thus, this ugly and sinister trend, has hitherto squeezed and suffocated the contemporary peripheral social formation like Nigeria. As a phenomenon that has generated lots of unsettled debates, Clark (1997:16) argues:

*The utility of globalization as a theoretical concept is much disputed. At the same time, there is surprisingly strong consensus amongst writers with very different theoretical viewpoints that globalization and fragmentation are salient themes of the twentieth century...*

Indeed, scholars have continued to argue that globalization is not a new concept. To them, however, it is a process which has always been in existence since the emergence of capitalism as a mode of production. Thus, it has always assumed different forms at different periods as capitalism tries to re-make the world in its preferred image (Owugah, 2004:119). The above argument is particularly true when considering the different policy prescriptions the third world, Nigeria inclusive, are coerced to adopt by Bretton Wood institutions IMF and World Bank. This is supported by Okoli (1997:267) who asserts that "the post colonial state of Nigeria has been wallowing from one developmental fad to another. According to him, Nigeria has moved from Import Substitution Industrialization in the 60s to Policy of Indigenization and Nationalization in the 70s and then the shagaris 'cliché' of Austerity Measure early in the 80s.

Supporting the debate that globalization is not new but rather an old capitalist concept which has over the years undergone several reformations, Emeagwali (2009:14) posits:

*...discussions of globalization should give credit to those Africans who left the continent and helped build other nations throughout the world-most nations on earth. Africans who have made contributions in Australia, in Russia, and in Europe must be acknowledged so that our children can have heroes with African roots-so they can know their own roots and be proud of them...*

It is, therefore, pertinent to note that the term globalization is not new particularly in the core-periphery relationship. The argument by Emeagwali is that the penchant to exploit the abundant human and material resources in Africa, Nigeria inclusive, necessitated the introduction of slave trade in the region by the West. This worse form of trade in the history of mankind no doubt, weakened the economy of Africa just as globalization is currently doing.

Though globalization has numerous promises to the nation states, the questions hitherto 'unanswered' by its apologists are, what are the missions of globalization particularly in Africa? Will it benefit all equally as its apologists assert? What is the future of some African economies that have been distorted and bastardized as a result of the actions and inactions of corrupt leaders who connive with the western capitalist states to exploit the resources. An action often referred to as the adoption of 'internationally acceptable global practices'. How can such countries like Nigeria and their economies be resuscitated, revamped or repositioned to achieve rapid economic growth for the general well-being of the citizens? Therefore, failure of policy makers to give cogent answers to these critical questions obviously implies that privatization programme has no moral justification in Nigeria as well as other third world countries.

### **Globalization: An Offshoot of Capitalism.**

Several writers have demonstrated at different fora that the greed by the western states particularly on profit maximization resulted in the drive to integrate the world economy for their benefits and those of their allies. This is captured in the views of Toyo (2007:12) who argued that:

*In the history of Euro-American expansionism, we have witnessed such terms as free trade, open door policy, trade liberalization, and market-friendly policies, all expressing the same intent as globalization.*

Thus, the ultimate aim of these capitalist policies which have taken center - stage in almost all the African countries including Nigeria, is to exploit the resources that abound in the region. Hence, the exploitation of these resources without a recourse to its attendant consequences on mankind could not have been effectively achieved by the west without betrayal and sinister collaboration of the elites in the peripheral social formations like Nigeria.

This particular situation explains largely why the west could easily ship vessels containing hazardous waste into African countries as in the case of the vessel the Federal Government of Nigeria ordered back to Germany in May, 2010, which contained hazardous wastes. This is also one of the ways capitalism as a mode of production has worsened and weakened the economies of the third world. Thus, for the capitalist states of US, Britain, France, Germany etc. this ideology is necessary for the achievement and promotion of the global peace - a term that they often employ simply to dominate and exploit the underdeveloped countries in Africa and Asia. Thus, the imposition of the Western hegemonic control on the third world sometimes force some of these peripheral countries to search for strategies to abandon their relationship with the western countries. This move most times proves abortive largely due to several factors. Sometime ago, former Late President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua attempted to adopt a paradigm shift in the relationship between Nigeria and some developed countries in the global system. Thus, Chiedozie, (2009:51) observes that "during the visit of Cuban Vice-President, Mr. Esteban Lazo to Nigeria in May, 2009. President Yar'Adua pushed for closer economic ties between Nigerian and Cuba". According to him:

*...Yar'Adua described the relationship between Nigeria and Cuba as "excellent, brotherly and historic"... Cuba has always stood by us on international matters to advance the cause of global peace, stability and justice, as well as the push for a new International World Order...*

The implication of the above assertion by Late Former President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua is that Cuba as a socialist state is totally against capitalism as political and economic ideology. Thus, Cuba has in many instances rejected all forms of assistance or what the capitalist states refer to as 'foreign aid' from US and its allies. The import of this decision by Cuban Government is to avert possible imposition of American's hegemonic control on Cuba as well as its attendant consequences of luring Cuba to adopt economic prescriptions like privatization, commercialization, deregulation, liberalization policies, among others, that are anti-socialist ideology. As these policies have adversely affected Nigeria's economy, Cuba therefore regards them as anti- people and economic sabotage against her citizens.

### **Globalization and Public Policy Decision-Making In Nigeria**

Scholars have argued that the profound restructuring of capitalism particularly since the 1970s has assumed different dimensions. However, many have come to refer to this process as globalization,

although what this concept exactly means, the nature, extent and importance of its changes/dynamics are hotly debated (Robinson, 1998:1). Thus, the discourse on globalization has continued to centre on the roles of the nation- state to economic globalization. Hence, these roles can effectively be performed and its objectives achieved through the adoption, formulation and implementation of public policies considered imperative in this regard. The trajectory of our argument is that globalization has profound but negative implications on the outcome of public policy decision-making by nation-states if promoted.

According to Dye (1995:2), public policy is conceived as whatever governments choose to do or not to do. To him, however, governments do many things in the state. Thus, governments regulate conflict within the society, they organize society to carry on conflict with other societies, they distribute a great variety of symbolic rewards and material services to members of the society among others. A critical look at Dye's definition indicates that governments can as well refuse to participate in the contemporary globalization process hitherto championed by the capitalist states of US France and Britain. Hence, the argument by some scholars that the third world countries like Nigeria are coerced and further integrated into the orbit of global capitalism is baseless and unfounded implicit in the above assertion. This is clearly because as Dye posits, public policy which is the mechanism through which the nation-states are expected to remove trade barriers and open their borders for the world to be globalized is purely a matter of choice by the state and not by coercion.

In spite of the above argument, we must not lose sight on the clandestine techniques usually adopted by the imperial countries to achieve their agenda in the third world. Thus, evidence has shown that the imperial states usually advise the third world, Nigeria inclusive to adopt certain economic prescriptions such as liberalization, deregulation, monetization etc as conditions to receive assistance or aid from the Bretton Word Institutions (IMF and World Bank). Since the third world countries do not often have any other alternative, they comply with these exploitative directives through the adjustment of their public policy decision-making apparatus.

Consequently, Nigeria is a victim of the above ugly political and economic situation. In Nigeria, the government has adopted several economic policies that adversely affected the economy of the country. For instance, the Babangida's regime adopted Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) in 1986 which rather than revamping the Nigeria's economy as articulated and professed by the IMF and World Bank, only succeeded in distorting and worsening the country's economy. It is equally imperative to note that before the adoption of SAP in 1986, the Shagari's administration had earlier adopted what was referred to as Austerity Measure - a policy that only succeeded in compelling Nigerians to "tighten their trouser belts". This particular policy also subjected Nigerians to abject poverty, malnutrition, hunger, diseases, untimely, deaths, among others.

Similarly, the Western world has simply succeeded in compelling the Nigerian government to adopted other 'Western-grown' economic policies like privatization and commercialization programmes. Those saddled with the responsibility of public policy making in Nigeria have failed to understand that public policies should be in the ultimate benefits and interest of the people. They have equally failed to understand that public policies should not only be people-oriented but should also reflect the history, yearnings, economic realities and collective aspirations of the people rather than the idiosyncrasy of the policy makers. Above all, the environment in which the settled policy is to be implemented, the skills, tools needed among others, should be accorded utmost priority. This is clearly because, as Dror (1968:3) rightly explains:

*The major problem with the contemporary public policy making is the constantly widening gap between what is known about policy making and how policy is usually made. Contemporary societies faced with critical problems whose solutions will require the utmost skill, rely on outmoded policy making*

*machinery. Corporations, private institutions, government organizations, all need to have their decision-making tools continually improved...*

The failure of policy makers to put the above critical issues into consideration before adopting these policies which they usually referred to as 'meeting the minimum acceptable global practices', has resulted in the collapse and failures of most government policies like privatization and its kindred terms ultimately designed to achieve desired policy goals in Nigeria. This is supported by Adamolekun (1983:142) who avers that "public policy is a course setting involving decisions of the widest ramifications and longest time perspective in the life of an organization". However, this therefore suggests that the adoption, formulation and implementation of economic policies like privatization, commercialization, deregulation particularly in Nigerian, ought not to have been done in a hurry.

The implication of these policies to the economy and the interests of the

Masses must have been considered first by the policy makers in Nigeria. Therefore, public policies in Nigeria, particularly those that have far-reaching implications on the citizens should not be implemented simply because the issues in contention are global trends. Rather, the country should adopt and implement policies that have the highest advantage to the state and less disadvantages and negative effects on both the citizens and the economy.

## **Globalization, Public Policy and Privatization Programme In Nigeria**

*...globalization as an accelerated movement across national and regional barriers of economic goods, means apart from increased transfer of resources, also increased flows of pollution, diseases and similar "bads" across national or regional borders (Svetlicic and Singer, 1996:19).*

Globalization as a process has resulted in the privatization of some dynamic sectors of the economies of the capitalist states in most part of the world. The rationale for this exercise as some states argued was to make the affected sectors more efficient in the provision of services to their people. Today, there is no doubt that privatization of public or State Owned Enterprises (SOEs) is a current worldwide approach for economic transformation. This is the path the Nigerian government has followed which has brought about economic doom in some privatized sectors of the National economy.

Thus, privatization as a concept is not new in the economic circle as it has been prominent in international economic and political circle since the 1970s. Historically, this concept crept into the Nigerian economic and political scene between the middle and late 1980s. Privatization has, therefore, been defined by many writers particularly those of Nigerian extraction. According to Obadan (2000:14), "privatization as a public policy is simply the transfer through the sale of public assets or enterprises to the private sector". It aims at ensuring productive, allocative and high economic growth. To Kayode, (1987:11) "privatization is conceived as the process by which government equity interest or ownership in business enterprises is transferred, in whole or in part, to private investors". This means that privatization can either be full or partial depending on the policy thrust of the government. Thus, full privatization implies divestment by the government of all its ordinary shareholding in the designated public enterprises while partial privatization as in the case of NITEL before government's decision to sale her 51% equity share, connotes divestment by the government of part of its ordinary shareholding in the designated

enterprises (Opara, 2010:39).

In Nigeria, as in other countries, privatization can assume different forms. This include the sales of shares, sales of assets, management or employee buy-outs, equity dilution joint venture, liquidation, management contract, lease, concession, transfer, build-operate transfer (BOT), among others. The proposed privatization of most public enterprises in Nigeria such as NITEL, NEPA etc must have aimed towards any of the above forms (Idonor, 2009:15).

Admittedly, for privatization to take place, three arguments have been advanced by scholars. Igbuzor (2003:1) elucidates on these three critical arguments:

*...first, for privatization to take place, there must be in existence, public enterprises which need to convert into private enterprises. Secondly, there is the reasoning that private ownership or control or management would be better than public ownership, finally, privatization is premised on the fact that there are problems with public ownership of enterprises and privatization is part and parcel of a reform agenda to turn around these enterprises so that they can deliver goods and services more efficiently and effectively.*

Thus, whatever the argument is, the proposed privatization of Nigeria Telecommunication PLC (NITEL) particularly the current challenges in the sale of 51 percent Federal Government equity share, has not been rosy. The exercise has received criticisms among the stakeholders in the

telecommunication industry, as well as the masses. The exercise according to the citizens of Nigeria seemed to have been characterized by Shoddy deals, corruption and other sharp practices contrary to public interests and expectations. Hence, this ugly trend calls for the need for re-examination of the policy by the Federal Government of Nigeria.

### **The Challenges In The Privatization Of The Nigeria Telecommunications Plc (Nitel).**

Globalization affects virtually all facets of government activities such as political, economic, social, cultural, among others. The contemporary globalization process according to Dhanapala (2001:53) demands that states must play strategic roles for the world to be effectively integrated. As earlier noted, such roles are understandable through a critical examination of public

policy decision-making process of government. In Nigeria, the body charged with the responsibility of privatizing public enterprises is the Bureau of Public Enterprises. This body also carried out the deregulation of the telecommunication industry that ushered in foreign and indigenous companies like Mobile Telecommunication Network (MTN), former ECONET, V-mobile, Vodacom, Zain (now Airtel) Global Communication (GLO), Etisalat, Visafone, Starcomm and other telecommunication firms currently operating in Nigeria.

Later on, the Bureau of Public Enterprises (BPP) further sold federal Government's 51% equity shares in NITEL to Transnational Corporation (Transcorp). According to the BPE, Transitional Corporation (Transcorp) was selected through a bidding process that was transparently conducted. Thus, as Federal government issued operating license to the company, Transcorp embarked on massive public offer so as to generate sufficient revenue for its operations. There is no doubt that many Nigerians bought Transcorp shares in 2006.

As president Umaru Musa Yar'Adua assumed office in 2007, several allegations were leveled on the committee that handled the bidding process that resulted in the selection of Transcorp as the highest bidder and core investor in the communication industry (NITEL). The allegation centered on the alleged fraud and corrupt practices that characterized the exercise. It was further alleged that former President Obasanjo led administration masterminded the selection of Transcorp as the core investor in NITEL. This was largely due to the vested interests of that administration in Nigerian's telecommunications industry.

Consequently, the Yar'Adua's administration ordered the immediate reversal of the exercise and further revoked the license issued to Transcorp. Thus, many Nigerians who keenly followed the process of the bidding that led to the selection of Transcorp, applauded President Yar'Adua for reversing the sale of NITEL. Their arguments were largely based on the fact that it was contrary to public interest.

As a result of this institutional challenge, the government opened up a fresh bidding for the sale of NITEL. Hence, many foreign and local investors expressed their interests. At the end the bidding process, the New Generation Telecommunications Limited (a Spanish consortium), was selected with a total bid of N2.5 billion. According to the Bureau of Public Enterprises (BPE), the New Generation Telecommunications Limited made the highest bid for the purchase of NITEL. As usual, the Federal Government issued operating license to the company. As the company was striving to settle down for the take-off of its operations, Nigeria lost her President Umaru Yar'Adua. This led to the assumption of office by President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan as Nigeria's President.

Similarly, President Goodluck Jonathan's administration in May, 2010, also revoked the operating license issued to New General Telecommunications Limited by the federal government under the leadership of the former President Umaru Yar'Adua, This company has been sent packing and the purchase of NITEL – 51% federal government's equity shares in the telecommunication industry (NITEL), now awaits new bidders.

Generally, it must be acknowledged that in spite of the mounting difficulties of public enterprises in Nigeria, pressures for their privatization were not felt until the mid-1980s with the onset of Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP). Thus, in the enterprise restructuring and operational efficiency that characterized the privatization drive in Nigeria, the apologists of privatization have argued that the poor performances of NITEL made the organization a target for reform. As if privatization would address the perennial problems confronting NITEL, the current challenges in the sale of 51% federal government's equity shares in the industry has shown the entire world that Nigerian government did not consider the 'pros and cons' of privatization as a policy before its adoption and implementation in Nigeria.

Therefore, government ought to have stopped at the stage of deregulation of the industry which has merely made many Nigerians to at least, possess mobile phones/handsets, even though the MTN, GLO, Zain, Etisalat, Starcom etc, are currently exploiting the Nigerian Masses through high tariff charges and poor network services. Against the backdrop of the dramatic political and socio-economic changes/upheaval, worsened by external pressures occasioned by globalization process, supporters of privatization programme in Nigeria have argued that NITEL accomplished a most impressive and extraordinary performance after the deregulation of telecommunication industry in Nigeria (Edukuho, 2009:42).

Unfortunately, many critics have argued that the industry as it is currently organized has abysmally failed Nigerians. The systemic and institutional crises bedeviling governments efforts in the privatization of NITEL in the last 8 years is an indication that privatization of NITEL and its attendant problems as well as revocation of operating licenses from investors, are purely against public interest.

The perceived challenges and abysmal failure of the Bureau of Public Enterprises in ensuring transparency in the exercise should have informed the federal Government of Nigeria to retrace its footsteps in the penchant to privatize this industry. This is clearly because, in spite of the exploitation of the masses through high tariff hitherto charged by operators like MTN, GLO, Etisalat, Airtel, Visafone etc, Nigerians are more comfortable with the situation than government selling outrightly this critical sector of the National economy.

It is, therefore, unapologetic and unequivocal to state that this exercise will only benefit the elites on the long run, while its effects and burden would be felt by already impoverished masses in Nigeria. Therefore, a country yearning for development must not allow itself to be coerced and influenced by external forces, otherwise the sovereignty of such country is jeopardized. The leaders in Nigeria must show commitment in the management of the country's resources and avoid the emulation and adoption of alien policies and programmes that have failed to address political and economic problems even in countries where they originated. Thus, if policies such as privatization, commercialization, liberalization, deregulations etc, are 'holy' and fault-free as claimed by their 'originators', why then did the countries that professed them recently witness economic recession or meltdown, particularly in America and Europe?. During this economic crisis in the Western World, why did their governments come to rescue those sectors, industries and companies that nearly collapse? Also, why did their governments refuse to fold hands and allow these enterprises rot away and become comatose?

Consequently, the dominant roles played by the western capitalist countries during the economic meltdown has left no doubt in the minds of marxist scholars that capitalism and its last stages such as imperialism and globalization as argued by Capitalist scholars have woefully failed to address the politico-economic challenges in the contemporary world. This is largely because, as Nabudere (1977:126) rightly observes, "capitalism engenders the division of the world into colonial, semi-colonial and informal spheres of exploitation". This is further given impetus by the policy prescriptions Nigeria and other third world social formations were advised and most times coerced to adopt/implement in their respective states as conditions to receive foreign aids from Bretton Woods' institution - IMF and World Bank.

## **conclusion**

We need to understand once and for all that globalization is not a new thing. It has been with us since the dawn of history. Before trade in goods and services, globalization consisted of the exchange of ideas across civilizations as opposed to loosely structured nations and/or tribes (Sheshaballaya, 2006:1). Thus, such ideas helped form world views and shape the world materially.

Additionally, globalization is another stage of capitalism - an effort by the capitalist states to re-make the world implicit in their selfish, parochial and exploitative interests. We are not certain of the next dimension capitalism might likely assume in the efforts of the western world to impose her hegemonic control on the underdeveloped countries particularly those in Africa and Asia. Thus, globalization and its attendant consequences on the socio-political and economic conditions of Nigeria is nothing worthy of celebration.

This situation which has hitherto cascaded all developmental efforts in Nigeria is clearly blamed on the policy makers. Those saddled with the responsibility of formulating and implementing policies and programmes in Nigerian are the number one enemies of the masses of this country. Similarly, policy makers have continued to connive with the imperial countries to exploit the masses through the adoption and implementation of anti-people's policies and programmes like privatization.

It is, therefore, argued that the move to sale 51% federal government's equity shares in NITEL is not the answer to poor performances of public enterprises in Nigeria. This is clearly because, the western countries where privatization originated are currently facing severe economic challenges which have resulted in government intervention to rescue the privatized firms from total collapse. Hence, the question arises as to the basis of the logic and argument in favour of privatization.

In view of this, we therefore argue that privatization of the critical sectors of the Nigeria's economy like NITEL is not the solution to enhance efficiency in the industry. This is clearly because, a responsible government, including the western world we emulate, do not privatize the dynamic sectors of their economy that have direct bearing on the lives of their citizens. Above all, policy makers should not fail to realize that these enterprises are sold to foreign companies even when most masses are clearly aware that no Nigerian company or firm has ever acquired any privatized company in America and Europe since the idea of privatization originated from the western world.

## **Recommendations**

To avoid Nigeria to be joined in the categories of countries hitherto referred to as failed states; the following recommendations are proffered as guides to policy makers in Nigeria and the civil society particularly at this era of globalization process.

1. The government should always consider the history and the socio- cultural environment of the Nigerian state before adopting any policy prescription particularly those emanating outside Nigeria's political

environment.

2. The government should always seek for public opinion before opting to belong to any association, union or group in the world including signing of MOUs with other countries to avoid the importation and infusion of ideas that may be inimical to public interest and the Nigerian economy.

3. The federal Government should as a matter of public interest, drop the idea of selling her 51% equity shares in NITEL to another foreign or local investor as the licenses already revoked in two attempts earlier made are clear indications that this idea is totally against the interests of Nigerians but a reflection of the selfish interests of the ruling class and their allies.

4. The civil society organizations, NLC, Trade Union Congress and Professional bodies such as NMA, NBA, ASUU, NUJ, etc should always rise against any public policy that is formulated against the interests of the general public in Nigeria.

5. It is recommended that any public enterprise whose privatization was hurriedly done by past regimes in Nigeria should be revisited by President Jonathan's administration since efficiency as the logic behind such exercise is yet to be witnessed by Nigerian.

## References

Adamolekun, L. (1983). *Public administration: A Nigerian and comparative perspective*. New York: Longman.

Ajayi, I. B. (2004). "Issues of globalization in Africa: The opportunities and the challenges" *Journal of Social sciences*, 2 (1), 122 – 139.

Akani, C. (2004). *The Policy of globalization and African security*. In Akani, C. (ed.) *Globalization and the people of Africa* (pp. 1-22). Enugu: Fourth Dimension.

Aluko, D. F. (2010). "Globalization, good governance and democracy: The interface". *Journal of Empirical Research*, 2(3), 198 – 215.

Boff, R. B. & Herman, E. S. (1997). "A critique on globalization". *Independent Socialist Monthly Review*. November 1997, (27-35).

Chiedozie, I. (May 6, 2009). Yar'Adua, Jonathan canvass closer economic ties with Cuba. *The Punch*, p. 51.

Clark, I. (1997). *Globalization and fragmentation: International relations in the twentieth century*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Danniella, P. C. (2000). *Globalization and regionalization: An historical approach*. Retrieved: January 20, 2012 from <http://www.info.com>.

Dhanapala, J. (2001). "Globalization and the nation-state: A cartography of governance: Exploring the role of environmental NGOs". *Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy*. Retrieved: January 19, 2012 from <http://www.globalpolcy.org/nations/future/2003/0530glob.htm>.

Dror, H. (1968). *Public policy making reexamined*. New York: Chandler.

Dye, T. R. (1995). *Understanding public policy* (eight edition). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Edukugho, E. (February 19, 2009). Telecom firm out with new equipment. Vanguard, p. 42.

Emeagwali, P. (March 28, 2009). Globalization not new: Look at the slave trade. The Sun, p. 14.

Goldstein, J. S. & Pevehouse, J. C. (2009). International relations (eight edition). New York: Longman.

Idonor, D. (August 26, 2009). NITEL/MTEL resale: VP gives new board 60-days ultimatum. Vanguard, p.15.

Igbuzor, O. (2003). Privatization in Nigeria: Critical issues of concern to civil society. Unpublished paper presented at a power mapping roundtable discussion on privatization programme in Nigeria organized by Socio-economic Right Initiative (SERI) held at Niger Link Hotel, Abuja, 3<sup>rd</sup> September, 2003.

Kayode, M. O. (December 10, 1987). Privatization: The neglected option II. Business Times, p. 11.

Obadan, M. I (2000). Privatization of public enterprises in Nigeria: Issues and conditions for success in the second round table (first edition). Ibadan: NCEMA monograph series No. 1, 80 AJPAM 16 (2).

Okoli, A. M. (1997). "Globalization and the challenges of development of Nigeria's political economy". Independent Socialist Review, November 1997, (262-277).

Nabudere, D. W. (1977). The Political economy of imperialism: Its theoretical and polemical treatment from mercantilist to multilateral imperialism. London: Zed press.

Onuoha, J. (2008). Beyond diplomacy: Contemporary issues in international relations. Nsukka: Great AP Express.

Opara, S. (February 1, 2010). Reducing telecoms service cost through infrastructure sharing. The punch, p.39.

Owugah, L. (2004). Globalization: Africa and the Asian paradigm. In Akani, C. (ed.). Globalization and the peoples of Africa (pp. 119-147). Enugu:

#### Fourth Dimension.

Robinson, W. I. (1998). Capitalist globalization and the transnationalization of the State. Retrieved: January 6, 2012 from <http://faculty.maxwell.syr.edu/merpuert/Research/HM%20workshop/R>

Sheshabalaya. A. (2006). The three rounds of globalization. Globalise: October 19, 2006. Retrieved: June 20, 2010 from <http://www.Qlobalpolicy.orQ/Qlobalis/cultural/2006/1019/threerounds.htm>.

Svetlicic, M & Singer, H. W. (1996). The world economy: Challenges of globalization and regionalization. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Toyo, E. (2007). Globalization from the perspective relevant to Africa. Calabar: Confident Options.