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Abstract
There seems to exist a conviction in the Third World countries that their rural development problem can be overcome through a synergy or collaboration between the African States and International Development partners like World Bank amongst others. This conviction is further accentuated by the proliferation of rural development programmes and projects which are products of this synergy but asymmetrical relationship shrouded in contradictions. In Nigeria, the visible and fast selling currency in the rural development is National Fadama Development Project. Understandably, the programme is collaboration between the Nigerian State and World Bank. This study attempts an examination of the collaborative role of both the Nigerian State and World Bank in relation to the sponsorship and implementation of rural development programmes in Nigeria with emphasis on Second National Fadama Development Project (FADAMA II). The study is a product of a qualitative review of some selected empirical studies across the country. We argue that, the state cannot be fair in its role of rural development because, those who make policies by the state represent the state and its class structure of contradictions. World Bank and as a development partner or donor agency represents the international capitalist structure that is responsible for the establishment of the bank in the first place hence the programme has not achieved its objectives.
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Introduction
One of the main issues in the current debates on development world over and most especially in the Third World is the problem of rural development. The constraints to developing the rural areas as well as the problems of this critical sector have come to loom very large. For over four decades in Nigeria, all attempts to put the rural areas on course of development have failed. Conditions have continued to worsen in the rural areas in spite of their potentials. Therefore, major concern to Nigerian State, like any other states in Africa and policy makers is to identify appropriate strategy for rural development.

The rural areas in Nigeria, however, present problems that are a contradictory paradox of its natural resource endowment. As noted by Chinsman (1998), rural communities are seriously marginalized in terms of most basic elements of development. In addition, the inhabitants tend to live at the margin of existence and opportunities. Most rural communities lack potable water, electricity, health care, educational and recreational facilities and motorable roads. It is pertinent to note that rural development plays an important role in the Nigerian economic development both at the micro and macro level.

Onibokun (1987) sees rural development to be faced with the paradox that the production oriented rural economy relies heavily on non-productive people who are ill-equipped with outdated tools, technical information, scientific and cultural training and whose traditional roles and access to resources pose problems for their effective incorporation into modern economic systems, whereas the consumption oriented urban economy is flooded with people, many of whom are either unemployed or unemployable, or marginally employed or underemployed.

As Harriss (1982:15) has pointed out, the notion of rural development appeared in the 1970s and criticized severely the development policy so far applied in developing countries. The mainstream of Third World development policy in the 1960s attached importance mainly to economic growth through
industrialization, which was a discussion about what is desirable change. As for policies on rural areas and agriculture, their main goal was the growth of agricultural productivity through modernization. The agricultural mechanization policy was typical in this context.

However, being aware of the existence of the massive number of poor people in developing countries, criticism against such exclusively growth-oriented policy has increased. This criticism has affected developmental thought, thus making international organizations such as ILO and the World Bank to put more emphasis in the 1970s on such issue as poverty alleviation, correction of inequality and fair distribution of developmental results (Esho, 1987). The policy framework for rural development appeared with such a change of developmental thought. When poverty alleviation came to be the central issue in development, it was natural that the rural areas, where the majority of the poor lived, attracted the major concern. The growth-oriented policy so far applied in developing countries had only limited ability to tackle the poverty problem; the trickle-down effect, which means that if economic growth continues, the result trickles down to the poor. On the contrary, the rural development policy confronted directly the critical issue of poverty. Rural in the notion of rural development meant in this context a place where the poor live. In total, the notion of rural development has been strongly linked with the goal of poverty alleviation, and with the framework for development strategy emphasizing not only economic growth but also distribution and equality. Such an idea of rural development appeared and rapidly spread in the 1970s as the new approach for Third World development.

The challenges and prospects of rural development in Nigeria have been of great concern to the Nigerian State and other international non government organizations and donors which informs the collaboration between the Nigerian State and World Bank in the financing of National Fadama Development Project. The National Fadama Development Project has three phases namely; First National Fadama Development Project, Second National Fadama Development Project, and Third National Fadama Development Project. However, the last project is our concern here, in that, it gives us the leverage for proper examination because it serves as the concluding phase of the project.

Therefore, the study is to examine the collaborative role of both the Nigerian State and World Bank in relation to the sponsorship and implementation of rural development programmes in Nigeria with emphasis on Third National Fadama Development Project (FADAMA II). The study is a product of a qualitative review of some selected empirical studies across the country.

**State and Rural Development: A Review of Literature and Theoretical Explication.**

The twin concepts of state and rural development have received a considerable attention in the development debate. This debate has assumed a dimension that questioned the ideological bases of the role of the state and the desirability to develop the rural areas. Our concern here is not to critique ideological stand points of the debate but to situate the concepts of state and rural development within the framework of our discourse. The justification is anchored on the fact that, social concepts have multidimensional perspectives as there are scholars in social sciences. Therefore, there is tendency to misconstrue the contextual meaning of the concepts with the ideological meaning which apparently may result to conceptual ambiguity.

There are perspectives on what constitutes the state. In fact, even the two major ideological schools of liberalism and Marxism have different concepts on what constitute the State (Mato, 1999:82; Tenuche, 2001:42). Though scholars associated with a particular school of thought may agree on a central argument, there generally concepts cannot be exactly the same; hence the difficulty of what is the state.

As an authority for maintaining law, order and protection in the society, the state Vermani, (2006:61) argues, has existed under different names and in different periods. The Greek-city-state used the world ‘polis’ (from where politics is derived) while in Roman period the world ‘republica’ was used. During the Medieval period, it was known as Christian Common Wealth.

However, these were not covered by the concept ‘state’ in that, they did not in themselves clearly and definitely contain the idea of stateliness, that is the sovereign political position of a person or body. In essence, the emphasis was more on the duties of the people rather than the authority of the rulers. The concept of the state came into frequent use as a political lexicon during sixteenth and seventeenth
centuries. It appeared first in the writings of Machiavelli who considered it as “the power which has authority over man” (Vermani, 2006:61).

The early liberal perspective of the state, that is, the classical liberalism was based on individualism. It sees the state as a necessary evil because only it could provide law, order, security of life and property, but it is an evil because it is an enemy of human liberty. It believes that the individual is the basis of all socio-economic and political systems and all social progress depended upon the unhampered initiative of the individual. It did not see any contraction in the self-interest of the individual and the authority of the state as antithetical and declared that the freedom of individual could be secured by limiting the sphere of state action.

The goal of liberalism was to free the individual from arbitrary and capricious authority, particularly, the authority of the state. It advocated that man is endowed with certain inalienable and natural rights such as right to life, liberty and property, the rights which are not dependent upon the mercy of state or society but are inherent in the personality of man.

In a related development, the non-interference as advocated by the classical liberalists not only increased the gap between the rich and the poor but also created a number of socio-economic contradictions. Slowly as argues by Mukherjee and Ramaswamy (2007:70), it began to be realized that this perspective of state was inadequate to fulfill the social, economic and political goals it was set up for. This threw up the emergence of the Neo-liberal scholars who deviated from the classical liberal tradition of non-interference.

Unlike the classical liberalist who regarded the state as a necessary evil, modern liberals regard the state as a necessary institution, but not an evil. The state is viewed as an instrument of social service and common welfare and not the enemy of liberty and rights of man (Mahajan, 2000:72; Mato, 1999: 102; Tenuche, 2001: 62).

From the foregoing argument, one can deduce the role of the state in rural development because the state is supposed to be an instrument of social service and common welfare. J. S. Mills who is one of the leading exponents of modern liberalism for instance disagreed with the classical liberalists and contends that, the duty of the state is not only to remove obstacles in the way of individual progress but also to take positive steps for the socio-economic well-being of the people. The measures he suggested include amongst others; compulsory education, limiting the right of inheritance, factory legislation, control and monopolies by the state, lessening of the working hours and attaching of less sanctity to landed property (Mills, 1956:238).

Rural Development is part of general development that embraces a large segment of those in great need in the rural sector. Hunter (1964) was among the earliest to use the expression Rural Development which he considered as the starting point of development characterized by subsistence.

Development as a concept resists a universally accepted definition. Nette (1969:52), states that, the problems which usually surround the concept of development revolves around its meaning or what it entails. This according to him is what defined the different theoretical conceptions as to how it can be achieved. He further, sees development from the view point of increased economic efficiency, expansion of productive capacity of a nation’s economy, technological advancement, economic and industrial diversification as well as adaptability in the face of external forces.

Streeten (1994:67), argues that development is simply an attack on the chief evils of the world today; Malnutrition, diseases, illiteracy unemployment and inequality. Measure indicators in terms of aggregate growth rates, has been a great success. But measured in terms of jobs, justice, infrastructure, basic needs and the elimination of poverty, it has been a failure or only a partial success.

It is the search for development that creates the impetus for the introduction of rural development programmes and in this case Third National Fadama Development Project (Fadama III). It is against this backdrop that Ottong (2002:14) sees development as:

A process of creating favourable conditions for growth or advancement of peoples’ self-esteem through the establishment of social, political and economic systems and institutions which
promotes human dignity and respect. By implication, a peoples’ range of choices and access to better life generally including the level of freedom improved significantly.

When development is qualified by the adjective ‘rural’, it becomes the change for better at the grassroots. In fact, rural development like development does not submit itself to a universally accepted definition. This is perhaps as a result of the scenario in the disciplines of social sciences. There is no generally acceptable definitions of concepts. Scholars within the purview of social sciences perceive the concept of rural development from distinct analytical perception and ideological milieu. In spite of this intellectual bias, some scholar conceived rural development as process of not only increasing the level of per capita income in the rural areas, but also the standard of living of the rural population, measured by food and nutrition level, health, education, housing, recreation and security (Diejomoh, 1973).

World Bank (2001:4), sees it as a strategy designed to improve the economic and social welfare of a particular group of people-rural poor. This involves extending the benefits of development to the poorest in the society. The group includes small scale farmers, tenants and the landless in rural areas. The above definition revolves around the idea of providing for the basic needs such as portable water, feeder roads, education etc. It is however, unfortunate to note that the absence of these basics of life defined most rural societies in Nigeria.

Rural development can also be defined as a comprehensive mode of social transformation, a social-economic change seeking to bring about more equitable distribution of resources within the society and veritable acceptance of the principle of growth from below. This implies that rural development is meant to improve the living standard of the rural populace that gives recognition to equal distribution in the production process such that exploitation is reduced to the minimal level (Olatunbosun, 1975:16; Adewumi, 1987:9).

Mobogunje (1980:94), considers rural development to do with the improvement of the living standard of the low income population living in rural areas on self sustaining basis through transforming the social spatial structures of their productive activities. Rural development therefore, corresponds with the nature of politics, state and production relations therein.

As a critical concept, Ollawa (1971) perceives rural development as “the restructuring of the economy in order to satisfy the material needs and aspirations of the rural masses and to promote individual and collective incentives to enable them participate in the process of development. Thus, this strategy involves a host of multi-sectoral activities including the improvement of agriculture, the promotion of rural industries, the creation of the requisite infrastructure and social overheads, as well as the establishment of appropriate decentralized structure in order to allow mass production (Wilkin, 2010). He further asserted that, rural development is “a multi-dimensional process aimed at uplifting the life of the rural dwellers in the society. This involves the creation of employment, access roads, health facilities, better housing, good water supply and equitable distribution of income among the rural people. In spite of numerous and diverse definitions the subject by scholars, one thing is imperative about the scope and boundaries of rural development as a field of inquiry. This analytical importance borders on the fact that rural development is directed principally and completely towards the total transformation of rural communities. The essence is to transform these communities to modern cities. The ultimate goal is to eradicate poverty and further reduce the persistent migration of people from rural to urban areas in search of better means of livelihood in the contemporary world.

Rural development has scope that is broad and elastic, and it depends on the interaction of many forces such as the objectives of the programme, the availability of resources for planning and implementation, etc. In developing countries, such as Nigeria, rural development projects will include agricultural set-up projects, rural water supply projects, rural electrification projects, rural feeder-road and maintenance projects, rural health and disease control projects, rural education and Adult education campaign, rural telecommunication system, and rural industrialization. Based on the scope of rural development (as the improvement of the total welfare of the rural low-income people), the following objectives of rural development evolved.
The above definitions stressed rural development as essentially a mass and continuous transformation with the aim of meeting the social, economic and psychic needs of the rural populace. It can be established from the foregoing that rural development is more of a conscious integrated system and process designed to uplift and improve the general living standard of the rural dwellers through the provision of the basic needs so as to develop the human potential which is the base for any development. This should not be confused with agricultural development as this is just an aspect of rural development, which is broader and multi-sectional.

We can therefore consider that the notion of rural development has been linked with political intervention. If we understand the term rural development literally, it only has a neutral meaning of development in a geographically specific rural area. In fact, this term is sometimes used without particular implication. Nevertheless, in the context of development studies, the notion of rural development has been linked, especially in the 1970s, with a specific policy framework.

As Harriss (1982: 15), points out, the notion of rural development appeared in the 1970s and criticized severely the development policy so far applied in developing countries. The mainstream of Third World development policy in the 1960s attached importance mainly to economic growth through industrialization, which was a discussion about what is desirable change. As for policies on rural areas and agriculture, their main goal was the growth of agricultural productivity through modernization. The agricultural mechanization policy was typical in this context. However, being aware of the existence of the massive number of poor in developing countries, criticism against such exclusively growth-oriented policy has increased. This criticism has affected developmental thought, thus making international organizations such as ILO and the World Bank put more emphasis in the 1970s on such issue as poverty alleviation, correction of inequality and fair distribution of developmental results. The policy framework for rural development appeared with such a change of developmental thought. When poverty alleviation came to be the central issue in development, it was natural that the rural areas, where the majority of the poor lived, attracted the major concern.

The growth-oriented policy so far applied in developing countries had only limited ability to tackle the poverty problem: the trickle-down effect, which means that if economic growth continues, the result trickles down to the poor. On the contrary, the rural development policy confronted directly the critical issue of poverty. Rural in the notion of rural development meant in this context a place where the poor live. In total, the notion of rural development has been strongly linked with the goal of poverty alleviation, and with the framework for development strategy emphasizing not only economic growth but also distribution and equality. Such an idea of rural development appeared and rapidly spread in the 1970s as the new approach for Third World development.

World Bank and Rural Development.
It was the World Bank that played the major role in spreading the notion of rural development in the 1970s. The World Bank experience is the reasons why the rural development policy, targeted on peasants, appeared in the 1970s, Mizuno (1999) mentions four factors. First is that, as the peasant revolution succeeded in several countries in Asia and Latin America in the 1960s, Western countries were eager to ameliorate the living standard of the peasants. Secondly, excessive urbanization has become a serious problem in many developing countries. This has led to international concern about rural poverty as the origin of migration. Third is that technical innovation such as high-yield varieties and fertilizers, progressed rapidly, thus making agricultural investment profitable. Finally, Chinese experience of rural development was highly appreciated internationally. These factors brought international concern to the peasant problem.

The World Bank governor's epoch-making speech in September 1973 declared the adoption of a new policy: rural development. In this "Nairobi Speech," the governor shed light on the significance of poverty alleviation and promised enlarged lending for rural development. The World Bank document in 1975 gave a short and clear definition of rural development. Rural development is a strategy designed to improve the economic and social life of a specific group of people the rural poor. It involves extending the benefits of development to the poorest among those who seek a livelihood in the rural areas. The group includes
small-scale farmers, tenants and the landless (IBRD, 1975b). Rural development was in this sense understood as the most effective strategy for alleviating poverty.


In Muroi’s research on Nigeria (1987, 1989). Nigeria actively promoted several agricultural and rural development programmes from the mid-1970s. Muroi analyzed two of the programmes; the large-scale irrigation programme financed mainly by the government, and "integrated rural development programme" financed mainly by the World Bank. Self-sufficiency in food was the main goal of both of these projects. The latter programme was intended especially for small-scale farmers, as the Bank financed it. Although abundant oil money was allocated for these programmes, Nigerian food production did not sufficiently increase. Though some strategically important food crops were selected (wheat and rice in large-scale irrigation programmes, and maize in the "integrated rural development programme"), the result was not satisfactory in either case. Neither the production of wheat nor of rice increased. The production of maize augmented, but the increase was mainly due to the provision of very cheap fertilizer. The government expended great amount to subsidize it. Moreover, in the former programmes, many peasants were enforced to move from their homeland because of the construction work. In the latter case, the project caused structural corruption such as the illegal marketing of subsidized fertilizer. While pointing out such problems with the projects, Muroi posed an important question: how did the "rural development policy affected the "relations of production" in rural areas. Although both the two programmes could not ameliorate Nigerian self-sufficiency in food, they did affect considerably on rural society, causing new situations: land appropriation, creation of opportunity for wage labour, distribution of fertilizer, introduction of new varieties, etc.

The National Fadama Development Project was introduced as a strategy to tackle rural development problems. There are quite a number of studies on rural development in general and fadama project in particular. These studies have been carried out in different parts of Nigeria and on different aspect of the impact analysis of the National Fadama Development Project. For example, Bajoga et al (2006) examined the impact of the project specifically on the living standard of dry season farmers who benefited from the fadama loans in Gombe state. The study revealed that the project did not make any impact on the beneficiaries of the fadama loan by increasing their income, improving the living standard of an access to more personal belongings.

Similarly, Adegbite et al (2008) carried out an assessment on the impact of fadama II on small-scale farmer’s income in Ogun state with emphasis on the implication for agricultural financing in Nigeria. Using a multi-stage stratified random sampling in their study, their villages were selected each for both beneficiaries and non- beneficiaries in fadama endowed communities of Obafemi-Owode local government area of Ogun State. Evidence from their study also revealed no significant increased in the income of the fadama beneficiaries compared to non-beneficiaries of the fadama project in the study area.

In another study Kudi et al (2008) examined the impact of the fadama II on poverty alleviation among farmers in Giwa local government area of Kaduna State, especially how the project has affected the socio-economic status of the farmers and production efficiency. They found that there was a little improvement in the income of farmers. The implication is that better income give better purchasing power and hence the improvement of living standard.

Adeoye et al (2011) also undertook a study to examine rural infrastructure and profitability of farmers under fadama II project in Oyo state, using infrastructural index and gross margin. They compared the infrastructural development between fadama II local government areas and non- fadama II areas. Their findings revealed that, more than half of the villages in fadama II local government areas have more infrastructures than non fadama II villages. This implies that Fadama II project had contributed significantly to the development of infrastructures in Oyo state.

The cross sectional studies as revealed above have shown that societies are subject to a process of development, which is itself not arbitrary, but regular; and that no social fact can be really understood apart from its history. Political economy has traditionally given priority to understanding social change and historical transformation.
The collaborative role of the state and any development partner in an economy and the resultant impact it has on the general populace can better be understood when one look at both the economic system as well as the social formations of the society. According to Ake (1981:11), the economic system is the material foundation of social life, the legal system, the political system, the belief system and the morality drive from the economic system. Once the economic system is understood, the general character of the other aspects of social system can be conjectured.

We argue that, the collaborative role of the Nigerian State and World Bank in the implementation of Third National Fadama Development Programme has exposes the impact of the state and capital on both the peasantry and provision of services within the galaxy of development. The Nigeria State and its class character as far as rural development is concern has to do with a phenomena that is anchored on who stands to gain from policies that emerge from the Nigerian state or its agencies. The need to understand those who stand to gain or who have been gaining from the policies of the state toward rural development is very important.

Therefore, we argue that the Third National Development Project like any other rural development programmes in the past whether initiated and sponsored by the Nigerian State or in collaboration with any development partner serves the interest of the ruling class and not aimed at enhancing rural development or socio-economic well-being of the entire people. Lenin (1945:220) argues along this perspective when he observes that;

> When it is not immediately apparent which proposal, measure etc. one should always ask, “Who stand to gain?” In politics, it is not so important who directly advocate particular views. What is important is who stands to gain from the views, proposal, measures put in place, it is better to see who stand to gain.

**Conclusion**

The state cannot be fair in its role of rural development because, those who make policies by the state represent the state and its class contradiction as well as the World Bank and as a development partner or donor agency represents the international capitalist structure that is responsible for the establishment of the bank in the first place. The roles of the World Bank, IMF and MNCs as well as canvassing, for neoliberal ideology are rather venal where they endlessly pursue their selfish interest to the detriment of the people they claim to be empowering. The whole world is a class entity and World Bank derives it ideology, finance etc from western governments and work incessantly to ensure the further integration of Third World economies into global capitalism even though they hide under the popular guise of promoting community development especially at the grass roots. The World Bank intervention is only aimed at ensuring the continuity of this process. Most of the international development agents are rather accountable to their donors and used to achieve the foreign policies of western countries. Despite their appearance as agents of socio–economic transformation, they are often co-opted by and reproduce neoliberal states as most of their developmental projects are often designed based on guidelines and policies of the imperialist centre and institutions. All these plethora of contradictions inherent in these agents of development activities have generated much heated debate and at the same time raising questions about their legitimacy and sustainability. In the long run such contradictions lead to social exclusion of the masses from the process of development.

However, because of class interest and the nature of politics in Nigeria rural development will not be developed to meet the aspirations of the rural dwellers. In addition, the project from all intent and purpose is development friendly in view of the fact that the project requires the rural poor to pay some amount of money as counterpart funds.
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