RECENT PATTERN OF ACCUMULATION IN THE NIGERIAN ECONOMY

By

*Dr. Bright U. EKUERHARE**

The thrust of this paper rests on the assumption that the character of the «Nigerian Nation» reflects the anatomy and physiology of the Nigerian Economy. The «State» of the Nigerian Nation, today, is therefore conceived of as a culmination of the evolution through historical time of the Nigerian economy. But, today, the Nigerian economy is in the throes of a deepening crisis. Two questions readily come to mind. Does the current economic crisis represent a major crisis of the Nigerian Nation? Does a desirable resolution of the current economic crisis necessarily require a desirable reconstitution of the Nigerian Nation? These questions are compelling as it can be argued that Nigeria's dependent capitalist social formation has largely been characterised by MYRDAL's conception of «the soft state» (MYRDAL, in Streeten, 1970).

Seeking satisfactory answers to these questions may require a study of the logic of, and the mechanisms responsible for structural shifts in the Nigerian economy. Such a study is attempted in this paper in the context of the accumulation process in the economy during the last decade. It is posited that the accumulation process determines the production and foreign trade structures, and that the mechanisms of control over the accumulation process are central to our understanding of the production and foreign trade structures in the economy. The mechanisms of control over the accumulation process are generally crystallized in the role of the class structure, particularly the role of the domestic bourgeoisie in Nigeria's political economy. The paper is therefore structured as follows. Section I sketches models of accumulation as a general theoretical background to the study. Section II attempts a quantitative analysis of the accumulation process, and Section III indicates the underlying class structure and policy implications of the process, and concludes the study.

I. — As a starting-point for sketching the models of accumulation, we need to define the term 'accumulation process'. This term encompasses all the mechanisms and institutions involved, within a given structure of ownership of means of production, in the extraction of surplus from the economy, and in the mobilisation and channelling of the surplus in such a manner as to create and expand the productive capacity of the economy. Defined in this way, the term refers to the process of investment and the flows of capital funds rêquired to finance it. In technical language, the term also refers to the process of «freezing of current output in the form of productive capacity (in the economy) so as to increase output in the future» (FITZGERALD, 1979, p. 148). An analysis of the pattern of accumulation in an economy over any relevant period of time may therefore

---

* *Department of Economics, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.*

collapse into an integrated analysis of the patterns of investment, savings and of flows of capital funds on the one hand, and of the structure of production on the other.

We may note from the foregoing that types of sources of surplus extraction may distinguish models of accumulation. In a dependent capitalist economy, which is not an imperialist power, three main sources of surplus extraction may be identified. The first is the taxation of 'rent' on natural resources which is generated as a result of the scarcity of primary products on metropolitan market. This process of surplus extraction may predominate in an extractive-industry-dominated economy. The second is the capitalist profits extracted through the exploitation of wage labour within capitalist enterprises. The capitalist profits are generally realised in the form of the excess of labour time over and above that required to produce the wage goods needed for the reproduction of the labour power of the workforce. The third source of surplus extraction, which is closely related to the second, is the intersectoral transfers of surplus through the price system. The most important mechanisms through which the intersectoral surplus transfers operate are the internal terms of trade and the external terms of trade. The internal terms of trade shift surplus from agriculture to industry through the domestic relative prices of food and manufactures, and the external terms of trade shift the surplus from the primary export sector to industry through the relative prices of raw material exports and imported industrial inputs.

The models of accumulation are, in general, delineated on the basis of the type and extent of the state involvement in the accumulation process occurring in a post-colonial economy. The models of accumulation usually rest on the assumption that the state does not act independently of social and political forces but supports one class or another depending upon its class composition. The state can, broadly, play either a 'support' role or a 'controlling' role in the accumulation process. A 'support' role of the state defines a classical capitalist model of accumulation, and a 'controlling' role of the state defines either a state capitalist model of accumulation or a socialist model of accumulation. A post-colonial economy can pass through these models of accumulation within a short period of time depending on the dynamics of internal contradictions as manifested in the changing balance of its class forces, on the rapidity of its transition from primary exporting towards industrialisation, and on the changing character of world capitalist system and imperialism.

The classical capitalist model of accumulation is distinguished by the fact that the state acts as a 'committee chairman' for the private sector operators (that is, both domestic and foreign capitalists), providing them with infrastructure and finance. The state provides the large 'lumps' of investment in transport facilities such as roads, basic inputs such as electricity and heavy industry such as steel which capitalist firms could not afford, but need in order to expand their investment activities and make them profitable. This may mean a considerable net subsidy to the users of the infrastructure as it is usually run at a loss. Through development banks, taxation, and appropriate credit and incomes policies the state mobilises capital funds and channels them into production activities where the private capitalists predominate. The state mobilisation of capital funds may involve the imposition of restraint on wages to allow for greater profit levels, and the channelling into private capitalists' enterprises of 'rental' income derived from natural resource exports. Thus, the private capitalists exercise a dominant influence in the direction of economic policy and, hence, determine the structure of production in the economy. But the structure of production may reflect the profit-making needs of the private capitalists rather than the needs to accelerate and restructure the productive capacity of the economy.

The state capitalist model of accumulation is characterised by the predominance of the public (state) sector in the generation of profits and determination of the structure of production in the economy. This, in general, is manifested in the large-scale state ownership and control of production and commercial activities in the economy. The state mobilises the surplus and channels it into state enterprises for expanded reproduction. The state provides infrastructure and finance to support the directly productive state enterprises; thus the transfer of capital funds from one sector of the economy to another is largely internal to the budgeting process of the state.

In terms of class forces, the state capitalist model of accumulation has often been inaugurated, given the obvious weaknesses of domestic private capitalists in a typical post-colonial economy, by the intermediary stratum of bureaucrats, the bureaucratic bourgeoisie. The model is seen, in this context, as an anti-imperialist strategy adopted by the bureaucratic bourgeoisie for achieving rapid and integrated industrial development in place of the fragmented and dependent development imposed on the economy by foreign capitalists. However, although foreign capitalists' assets are often nationalised, state joint ventures with foreign capitalists continue to mark this model of accumulation. The state joint ventures create monopolies for the foreign capitalists in the economy through the state licensing and tariff policies. Through the state joint ventures, the foreign capitalists have easy access to regulated low wages, prices of infrastructural inputs, banking, housing, and of other services; they also have easy access to such scarce external resources as imports and foreign exchange. Even where the foreign capitalists are not involved in state joint ventures in terms of ownership, the expansion of state enterprises facilitates the further penetration of foreign capitalist interests in the economy. For instance, the expansion of state enterprises provides avenue for expanding the market in capital goods, patents, consultancy, management and financial services for the foreign capitalists. We should also note that, although the weaknesses of the domestic private capitalists provide the *raison d'être* for the inauguration of the state capitalist model of accumulation, the operation of the model provides the domestic private capitalists with the opportunities to flourish in the economy. In this connection, institutional preconditions are often created for the formation of alliances among the domestic private capitalists, the foreign capitalists and the bureaucratic capitalists, alliances which are increasingly required for the intensification of the processes of surplus extraction from, surplus utilisation in, and surplus expatriation from the economy.

The socialist model of accumulation is distinguished by the complete control of the processes of surplus extraction and surplus utilisation in the economy by the state composed mainly of workers, peasants, and of the radical elements of the intermediary strata of bureaucrats and intellectuals. This model is often inaugurated with the surplus extracted from the economy through the state expropriation of the assets of both the domestic private and the foreign capitalists. This model may emerge from the state capitalist model as the latter fails to establish a hegemonic capitalist state in a post-colonial economy. The distinct possibility, of course, exists for the state capitalist model to assume the Kaleckian «intermediate regime» model, the inherently unstable characteristic of which may revert it to a dependent capitalist model of accumulation (KALECKI, 1972, pp. 162–169). This possibility may arise from the fact that because of its limited political base in the civil society, the state capitalist model may create severe economic imbalances from insufficient control over the processes of surplus extraction and surplus utilisation in the economy, problems which the state may be powerless to resolve. For the same reason of limited political base in the civil society, the state may fail in its negotiation with imperialism for a reduction in the external dependence of the accumulation process.

Yet the operation of the state capitalist model may generate sufficiently sharp contradictions in the civil society to warrant the creation of the social and political basis for initiating the socialist model of accumulation. The contradictions may arise from the introduction of integrated planning process to enable the state to negotiate with foreign capital for the purpose of achieving wider economic objectives through the restructuring of production. The contradictions may also arise from the introduction of a comprehensive system of worker participation in the profits and management of corporate enterprises, and from the vigorous pursuit of radical land reforms programme. The worker-participation arrangement, far from breaking up trades unions solidarity, may raise the degree of class consciousness of the labour movement to such an extent that it may demonstrate its strength not only in raising wage levels but also in exercising control over production. The resulting sustained industrial conflicts within state enterprises may, thus, reveal the true class nature of state capitalism. Such sustained conflicts may crystallise in «the development of political organisation among workers and peasants and a radical leadership capable of restraining and ultimately superseding the political domination of the bureaucracy» (BECKMAN, in Yash GHAI, 1977, p. 135). In consequence, the death-knell of the alliances among domestic private capitalists, foreign capitalists, and bureaucratic capitalists sustaining the state capitalist model may sound heralding the laying of an enduring foundation for a coherent and effective domestic control over the emerging structure of production in the economy through the inauguration and operation of the socialist model of accumulation.

II. — We need to analyse, quantitatively, the pattern of accumulation in the Nigerian economy over the last decade so as to generate the empirical evidence required for an interpretation, attempted in the next section, based on the foregoing theoretical models of accumulation. The empirical analysis focusses on the changing patterns of investment, savings, flows of capital funds, and of production in the economy over the last decade. An analysis of shifts among production activity sectors forms a useful basis for the empirical analysis of the patterns of investment, savings, and of flows of capital funds in the economy. Tables 1 and 2 present a detailed picture of the dynamics and shifts in the structure of production over the 1973/74 – 1982 period. Emerging from this picture is the fact that the overall growth performance of the economy during this period was unimpressive: the gross domestic product recorded an average annual growth rate of only 2.4 % in real terms. Assuming that the country's population was growing at the rate of 2.5 % per annum during this period, this growth performance of the economy represented a negative rate of growth of the real per capita gross domestic product of 0.1 %. Notably, this overall growth performance of the economy was characterised by extreme imbalances in its structure of production. For instance, whilst the agricultural and crude petroleum sectors declined absolutely and relatively, such activity sectors as the manufacturing, building and construction, transport, services including wholesale and retail trade, finance and insurance exhibited dynamism and increasing importance. During the review period, agriculture and crude petroleum achieved negative average annual growth rates of 1.5 % and 2.6 % respectively. We should also note from Table 1 that gross domestic product not only recorded negative rates of growth for 1978/79, 1981 and 1982 but also most other production activity sectors registered negative rates of growth for these years. This fact is relevant to the analysis of the accumulation cycle in the economy over the 1973/74–1982 period.

The trends in the accumulation cycle in the Nigerian economy over this period as represented by the trends in gross fixed capital formation and net fixed capital formation at constant values can be discerned from table 3. The gross fixed capital formation and net fixed capital formation stood, respectively in 1973/74 at 23 % and 18 % of gross domestic product. The rates of gross and net capital formation fell slightly in 1974/75 but accelerated to 40 % and 36 % respectively in 1978/79, fell again in 1979/80 but accelerated to the all-time high rates of 44 % and 39 % in 1981, and fell again in 1982. These trends represented, ostensibly, an unprecedented expansion in the productive capacity of the economy in the contemporary economic history of Nigeria. For instance, it has been shown (by RIMMER, in Bienen and Diejomaoh, 1981, p. 44) that the rate of gross fixed capital formation at constant values rose from only 11 % in 1960/61 to 15 % in 1965/66.

Although we have not been able to generate our own information on the ownership structure of investment, we can conclude from OKIGBO's data (OKIGBO, 1981, p. 171) that the public sector dominated the accumulation process during the 1973/74–1982 period. According to OKIGBO's computation, the rate of gross investment by the public sector rose from 36 % in 1965 to 62 % in 1974 and reached 68 % in 1977 but fell to 60 % in

1978. He concludes that whilst «the bulk of the public sector outlays used to go into building and construction in the early 1960s, now it is divided between that and machinery because of the increase of public sector activity in manufacturing enterprises and in the mechanisation of agriculture» (OKIGBO, 1981, p. 171). It is for this reason of the increasing dominance of the public sector in the accumulation process that OKIGBO (1982) has estimated that the contribution of the public sector to the gross domestic product rose from 9 % in 1962 to 55 % in 1979. But, given the massive state investment expenditure on such huge projects as the iron and steel industry and the Green Revolution programme since 1979, the public sector's contribution to the gross domestic product may now have exceeded 60 %. But the structure of the public-sector-dominated investment process underpinned the extreme imbalances that characterised the structure of production in the economy as observed earlier. For instance, as can be seen in Table 4, building and construction dominated the gross fixed capital formation, followed by machinery and equipment and transport equipment over the 1973/74–1982 period indicating the unusual dynamism of the building and construction and related activities and of manufacturing industrial activity that marked this period. On the other hand, the insignificance of land improvement in the gross fixed capital formation underscored the unprecedentedly unsatisfactory performance of the agricultural sector during the period.

The patterns of savings and of flows of capital funds which financed the foregoing observed investment process in the economy need to be briefly analysed. Over the 1973/74–1982 period, domestic savings, as can be seen in table 5, constituted the main source of financing gross accumulation in the economy. We may note that external finance was insignificant as a source financing gross accumulation until 1978/79 when the rate of external finance rose to 5 % from only 0.8 % in 1974/75. The rate of external finance fell from the 1978/79 rate of 5 % to 2 % in 1981 and rose stupendously to 14 % in 1982, thereby initiating, perhaps, a new era of massive dependence on the external source of financing accumulation in the economy. Be that as it may, domestic savings was the main source of financing the gross accumulation throughout the 1973/74–1982 period. The domestic savings, we must stress, was generated largely in the state sector through budget surpluses during this period. In this connection, after a careful review of the evidence, OKIGBO (1981, p. 180) concludes that when the budgetary deficit of the civil war years had practically been wiped out by 1972, budgetary savings by the state sector had become the main contributor to the financing of investment expenditure by 1974 and after. But the budget surpluses arose largely from the petroleum-sector-derived revenues. For instance, the petroleum-sector-derived revenues as a proportion of the total Federal Government revenues fluctuated between 75 % and 83 % over the 1973/74–1982 period. Thus we may conclude that it was the state taxation of 'rent' on the crude petroleum resource that largely created the basis for the domestic financing of gross accumulation in the economy. Part of the surplus thus extracted was channelled through the intermediation of financial institutions to production activity sectors of the economy.

But the point must be made that the process of extraction of surplus in the economy through the state taxation of the 'rent' on the crude petroleum resource was reinforced by the generation of capitalist profits extracted through the exploitation of wage labour within capitalist enterprises including state enterprises. In this sense, the analysis of investment process and savings attempted above is the complement of that of consumption and of labour remuneration. If wage and salary expenditure made up the greater part of current consumption, their control would become a major element in economic policy designed to support the accumulation process. This is because for accumulation to take place, the level of consumption must either be reduced or its pattern changed. From the pattern of factoral distribution of income in Nigeria over the 1973/74–1982 period presented in table 7, we can conclude that the exploitation of wage and salary labour operated in the economy during this period. For instance, whereas labour incomes as a proportion of total domestic factor income at constant values rose from 28 % in 1973/74 to 32 % in 1975/76 but fell continuously from this proportion to 23 % in 1982, the proportion of property and property related incomes fell from 72 % in 1973/74 to 68 % in 1975/76 but rose steadily from this proportion to 77 % in 1982. This pattern of factoral income distribution, biased against wage and salary labour and in favour of capital, was paralleled by a reduction in consumption level. For instance, private consumption as a proportion of aggregate demand at constant values rose slightly, as can be seen in table 6, from 63% in 1973/74 to 65 % in 1974/75 but fluctuated downwards over the 1974/75–1982 period. It is therefore staggering that the National Economic Council (NEC) Expert Committee Report «On the State of the Nigerian Economy» recommended draconian measures for reducing the level of labor remuneration as the Report regarded labour remuneration as a major source of the deepening crisis of the Nigerian economy. Either the authors of this Report were ignorant of the mechanics of the accumulation process occuring in the economy or they surreptitiously intended the recommended measures for intensifying the exploitation of labour as a means of detonating the state capitalist model of accumulation which characterised the Nigerian economy over the 1973/74–1982 period. It is argued, in section III below, that it is the peculiar variant of this model of accumulation, in terms of its specific manifestations in the Nigerian context, that forms the source of the current deepening economic crisis of the country.

III. — In our brief attempt in this last section of the study to indicate the underlying class structure and policy implications of the analysis of the pattern of accumulation in the Nigerian economy over the 1973/74–1982 period, we will endeavour to locate the structural sources of the current deepening crisis of the economy. We may conclude from the preceding quantitative analysis of the accumulation process in the economy and from the theoretical models of accumulation summarised in section I above that the state capitalist model of accumulation was inaugurated in the economy during the 1973/74–1982 period. But the inauguration of the state capitalist model of accumulation in Nigeria was, fundamentally, unlike what happened elsewhere, not at the instance of the radical intermediary stratum of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie pursuing an anti-imperialist strategy for restructuring the productive capacity of the Nigerian economy. Another peculiarity of the Nigerian variant of the state capitalist model of accumulation of the 1973/74–1982 period should also be noted. This model of accumulation was inaugurated, essentially, through the surplus extracted by the state from the crude petroleum resource, a surplus which accrued to the state largely in the form of 'rent'. It was the extent and pattern of conversion of this surplus into productive investment that determined the rate and pattern of expansion of the productive capacity of the economy. In other words, the surplus extracted from the crude petroleum resource largely determined the potential surplus of the economy, but the realisation of this potential surplus was dependent upon the rate and pattern of capitalist investment activity undertaken in the economy.

The hypothesis advanced, in this respect, is that the control exercised over the extent and pattern of the realisation of the potential surplus, extracted from the crude petroleum resource, by the alliances among the bureaucratic capitalists, domestic private capitalists, and foreign capitalists determined the rate and pattern of the productive capacity of the economy over the 1973/74–1982 period. Changes in such alliances among these categories of capitalists and among various factions of each of these categories determined, predominantly, the general direction of economic policy during this period. The incipient alliance formed between the bureaucratic and the domestic private capitalists up to the eve of the civil war was strengthened by the civil war conditions. The exploitation of the civil war profiteering conditions united the bureaucratic and the domestic private capitalists in their common aspirations of evolving themselves into the domestic bourgeoisie ('national bourgeoisie') determined to appropriate the surplus accruing to the state from the emergent 'booming' petroleum industry. In essence, this was the «Viable Polity» searched for Nigeria by the distinguished members of the bureaucratic and the domestic private capitalists who assembled in a national conference at the Institute of Administration of the Ahmadu Bello University in 1973 (See Mahmud TUKUR and Tunji OLAGUNJU, *Nigeria in Search of Viable Polity).*

The domestic bourgeoisie's exploitation of the 'Viable Polity', as reflected in the level and pattern of utilisation of the petroleum-derived surplus, was to be accomplished through the strengthening of, and the forging of the existing and new alliances with foreign bourgeoisie. The general thrust of economic policy over the 1973/74–1982 period was intended to accelerate these developments and, therefore, to promote and defend the economic interests of the domestic and foreign bourgeoisies. The general direction of economic policy and its implications for promoting extremely unbalanced, import-oriented, and foreign-exchange-intensive structure of productive capacity of the economy may briefly be illustrated in the specific contexts of indigenisation, industrial, agricultural, and expenditure policies. The indigenisation policy not only promoted the ownership and control by the domestic bourgeoisie of merchandising and small-scale industrial enterprises but also promoted the ownership and control by the foreign bourgeoisie of highly state protected and subsidized and high-technology enterprises. In consequence, wealth accumulated and concentrated amongst the bureaucratic, professional and intermediary, merchandising and industrial factions of the domestic bourgeoisie; the foreign bourgeoisie institutionalized its networks of clientage in the commercial activities of its old mercantile monopolies. Industrial policy generally encouraged the expansion of the domestic production, largely by the foreign bourgeoisie and its joint ventures with the state, of consumer goods previously imported, and not the expansion of the domestic production of intermediate and capital goods. Recently, however, state joint ventures with foreign bourgeoisie initiated the expansion of the intermediate and capital goods sectors of Nigeria's industrialisation process. Agricultural policy typically biased the pattern of resource allocation in favour of the bureaucratic faction of the domestic bourgeoisie and the joint ventures between this faction and the foreign bourgeoisie on the one hand, and in favour of the state joint agricultural ventures with the foreign bourgeoisie on the other. Appropriate policy instruments were devised to supply such large-scale agricultural enterprises with highly subsidised imported material inputs. The small-scale farmers, the peasant producers, who form the majority of the population of agricultural producers, were left in the limbo of resource allocation: agricultural policy largely denied them access to resources. Finally, expenditure policy emphasized the system of farming out the contract system, to contractors and consultants the execution of public works and services which were previously performed by government-employed professionals.

A detailed analysis of how each of these strands of economic policy, pursued over the 1973/74–1982 period for the advancement of the economic interests of the domestic and foreign bourgeoisies, constituted the structural sources of the current deepening crisis of the Nigerian economy needs not detain us. But suffice it to say that the domestic bourgeoisie used the state apparatus to formulate and implement economic policy which encouraged an extremely low degree of the realisation of the surplus through productive accumulation in the economy. This implies that unproductive accumulation substantially characterised the production structure of the economy. This, in turn, implies that what was officially regarded as investment could be treated, to a large extent, as disguised unproductive accumulation. This phenomenon forms the major structural source of the current deepening economic crisis of Nigeria. Its manifestation is the incidence of widespread poverty and deprivation of the majority of the population whilst the domestic bourgeoisie together with its foreign bourgeois ally indulges in conspicuous consumption and surplus expatriation from the economy. For instance, it has been estimated from table 7 that the national factor income as a proportion of the domestic factor income expatriated from the economy rose steadily from 6 % in 1974/75 to 10 % in 1981. The production structure of the economy was marked by extreme import and foreign exchange intensity: as can be seen from table 6, imports of goods and services as a proportion of gross domestic product rose from 14 % in 1974/75 to 34 % in 1981.

Two major conclusions may be drawn from this study. The first is that the state capitalist model of accumulation, inaugurated over the 1973/74–1982 period, largely resulted in extremely unbalanced, import-oriented, and foreign-exchange-intensive structure of productive capacity of the economy. The second is that rather than using the state capitalist model of accumulation as an anti-imperialist development strategy for achieving a fundamental restructuring of the productive capacity of the Nigerian economy, the domestic bourgeoisie used this model of accumulation as a means of surplus appropriation and surplus expatriation and as a means of fostering new forms of collaboration and accomodation with imperialism. The deepening current economic crisis therefore represents, in a fundamental sense, a crisis of the state capitalist model of accumulation in Nigeria, the resolution of which, in any way, is bound to generate social and political forces that are likely to compell a drastic reconstitution of the Nigerian state.

TABLE 1

NIGERIA: GROWTH RATE OF GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT BY PRODUCTION ACTIVITY SECTOR AT 1973/74 FACTOR COST

1973/74 - 1982

Production Activity Sector		73/74	74/75	75/76	76/77	77/78/	78/79	79/80	1980	1981	1982	Average annual Growth Rate over 1973/74 - 1982 period
AGRICULTURE	(₦m)	3138.6	3471.6	3103.5	2914.6	3240.5	2948.2	2857.3	2748.0	2861.3	2613.0	
	(%)	-	10.6	-10.6	-6.1	11.2	-9.0	-3.1	-3.8	4.1	-8.7	-1.5
INDUSTRY	(₦m)	4130.7	4351.7	4043.8	5049.5	5461.5	5260.0	5686.3	5923.2	5631.4	5582.5	
	(%)	-	5.4	-7.1	24.9	8.2	-3.7	8.1	4.2	-4.9	-0.9	3.4
SERVICE	(₦m)	3721.4	4124.4	5116.7	5387.7	5784.7	5488.2	5797.1	5883.4	5757.7	5640.2	
	(%)	-	10.8	24.1	5.3	7.4	-5.1	5.6	1.5	-2.1	-2.0	4.6
CRUDE. PETROLEUM*	(₦m)	1823.1	2037.7	1576.3	1873.1	1898.0	1731.0	2016.5	1855.9	1266.8	1223.0	
	(%)	-	11.8	-22.6	18.8	1.3	-8.8	16.5	-8.0	-31.5	-3.5	-2.6
MANUFACTURING*	(₦m)	496.9	480.5	593.8	732.4	778.1	890.0	955.0	1123.3	1255.2	1239.3	
	(%)	-	-3.3	23.6	23.3	6.12	14.4	7.3	17.6	11.7	-1.3	10.0
BUILDING & CONST.	(₦m)	1123.21	1131.70	1129.66	1498.95	1748.40	1581.21	1624.51	1786.46	1873.14	1786.02	
	(%)	-	0.8	-0.2	32.5	16.8	-9.6	2.7	10.0	4.9	-4.7	5.3
TRANSPORT	(₦m)	418.15	417.94	431.85	448.96	463.90	493.83	531.11	591.19	661.15	749.03	
	(%)	-	-0.1	3.3	4.0	3.3	6.5	7.5	11.3	11.8	13.3	6.1
WHOLESALE AND	(₦m)	2197.07	2341.40	2672.32	2865.52	3164.35	2898.76	3229.62	3237.68	3233.49	2992.26	
RETAIL TRADE	(%)	-	6.6	14.1	7.2	10.4	-8.4	11.4	0.2	-0.1	-7.5	3.4
FINANCE AND	(₦m)	140.45	268.60	385.14	409.75	463.50	499.50	517.33	538.09	558.56	607.78	
INSURANCE	(%)	-	91.2	43.4	6.4	13.1	7.7	3.6	4.0	3.8	8.8	18.2
REAL ESTATE AND	(₦m)	61.06	65.59	76.97	70.89	74.79	78.83	79.01	80.90	83.63	85.73	
PROFESSIONAL SERV.	(%)	-	7.4	17.4	-7.9	5.5	5.4	0.2	2.4	3.4	2.5	3.6
HOUSING	(₦m)	625.94	729.23	764.28	777.44	789.05	783.86	785.96	796.34	806.88	792.13	
	(%)	-	16.5	4.8	1.7	1.5	-0.7	0.3	1.3	1.3	-1.8	2.5
GOVERNMENT	(₦m)	664.41	685.58	1181.19	1225.70	1252.33	1077.56	1128.94	1168.77	1208.22	988.85	
	(%)	-	3.2	72.3	3.4	2.2	-14.0	4.8	3.5	3.4	-18.2	6.1
GROSS DOMESTIC	(₦m)	10990.7	11947.7	12264.0	13351.8	14486.7	13696.4	14340.7	14554.6	14250.4	13835.7	
PRODUCT	(%)	-	8.7	2.6	8.9	8.5	-5.5	4.7	1.5	-2.1	-2.9	2.4

Note: * Crude Petroleum and Manufacturing are parts of the Industrial Sector and are shown only as subsets of that sector.

Source: Calculated from Fed. Office of Statistics, Lagos, National Accounts of Nigeria 73/74 - 1982.

TABLE 2

NIGERIA: DISTRIBUTION OF GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT BY PRODUCTION ACTIVITY SECTOR AT 1973/74 FACTOR COST (%) 1973/74 - 1982

PRODUCTION ACTIVITY	1973/74	74/75	75/76	76/77	77/78	78/79	79/80	1980	1981	1982
Agriculture	28.54	29.05	25.31	21.83	22.37	21.52	19.92	18.88	18.68	19.01
Industry	37.60	36.41	32.95	37.83	37.70	39.15	39.66	40.70	39.51	40.65
Services	33.86	34.54	41.74	40.34	39.93	39.33	40.42	40.42	41.81	40.34
Crude Petroleum*	16.59	17.05	12.85	14.03	13.10	12.64	14.06	12.75	8.89	8.91
Manufacturing*	4.52	4.02	4.84	5.49	5.37	6.50	6.66	7.72	8.81	9.03
Building and Construction	10.22	9.47	9.21	11.21	12.07	12.28	11.33	12.28	13.14	13.00
Transport	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.6	3.7	4.1	4.6	5.5
Wholesale and Retail Trade*	19.9	19.60	21.79	21.46	21.84	21.16	22.52	22.25	22.69	21.78
Finance and Insurance	1.3	2.3	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.9	4.4
Real Estate and Professional Services	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6
Housing	5.7	6.1	6.2	5.8	5.5	5.7	5.5	5.5	5.7	5.8
Government*	6.0	5.7	9.6	9.2	8.6	7.9	7.9	8.0	8.5	7.2

Note: * *Crude Petroleum, Building and Construction, Manufacturing are parts of the Industrial Sector and are shown only as subsets of that sector. Similarly, Wholesale and Retail Trade, Government, are parts of the Services Sector and are shown only as subsets of that Sector. Only the Agriculture, Industry and Services will therefore sum up to 100% in respect of each corresponding year.*

Source: *Calculated from Federal Office of Statistics, Lagos, National Accounts of Nigeria, 1973/74 - 1982.*

TABLE 3

ACCUMULATION CYCLE - INVESTMENT IN NIGERIA, 1973.74 - 1982. (Percentage of Gross Domestic Product at 1973/74 Values).

	73/74	74/75	75/76	76/77	77/78	78/79	79/80	1980	1981	1982
1. Gross Fixed Capital Formation	22.8	20.8	26.5	39.1	40.5	40.1	35.3	39.8	43.6	38.0
2. Stock Building	1.0	1.7	3.4	2.4	2.2	2.2	1.9	2.1	2.3	1.6
3. Gross Capital Formation	23.8	22.5	29.9	41.5	42.7	42.3	37.2	41.9	45.9	39.6
4. Gross Fixed Capital Formation	22.8	20.8	26.5	39.1	40.5	40.1	35.3	39.8	43.6	38.0
5. Consumption of Fixed Capital	4.6	4.4	4.0	4.6	4.9	4.4	3.9	4.6	4.8	4.2
6. Net Fixed Capital Formation	18.2	16.4	22.5	34.5	35.6	35.7	31.4	35.2	38.8	33.8

Source: *Computed from Federal Office of Statistics, Lagos, National Accounts of Nigeria 1973/74 - 1982.*

TABLE 4

COMPOSITION OF GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION IN NIGERIA, 1973/74 - 1982 (Percentage of Gross Domestic Product at 1973/74 Values).

	73/74	74/75	75/76	76/77	77/78	78/79	79/80	1980	1981	1982
1. Building and Construction	17.5	15.5	16.3	22.0	23.8	25.6	24.5	26.6	28.7	25.8
2. Land Improvement	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
3. Transport Equipment	2.1	2.4	4.3	7.7	6.5	5.0	4.4	5.2	6.1	4.7
4. Machinery and Equipment	2.9	2.5	5.5	9.0	9.8	9.1	6.0	7.6	8.4	7.1
5. Breeding Stock	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gross Fixed Capital Formation	22.8	20.8	26.5	39.1	40.5	40.1	35.3	39.8	43.6	38.0
6. Stock Building	1.0	1.7	3.4	2.4	2.2	2.2	1.9	2.1	2.3	1.6
Gross Capital Formation	23.8	22.5	29.9	41.5	42.7	42.3	37.2	41.9	45.9	39.6

Source: *Computed from Federal Office of Statistics, Lagos, National Accounts of Nigeria 1973/74 - 1982*

TABLE 5

ACCUMULATION CYCLE - SOURCES OF FUNDS, 1973/74 - 1982 (Percentage of Gross Domestic Product at 1973/74 Values)

	73/74	74/75	75/76	76/77	77/78	78/79	79/80	1980	1981	1982
1. Domestic Savings	19.7	22.2	23.4	33.5	27.6	21.8	31.9	36.7	25.7	31.2
2. Consumption of Fixed Capital	4.6	4.4	4.0	4.6	4.9	4.4	3.9	4.6	4.8	4.2
3. External Foreign Finance	1.8	0.8	1.1	1.0	1.1	4.8	3.2	2.8	1.7	14.0
Finance of Gross Accumulation	26.1	27.4	28.5	39.1	33.6	31.0	39.0	44.1	32.2	49.4

Source: *Computed from Federal Office of Statistics, Lagos, National Accounts of Nigeria, 1973/74 - 1982*

TABLE 6

COMPOSITION OF AGGREGATED DEMAND IN NIGERIA, 1973/74 - 1982 (Percentage of Gross Domestic Product at 1973/74 Values).

	73/74	74/75	75/76	76/77	77/78	78/79	79/80	1980	1981	1982
1. Private Consumption	62.8	64.6	62.5	53.7	55.1	60.3	52.9	48.7	59.8	56.8
2. Government Consumption	8.9	7.9	10.7	8.8	11.7	12.9	10.4	9.0	8.9	7.4
	71.7	72.5	73.2	62.5	66.8	73.2	63.3	57.7	68.7	64.2
3. Gross Capital Formation	23.8	22.5	29.9	41.5	42.7	42.3	37.2	41.9	45.9	39.6
4. Domestic Demand	95.5	95.0	103.[illegible]	104.0	109.5	115.5	100.5	99.6	114.6	103.8
5. Exports of Goods and Services	22.4	20.8	17.2	16.6	17.9	15.5	22.0	28.3	20.9	19.4
6. Imports of Goods and Services	16.0	14.3	18.9	19.4	26.2	29.6	21.1	26.6	33.8	22.3
7. External Demand	+6.4	+6.5	-1.7	-2.8	-8.3	-14.1	+0.9	+1.7	-12.9	-2.9
8. Total Demand	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
9. Errors Due to Rounding	1.9	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.7	0.9

Source: *Computed from Federal Office of Statistics, National Accounts of Nigeria, 1973/74 - 1982.*

TABLE 7

FUNCTIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME IN NIGERIA 1973/74 - 1982 (Percentage of Domestic Factor Income at 1973/74 Values).

	73/74	74/75	75/76	76/77	77/78	78/79	79/80	1980	1981	1982
1. Labour Incomes[1]	27.6	31.1	32.0	28.5	27.8	27.2	25.4	24.5	25.4	23.2
2. Repatriated Labour Incomes	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.5	1.0	0.8	1.0	1.1	1.1
3. Property and Related Incomes[2]	72.4	68.9	68.0	71.5	72.2	72.8	74.6	75.5	74.6	76.8
4. Actual Repatriated Property and Related Incomes	5.6	2.5	1.9	1.4	1.9	1.0	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.6
5. Estimated Repatriated Property & Related Incomes Through Transfer Prices	3.4	3.0	3.9	4.1	5.5	6.2	4.4	5.6	7.1	4.7
6. National Labour Incomes	27.2	30.8	31.8	28.8	27.3	26.2	24.6	23.6	24.3	22.1
7. National Property and Related Incomes	63.4	63.4	62.2	66.0	64.8	65.6	68.9	68.4	66.0	70.5

Note: 1. *Labour Incomes include wages, salaries, employees' contribution to the National Provident Fund and other pensions schemes and other labour benefits.*

2. *Property and Related Incomes include Enterpreneurial Incomes, interest, dividend rents and royalties.*

Source: *Computed from Federal Office of Statistics, National Accounts of Nigeria, 1973/74 - 1982.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BECKMAN, BJORN (1977) «Public Enterprise and State Capitalism», in Yash Ghai (ed.), *Law in the Political Economy of Public Enterprise*, New York, Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.

FITZGERALD, E.V.K. (1979), *The Political Economy of Peru 1956–78: Economic Development on the Restructuring of Capital*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

KALECKI, MICHAL (1972), *Selected Essays on the Economic Growth of the Socialist and the Mixed Economy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

MYRDAL, G. (1970), «The Soft State in Underdeveloped Countries», in Streenten P. (ed.), *Unfashionable Economics: Essays in Honour of Lord Balogh*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

OKIGBO, P. N. C. (1981), *Nigeria's Financial System: Structure and Growth*, Essex, Longman.

OKIGBO, P. N. C. (1982), «Economic Implications of the 1979 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria», *Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Nigerian Economic Society, Port-Harcourt, 12–15th May.*

RIMMER, D. (1981), «Development in Nigeria: An Overview», in Bienen, H. and Diejomaoh, V.P. (ed.), *The Political Economy of Income Distribution in Nigeria*, London, Holmes and Meier Publishers.

TUKUR Mahmud and OLAGUNJU, T. , *Nigeria In Search of a Viable Polity*, Zaria, Baraka Press, No date of Publication.