THE INCLUSIVE AND SUSTAINABLE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY: WHICH WAY FOR NIGERIA?

Abstract

The United Nations, as usual, demonstrated a commitment by the formulation of «Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development» (ISID) to alleviate poverty through job creation in response to the realisation of SDG-9. With a descriptive research design and the documentary analysis method, it is found through this research that in spite of the policy, Nigerian industrial development efforts are not impressive. It is realised that both developed nations and the Nigerian government lack sincerity in the implementation of the policy.

The purpose of the article is to canvass for a demonstration of a strong commitment by the UN and the Nigerian government, strengthening of science and technological institutions of learning for result-oriented Research & Development; and enactment of a law that will criminalise importation of goods that can be produced locally.

The scientific novelty. In this paper, the foundation for the study, the research problem, nature of Nigerian industrialisation, the commitment of Nigerian government and stimulation of the policy in the actualisation of industrialisation in Nigeria are discussed with the adoption and application of «Endogenous growth theory».

Conclusions. Conclusively, it is paramount to clearly state that the introduction of ISID is targeted at encouraging full participation, empowerment, and control over resources allocation in response to the SDGs which brought about the development of global policy and productivity enhancement for social advancement. Notwithstanding, therefore, it is found through this research that though there are various industrial development policies, and medium-term economic plans at both local and international levels, the portrait of Nigerian industrialisation is not impressive.

Thus, many countries in the world are diversifying their sources of income. Nigeria is therefore expected to re-invigorate its manufacturing sector like other developed economies of the world by engaging sustained improvements and proactive activities as the sine-qua-non for dismantling the vicious circle of poverty and the realisation of a self-reliant and dynamic economy. So, developed human resources through rigorous R&D are tantamount to industrial services that will be central to the efforts of Nigeria to develop her socio-economic status.
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Introduction

The process of industrial growth and development is unequal across countries in all ramifications (Encyclopedia of Sociology, 2011).
rarely experienced. This lies in the position that Aluko (2001); Sonobe, Akoten & Otsuka (2011) & Ayema (2016) put forward that developing countries are characterised mainly by lack of knowledge and capacity, policy and regulatory structure, and environmentally sustainable wherewithal to foster viable industrialisation. Thus, the foremost task facing developing countries is industrial distortion and extraction from increasing incorporation into the international trading arrangement. In other words, there is an absence of the elements that will promote industrialisation; particularly how to create the critical mass of linkages that provides pecuniary externalities to industrial firms (Bangura, 1991; Aliyu, 1995; Mayer, 2018). In developing countries, for example, serious issues that range from critical infrastructures, capital investment, to modern technology and market access are found wanting in an increasingly complex constellation of strategies, actors, and means of intervention (Scholtès, 2015). The experience of the continent [Africa] in industrialisation for the past four decades as Adoji (2018) and United Nations Conference on Trade and Development–UNCTD (2018) opined has been below par because, in 2010, Sub Sahara Africa (SSA) countries’ common share of manufacturing value-added in GDP was only 10% without a change from the 1970s and in 2016. In Africa for instance, the average GDP per capita as observed was $2,008 respectively.

Following this development, Oyebanji (1982) conceived that after the Nigerian civil war, industrialisation assumed priority as a remedial measure for structuralisation and driver of the economy. However, Ayeni (2011) perceived that the Nigerian economy is faced with one major challenge of the low industrial base which drew minutes or no attention. The country is finding it difficult to be identified with knowledge-driven nations. Obviously, 85% of the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO)’s total Research & Development (R&D) budget is expended in technological driven countries of the world basically because this is where most innovations resonate (Soubbotina, 2004).

This article is therefore aimed at reviewing the ISID framework and how it has impacted industrialisation in Nigeria, and the extent to which Nigerian government leveraged on the structure to galvanise industrialisation and to understand whether it has stimulated industrial development programmes’ implementation. The final part of the study provides concluding observation and recommendations.

**Methodology**

The descriptive research design is used in this study. The research draws broadly from earlier studies and published works that appertain to industrial development issues most of which were supported by the federal government, research institutions, economic development organisations, media houses, and non-governmental organisations/donor agencies. Significantly, this study explored and emphasised the documentary analysis method which is a structure of qualitative research that analyses data to give influence and implication around an assessment topic (Bowen, 2009; Onwueguzie, Leech & Collins, 2012:30).

Following Messick’s (1989) and Obasi (1999) concept of validity and reliability which states the unification and integration of contents, criteria, and consequences, this qualitative research leads to the integration and validation of the «Endogenous Growth Theory». Essentially, the study found that the implementation of the UNIDO framework has not significantly impacted the Nigerian industrialisation process.

**Statement of the Problem**

The growing economy of Nigeria was hampered in the 1970s following the oil boom that made the country abandoned agriculture and manufacturing. At the beginning of the 21st century, the oil sector became the mainstay of the Nigerian economy accounting for over 98% and 83% of external income and revenue for the government (NPC, 2019). With this development, many sectors were relegated to the background and Nigeria backs lidded into a single model of economic activity and that fuelled the massive movement of young and productive graduates into the cities which resulted in widespread poverty. This circumstance led to overcrowding and pressure on the basic infrastructures in the urban centres since the beginning of the 1980s.

The non-existence of essential industrialisation and the production of the automobile has been a cog in the wheel of effective technological development in Nigeria (Mayer, 2018). Thus, there is also the general failure in industrial interconnectivity in the utilisation of the
products and by-products of other companies in the manufacturing process. Moreover, researches have revealed that efforts on manufacturing in Nigeria have only paid attention to small and medium-scale setup and other aspects of the production process regionally.

The superficial character of Nigeria’s technological facility equally halted the economy from stirring ahead of the basic stages of the ambitious industrial development programmes outlined in the Second (1970–74) and Fourth (1981–85) National Development Plans respectively. These are plans in areas like fertiliser, cement, salt, sugar, pulp and paper, iron and steel, which are indeed operating at a low level or are non-existent.

According to Soubbotina (2004:67), «developing countries’ capacity to tap the internationally available flows of knowledge and adapt them for their specific needs is impeded by the relatively small number of scientists and engineers working in these countries and the relatively low level of their populations’ education». Accordingly, the Nigerian industrial sector has been characterised by frequent productive activities, spatial design of distribution; that industries are essentially concentrated in major cities, inability to revolutionise production and sub-contracting linkages as a result of low-level technological-orientation, little wages, artless assembly methodologies, resource and labour-intensive industries, and the production of light consumer goods. From the foregoing, this research shall consider:

i. The Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development Strategy,

ii. The extent to which the Nigerian government leveraged on the framework to galvanize industrialisation, and

iii. Whether the structure has stimulated the implementation of industrial development programmes or not in Nigeria.

Theoretical Underpinning

This study is anchored on «Endogenous Growth Theory». Endogenous growth theory emerged out of research done by Paul Romer to find an alternative to the exogenous growth model in the 1980s. Other proponents of the theory include Grossman & Helpman (1991); Romer (1990) and Agion & Howitt (1992). According to Liberto (2019), the theory challenged the wide gap of economic development between developed and underdeveloped nations in the case of persistence «investment in physical capital like infrastructure» which is subjected to diminishing returns. The government local policy stimulation, increasing returns on investment in education, Research & Development (R&D), protection of property rights, and entrepreneurship and innovation are basic tenets of the endogenous growth theory.

The endogenous empowerment approach as Garba (2003:361) referred to is identified by two features: intrinsic and sensible expectations. Therefore, despite the rising population growth, declining per capita income, Williams (2000) and Odufa (2000) said Nigeria has no option than to continue in the informal sector to serve as fertile ground for entrepreneurship development and an avenue for the promotion of local resource mobilisation, employment creation, local technology, income generation as well as social engineering.

Endogenous growth theory in this research draws the attention of the Nigerian government in particular and Africa in general to their failure to reinvigorate the expected change following their inability to produce interconnectivity and local network in its human and material resources. This has chiefly made Nigeria a parasitic and lazy economy in the world comity of nations. Hence, Romer (1990) posited that «government policies, including investment in R&D and intellectual property laws, helped foster endogenous innovation and fuel persistent economic growth». To this end, Todaro & Smith, (2011:134) cited by Sredojević, Cvetanović, Bošković (2016:179) argued that «endogenous growth models justify an active policy of the state in promoting growth through direct and indirect investment in the improvement of human capital and the support of foreign investors to invest in the development of the information and communication sector and the software industry». Therefore, endogenous growth approach emphasises tapping into the local opportunities to create development. This is because every society has its stock of indigenous technology which varies in size and number of components to conserve, manage, process and produce products for utilization.

UNIDO and ISID: An Evaluation

According to Acemoglu & Robinson (2012:132) and UNIDO (2012:18), it is
surprising that the industrial revolution has still not extended to Africa consequent upon the fact that the whole regions in the continent have been ravaged by a standing «vicious circle of the persistence and re-creation» of empty economic and socio-political frameworks. This informed the reason why Norton, Rogerson & Maxwell (2012) held that there has been a challenge to the very concept of ‘international development’ as an enslavement relationship between developed and underdeveloped nations. Nevertheless, Yong (2015) objected this notion by identifying the achievement of UNIDO in Nigeria to include:

i. The establishment of Standard Organisation of Nigeria (SON) in 1971 to prepare standards relating to the information and production of materials, measurements, products, services and processes; clarify products.

ii. Creation of Geo-environmental Research Centre at the University of Ibadan to carry out analysis on sites contaminated by the persistent organic pollutants and toxic ones across the country.

iii. The establishment in 2013 of Common Facility Centres in Kano, Abu and Asaba, Delta State to support micro-entrepreneurs in leather and leather products sector.

iv. The establishment of the «UNIDO Regional Centre for Small Hydro Power» in Abuja in 2006.

v. UNIDO opened an Investment and Technology Promotion Office in Lagos which is the first of its kind among ECOWAS states.

Nonetheless, the promotion of an all-encompassing, environmentally-clean, resource-oriented manufacturing and economic development cannot be over emphasised. This is based on the fact that the significant patterns of current industrialisation are non-inclusiveness, one-sidedness and marginalisation of the developing countries (Imhanlahimhin, 2000; Sachs, 2005; Yong, 2013). Hence, after the UNIDO realised that the present approaches to industrialisation are not inclusive and sustainable; the Member States in December 2013 at their General Conference in Peru, therefore, came up with «The Lima declaration». They endorsed that the «Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development (ISID)» framework should be a fundamental component of the international ‘long-term development’ programme (UNIDO, 2013). The figure 1 below stresses the enablers of all-inclusive industrial growth and development.


From Figure 1, the real question about industrialisation is the type that ought to be prioritised for maximisation of «the synergies with the global development agenda towards the overarching objective of achieving sustainable development and prosperity for all». Besides, Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development policy is considered as a valuable poverty eradication methodology from this generation to the next (Burns, 2013; UNIDO, 2013). Accordingly, Yong (2013) put forward that «in doing so, they have clearly recognized the role that inclusive and sustainable industrial development plays in eradicating poverty and fostering sustainable development. This Declaration will shape the future operations, spirit and direction of UNIDO in the years to come». 

---

*Fig. 1: Diagrammatic Description of ISID
*Source: ISID and the Post-2015 Development Agenda (UNIDO, 2014).*
To guarantee unbiased delivery of the economic gains of industrialisation, Norton et.al (2012) wrote that the above mentioned strong industrial and socio-economic framework was, therefore, necessary to concentrate on the multifaceted poverty issues with the creation of inclusive prosperity, the advancement of a competitive economy and environmental sustainability.

![Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development](image)

*Fig. 2: Fundamentals of (ISID)*

*Source: UNIDO (2014)*

From the fundamentals of inclusive and sustainable industrialisation stated in *Figure 2* above, Norton et.al (2012) observed further that, ISID simply means that:

«No one is left behind in benefiting from industrial growth, and prosperity is shared among all parts of society in all countries as [the] industry creates the wealth needed to address critical social and humanitarian needs.

Every country [can] achieve a higher level of industrialisation in their economies and benefits from the globalization of markets for industrial goods and services.

Broader economic and social [growth] is supported within an environmentally sustainable framework, so that industrial expansion does not jeopardize the well-being of future generations; and

The unique knowledge and resources of all relevant development actors are combined, including those of the private sector and international financing institutions, to maximize the development impact of ISID».

ISID develops and strengthens socio-economic development and expansion in a comprehensive and thorough manner, following the above stated principles. In summation, the significance of an inclusive sustainable industrial development was deemed fit by the UN General Assembly in her approach to the current Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) which is SDG–9; to further foster infrastructural innovation and resiliency. In the assessment of Herbert (2013); George (2014) and Kwanashe (2016), the SDG–9 situated industrialisation as the main propeller of poverty eradication, environmental sustainability, economic growth, and national prosperity if genuinely implemented.

The Nigerian Government and Commitment to Industrialisation: A Review

As nations are in search of rapid socioeconomic development, Nigeria emerged in the late 20th century as an ambitious state for industrial development (Maitama, 2008; Mungonu, 2015; Ayida, 1979 in Nweze, 2017). Hence, Yong (2015:2) described the Nigerian economy as:

...a middle-income country, with expanding financial, service, communication and technology, and entertainment sectors. It is ranked as the 21st largest economy in the world in terms of nominal gross domestic product, and the 20th largest in terms of purchasing power parity. It is the largest economy in Africa. Its re-emergent, though currently underperforming, manufacturing sector is the largest on the continent, and produces a large proportion of goods and services for the West African sub-region. Oil and gas sales make up over 70 per
cent of government revenues and over 90 per cent of foreign exchange, even though oil and gas contribute just 14 per cent to GDP.

This aligns with the fact that industrialisation has been discovered to be a pivotal mover and aspiration for national development and the growth of the economy (Kaplinsky, 1997; Oyelaran-Oneyinka, 1997; Inhanlanhimhin, 2000; Cheto, Adeoti, Adedayinka & Ogundele, 2014; Nweze, 2017). However, Fifty-nine years after, following the civil war and destruction together with the economic boom in the 1960s and 1970s, these great ambitions are not realised «with double-digit growth rates and an expansion of business and economic activity» (Chhair & Ung, 2013:1; UNDP, 2018:14). Therefore, number of studies (Aribisala, 1993:40; Onah, 2006:76; Mayer, 2018:28) have asserted that the Nigerian industrial sector «has been dominated by a valorisation of raw materials and import-substitution type that are capital intensive rather than labour intensive» which emerged due to inconsistency and poverty in Nigeria's industrial, trade and well defined integrated industrial development policies (Inhanlanhimhin, 2000:199; Kormawa, 2014; ukessays.com). This is predicated on the downturn in the «global oil market in the early 1980s» (Ogwumike, 2013:168). Hence, Nigeria as a nation experienced serious challenges which were not far-fetched from pronounced unemployment, underemployment and high poverty incidence in this period. This brought attention to industrialisation which serves as a fundamental factor for rapid economic growth, empowerment and a lasting poverty reduction strategy. The structure of industrialisation remarkably pedals how the poor utilise the gains of economic growth (Obadan & Ayodele, 1998; Ogwumike, 2013). Thus, pro-poor economic and industrial policies in the findings of Knivili (2007:297) centre on «increasing the economic returns to the productive factors that the poor possess».

Therefore, Nigeria remains a major player in industrialisation amongst the countries in the West/sub-Saharan Africa sub-region (Oyebanji, 1982; Ajakaiye, 2003; Ajayi, 2011). Even though some studies like Ayeni (1981a & b); Mabogunje (1990) and Meagher (2010) have emphasised on productive activities which are mostly on regional, small and medium-scale and local industrialisation, they agreed that industries are localised and concentrated in a little towns, and particularly the major capital cities in Nigeria. Besides, «the economy could best be described as a mixed-economy which merged individual capital and enterprise with state capital and supervision» (Chhair & Ung, 2013:1). According to Okonjo-Iweala (2012:3), the structure of the Nigerian economy in the pre-1970s can be described as one that was based mainly on agriculture with more than 80 % population in rural areas. She adds that it was along agricultural products exportation that exploration of hydrocarbons began in early 1907 after which crude oil was discovered in commercial quantities in 1956 at Oloibiri in the Niger Delta region and that opened up oil industry to investment from multinational corporations such as Mobil, Tenneco, Amosco (now Chevron Texaco), and Agip which has now taken over the mainstay of Nigerian economy.

Accordingly, industrial development in Nigeria took a dimension of what Yesufu (1996:250) and Ajakaiye (2003:281) referred to as the «national economic development aspiration which remained that of altering the structure of production and consumption activities to diversify the economic base, reduce dependence on oil and on imports all in a bid to put the economy back on a path of self-sustaining, inclusive and non-inflationary growth, thereby alleviating poverty». Subsequently, Maitama (2008: 3) portrayed the Nigerian economy in independence as:

...booming and the construction industry were enjoying higher growth than the manufacturing sector. Large office blocks, industrial complexes, and long bridges were being built, and the government had plans for heavy industrial investment in liquefied natural gas, petrochemical plants, and fertilizer plants.

It is a noticeable situation that Nigeria's economic development requires structural growth and technological change (Ajakaiye, 2003). However, the configuration of the economic situation is a description of a weak and underdeveloped one (Idachaba & Ayoola, 1991; Aluko, 2001; Ajayi, 2007; Adoji, 2018). So, less than half of the GDP is accounted for by the most important sector through agricultural development which continues to play a significant function. Conversely, Yesufu (1996); Imhanlanhimhin (2000) and Szirmai (2012) emphasised that industrialisation is
more important for a country than agriculture. However, the oil and gas industry becomes a major mover of the Nigerian economy, presenting «over 95 percent of export earnings and about 85 percent of government revenue between 2011 and 2012» (Chete, et al 2014:1; Okonjo-Iweala, 2012:3; Adoji, 2018:123). They added that the sector supplied 14.8% GDP in 2011, 13.8% to GDP in 2012 and also «recorded an increase in reserves to 37.119 billion barrels in 2012 from 36.042 in 2011».

Equally, the Nigerian industrialisation which is made up of manufacturing, mining, and services amounts to an insignificant quantity of trade and industrial activity of 4% to 6% contribution to the GDP in 2011. This is regardless of policy frameworks in the last 59 years which has more recently assisted the industrialisation process (Imhanlahimhin, 2000). From the foregoing, industrialisation is considered fundamental to any national economy because it brings about job creation, a favourable balance of payment, high income, and standard of living, increased political and military power, strategic international recognition and placement, and diversification of the economy.

Comparatively, the national economic emancipation strategy choosing by India after World War II was similar to that of China’s – near autarky, industrialisation, and the state-dominated economy. The development of the economy has always been similar to the concentration of industry mainly on basic goods such as iron and steel, machinery and capital which has not been prioritised in Nigeria as an effectual motor for development. As a result of that, government regulation and ownership were considered to be indispensable. Again, the domestication of industrial development policies and strategies by China, India, Taiwan, Indonesia, Korea, Brazil, Mexico, and Russia were ones that accentuate:

i. agricultural development and sustainability,

ii. import substitution and export orientation pattern,

iii. shielding of the manufacturing sector from international competition,

iv. the favourable tax regime for private manufacturing companies,

v. licensing of industrial activity,

vi. SMEs greater importance,

vii. controls over foreign direct investment, and

From the foregoing, the mentioned developing countries adopted and domesticated selective industrial development policies through which they target to transform their nation for better socio-economic development prospects and faster growth. For instance, Taiwan and especially Korea are examples of «export-manufacturing-oriented countries» that have fruitfully utilised government involvement and apparatus against importation in the early phases of their industrialisation. Therefore, Okoli (2007:40) citing the Economic Commission of Africa opined that «any African country which wants to be technologically independent, will have to generate existing technology internally or gear its productive activity to the level of technology which it can generate internally».

Mauritius and Tunisia – that went their way in terms of policy structure and decisive political will for industrialisation are fairly succeeding (Page, 2014). It is therefore important to state that the adoption and implementation of any foreign economic advancement programme cannot be successful without the empowerment of the local labour force. According to Kaplinsky (1997) and Bray & Lykins (2012), the existence of qualitative universal education in China and Korea provided their citizens with opportunities to be involved in the industrial development process. In a nutshell, the development of human resources and advancement in technology are keys if a nation is interested in global competition, economic sustainability and prosperity of which Korea and Taiwan are examples. Essentially, Iwuagwu (2009) and Sule (2009) cited in PAUL, Wada, Adu & Omisore (2013) argued that local capacity building and investment is a role and fulcrum of the workforce’ education and skill acquisition which are important factors for economic progress and developing industrial clusters. Therefore, UNIDO (2016) maintained and directed countries to embark on the development of home-grown capacity and research development as done by Taiwan and Korea to a large extent. In same vein, only those nations that can «constantly generate new activities based on upgrading to higher levels of value-addition, higher productivity, or higher returns to scale – economies [characterised] by structural change – can
sustain stable jobs and increase the prosperity for a growing share of the population» (UNIDO, 2018). As it stands, Nigeria has not prioritised R&D, and the development of human capital to meet the 21st-century global economic competition.

As Morley (2015) contended, the endogenous industrial revolution is dependent on the composition of the country’s population and capital accumulation which is tied to «the number of people working in the knowledge sector (think of this as effort devoted to R&D)» In the findings of Okoli (2007) and Olaoluwa (2015), Nigeria can develop her industrial base through:

i. deliberate counter-strategies in the part of the periphery countries by combinations among community producers,

ii. conscious disengagement from dependence on imported industrial technology, and reliance on much simpler, home-made technology,

iii. reproduction of the metropolitan's capacity to make technological innovation (the Japanese path),

iv. opting for a much simpler home-made technology, manufacturing purely for the domestic market, or the markets of other underdeveloped countries with like-minded regimes,

v. import substitution policies, which are designed to encourage the local manufacture of those goods, which are manually imported, and

Consequently, Nigeria cannot and will never develop her industrial base as it continues to patronise expatriates, raw materials and finished goods. It is accepted to be true that the Nigerian government has not sufficiently demonstrated the commitment to leverage on the ISID policy to galvanise industrialisation.

The ISID and Stimulation of Economic Development in Nigeria: A Discourse

European colonisation «set the stage for institutional divergence in the Americas, where in contrast to the inclusive institutions developed in the United States and Canada extractive ones emerged in Latin America, which explains the patterns of inequality we see in the Americas» (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012:130). Practically all industrial development projects under implementation in sub-Saharan Africa region, including the Ajaokuta and Alaja Steel Industries in Nigeria, with the exclusion of ACOMINAS, COSIGUA, «SICARTA in Mexico» and others in Brazil – in Latin America are under indefinite suspension or cancellation. In short, the completion of Ajaokuta and Alaja Steel Industries in Nigeria was suspended by the Buhari/Idiagbon administration (1983 – 1985) without reason. This is contrary to that of Asia (China, South Korea, and Taiwan) that have been allowed to demonstrate vitality, benefited from vigorous project financing from UNIDO, and established competencies at low costs, thereby emerging well-built in industrial development.

According to Garba (2003) and Onimode (2003), the current phase of industrialisation and globalisation has also meant the exacerbation of the bane of unequal exchange, failed Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) external indebtedness, and declining capacity for development in Nigeria, in spite of the free traders and neo-liberal reformers. Also, Acemoglu & Robinson (2012:131) highlighted that though the slave trade generally came to an end of 1807, succeeding «European ‘disguised colonialism’ not only threw into ‘overturn’ growing economic modernisation in parts of southern and western Africa but also cut off any possibility of home-grown organisational transformation». Onimode (2003:40), revalidated by Eri (2018:13) revealed that perhaps the most graphic allegory of this bane is the disturbing reality that whereas a ton of Cocoa and 25,000 litres of palm oil could buy one tractor in the 1960s – 1970s, that same ton of Cocoa and litres of palm oil in the 1990s could buy one tyre. This is premised on the fact that industrialised nations depend on Nigeria’s raw materials for their industrial growth whereas the machinery needed to boost industrialisation cannot be afforded on the same scale. Acemoglu & Robinson (2012:48) submitted that:

While there is a lot of persistence in the patterns of prosperity we see around us today, these patterns are not unchanging or immutable. First, as we have already emphasized, most of the current world inequality emerged since the late eighteenth century, following on the tails of the Industrial Revolution. Not only were gaps in prosperity much smaller as late as the middle of the 18th century, but the rankings which have been so stable since then are not the same when we go further back in history.

They explained that the old Singer-Presbisch thesis of secular deterioration in terms
of industrial growth of the developing countries foreshadowed the external debt crisis, the abuses of failed IMF/World Bank loan forced the new protectionism (crafted under the Uruguay Round of GATT negotiations and its railroading World Trade Organisation (WTO) and the UNIDO. This situation has adversely affected the capacity for international economic development and oriented public policies. Also, they have simply rendered Nigeria and Southern nation’s developmental agenda impotent. Instead, there is endless rhetoric on growth and adjustment; as if that was the agenda that transformed «Europe and North America».

Accordingly, the «GATT-WTO under the new global trading system» has also been the new protectionism aggravating unequal exchange rate, retarding global technology transfer (Raghavan, 1990:56). Indeed one account maintained that the new trading system has been designed to depress and re-colonise. This is consequent upon the fact that local crafts and suppliers are insignificant in industrial development (Oyeyinka & Adeloye, 1988). Thus, some factors have been identified as the portray of UNIDO’s lack of commitment to the development of industries in Africa at large and Nigeria in particular. These are currency control and regulation, synthetic substitution for raw materials, the fixing of macroeconomic policy, the dominance of transnational monopolies, the choices of foreign policy and liberalisation, the monopoly of legitimate violence, and external debt manipulation.

Norton et.al (2012) said that the export prices of raw materials and other primary products plunged to their lowest levels and policy emphasis had shifted from tradable to the neglect of the non-tradable, which sustains the majority of the African populations. The exported (growth) strategy is, however, dismal failure in Nigeria and Africa. Thus, Nigeria simply cannot hope to emerge from the current crisis by relying on exports of traditional products. Today, Nigeria has to count more on aid and less on trade. On the other hand, Raposo (2014) warned that the growth and development of many Africa countries felt in the last decade has not yet translated into more self-reliance and ‘true’ ownership of an Africa-driven development agenda, as donors still dominate the development policy agenda. For this reason, Adelman (1999:13) suggested that the adoption of the UNIDO framework of ISID will result in an unsuitable technology, induced not only by inappropriate comparative factor prices but also by the direct movement of recent technology from developed countries where capital-labour ratios were much lower than in developing country like Nigeria. It can be observed that «today, the degree of policy freedom left to developing countries is narrower than it was some decades ago, even if some well-planned government intervention may seem justified based on the success stories of the earlier decades» (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012:48). This informed why Garba (2003) posited that «there is, therefore, no reasonable basis to expect that policy advice from the high-income countries and collusive bilateral and multilateral organisations would become more effective in stimulating the development of African countries in the 21st century».

It becomes obvious from our analysis above that ISID’s policy framework to develop industries in Nigeria is mere attempts at stylish subjugation of the country’s economy to the developed country’s dominance. This is validated by the fact that Nigeria, for example, is a well-endowed country with the world’s eighth-largest population, a big domestic market in Africa and her entire industrialisation process is controlled in support of the metropolitan nations, to the detriment of local industries (Agba & Odu, 2012; Okonjo-Iweala, 2012). It is Nigerians that highly patronise imported products above ‘Made in Nigeria’ goods. This is the result of the policy and target during the colonisation period. It can, therefore, be accepted that the possibility of the UNIDO framework to stimulate industrial development policy implementation in Nigeria is not tenable.

Conclusion and Recommendations
Conclusively, it is paramount to clearly state that the introduction of ISID is targeted at encouraging full participation, empowerment, and control over resources allocation in response to the SDGs which brought about the development of global policy and productivity enhancement for social advancement. Notwithstanding, therefore, it is found through this research that though there are various industrial development policies, and medium-term economic plans at both local and international levels, the portrait of Nigerian industrialisation is not impressive.
Thus, many countries in the world are diversifying their sources of income. Nigeria is therefore expected to re-invigorate its manufacturing sector like other developed economies of the world by engaging sustained improvements and proactive activities as the sine-qua-non for dismantling the vicious circle of poverty and the realisation of a self-reliant and dynamic economy. So, developed human resources through rigorous R&D are tantamount to industrial services that will be central to the efforts of Nigeria to develop her socio-economic status. Specifically, it is recommended that there should be:

i. a demonstration of a strong commitment by both UNIDO and the Nigerian government in the establishment of investment promotion organisations, manufacturing industries’ accreditation and quality control agencies that will be strongly recognised by international bodies;

ii. strengthening of Federal Universities of Technology, Universities of Agriculture, and Engineering, Federal Polytechnics and Technical Colleges for result-oriented Research and Development;

iii. a concerted effort in the overall Human Resources Development (HRD) in Nigeria human resources;

iv. Enactment of a law that will criminalise the importation of goods that can be produced locally. This will encourage local production and consumption, and the sustainability of SMEs.
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