

Research Note
**Decolonization of Policy Process and not the Policy of
Decolonization**

Politik Süreci Sömürgecilikten Kurtarmak

Samuel O. Okafor

University of Nigeria, Nigeria

Abstract

Colonialism and neo-colonialism as socioeconomic and political realities among the third world nations were designed to operate through the logic of socioeconomic thinking and activities of the indigenous people. Ignorance of this has made the colonized vulnerable to the complex and fluid networks of colonialism, and neo-colonialism programs as designed by the colonialists and neo-colonialists. Most of these nations have put forward policy of decolonization without thinking about decolonization of their domestic and international policy postures. By so doing, most of these nations have become more vulnerable to their former colonialists as well as the entrant neo-colonialists. Nigeria, as one of the nations operating in the raiders of their former colonial masters and the entrant neo-colonialists, has been subjected to perpetual dependency and failure due to the ignorance of the fluid structure and networks of neo-colonialism. The fact, as this paper specifically aims to prove, is that there is no way socioeconomic logical framework on the platform of imperialism paradigm will produce genuine and sustainable development. As such, the paper modelled the colonialists' socioeconomic policy logical framework, neo-colonialists' socioeconomic policy logical framework, and the decolonization of socioeconomic policy logical framework in Nigeria for sustainable development.

Keywords: Colonialism, neo-colonialism, socioeconomic logical framework, policy of decolonization, decolonization of policy process.

Öz

Üçüncü dünya ülkelerinde sosyoekonomik ve politik bir gerçeklik olarak kolonileşme ve neo-kolonileşmenin "sosyoekonomik mantıksal çerçeve yaklaşımıyla" ve yerli halkın eylemleri sayesinde etkin olması planlanmıştır. Bu durumun göz ardı edilmesi sömürgeciliğe maruz kalmış ülkeleri, (neo)kolonileşmenin istikrarsızlaştırma politikalarına karşı kırılmaştırmaktadır. Bu ülkelerin çoğu, kendi iç ve dış politikalarına dair duruşlarını hesaba katmadan sömürgecilik karşıtı politikalar öne sürmektedir. Bu nedenle, ülkelerinde önceden sömürgeci güç olan uluslara karşı daha savunmasız hale gelirler. Tarihteki önceki sömürgecilerine ve neo-kolonileşmeye karşı bir duruş içerisinde olan diğer ülkeler gibi Nijerya da günümüz sömürgeciliğinin istikrarsızlaştırma politikasını göz ardı ettiği için sürekli dışa-bağımlı durumdadır. Bu çalışma, sürdürülebilir gelişme elde etmek için (yeni)sömürgeci gücün sosyoekonomik mantıksal çerçeve politikasına karşın sömürgecilik karşıtı sosyoekonomik mantıksal çerçeve yaklaşımını modellemeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kolonileşme, neo-kolonileşme, sosyoekonomik mantıksal çerçeve yaklaşımı, sömürgecilikten kurtulma, sömürge karşıtı politika.

CUJHSS, June 2020; 14/1: 126-137.

© Çankaya University ISSN 1309-6761 Printed in Ankara

Submitted: May 14, 2020; Accepted: June 16, 2020

ORCID#:0000-0001-8584-5616; samuelokey200@gmail.com

Introduction

Among other phenomena that have shaped the history of man, colonialism appeared to be outstanding among the African nations. While the phenomenon at the surface appeared to have been fizzled away in the history of man, empirical indices show the phenomenon appearing and reappearing among the developing nations in different packages and forms. This is not far from the original nature and character of the phenomenon from the earlier appearance from Europe.

While the economic expansionism opened the door for the Euro-American slave trade, the missionaries surveyed and softened the ground for the colonialists who were determined to expand their empires for economic exploitation (Adetoro 43). For the Europeans to succeed in their slave trade in Africa, superior weapon was of great importance so that communities will surrender and also use the weapons sold to them in capturing their neighbours to sell to the slave traders (Equiano 13). In the case of colonialism, which required occupation of territories, psychological inducement was necessary and was achieved through the missionaries and merchants who established schools, churches and made treaty on behalf of the empire builders (Rodney 161). The 14th century mission of the Portuguese economic adventurers ostensibly to capture and economically enslave the people of the South Pole, majorly characterized as the blacks, originated the hard-to-dismantle socio-political and economic domination strategy of the people of the North Pole ... a situation that was latter conceptualized as colonialism (Chinweizu 35). While the Portuguese claimed to be exploring Africa for missionary work and civilization via the Roman catholic mission, the outcome of the 1884 Berlin conference was soon captioned the move to civilize Africans by the Europeans. In any case, the colonialism agenda simply started with hypocrisy and had been sustained as such. While the Portuguese pseudo missionary work and civilization peaked with slavery business involving Spain, America and other European nations, the participants in the 1884 Berlin conference started with pseudo protection of the local territories in Africa and peaked with neo-colonialism, which is currently ravaging most African nations.

The covert socioeconomic and political agenda encapsulated in civilization jingle from European nations to African nation soon turned to chronic disease, which the erstwhile economically sufficient small-scale societies are managing today across African continent. While the slavery business originally from the Portuguese grew to become the chronic disease of brain drain in Africa and quest for migration, colonialism, which originated at the 1884 Berlin conference, had grown to become neo-colonialism and permanent enslavement of the African nations into the common wretched of the nations [a term ostensibly presented as *Common Wealth of Nations*] (Okafor 46). While the chronic disease of slavery is embedded in the constant socioeconomic and political instability of the African nations to force the inhabitants to seek for access into European and American nations where they are considered based

on their economic viability, the chronic disease of colonialism was embedded into the policy making processes directly influenced from the metropolis and the pseudo global organizations. In Nigeria, the aforementioned situation has permanently subjected the nation to international begging and recipient of Socioeconomic Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (SAIDS) from America, Europe, Asia, and other nations interested in the business of neo-colonialism.

The main effects of the European assault on Nigeria, Africa and other parts of the world via colonialism and neo-colonialism, remains a multidimensional issue, which only surfaces with time and area of interest to whoever observes it (Ziltener, Künzler and Walter 156). For example, the present chaos in the Middle East regarding the Islamic State and the multifaceted rebel groups is traceable to the colonialists' intervention, which destroyed the Ottoman Empire and offered Middle East as colonial subjects to Britain and France. Initially, finding it difficult to defeat the Ottoman Empire which, spanned across Middle East, Britain and France lured Iraq and Syria into sabotaging the Ottoman Empire in exchange for independence. At the end what Iraq and Syria received was subjugation by their pseudo friends [Britain, France] hence the popular Sykes-Picot agreement, which was responsible for the agitations by Islamic State, Kurds and the rest of the Arab world (Barker 86; Hughes 78).

Whichever way the phenomenon of colonialism appeared to the common masses and the elite class of the affected societies, especially as it concerns Nigeria, there is a need for evaluation of the origin, characteristics and resilience of colonialism and neo-colonialism. This can be done through the understanding of the logical policy framework of the colonial metropolis and the neo-colonialism, with focus on the essence of populism in the process of decolonizing socioeconomic policies of the affected nations. The present paper is interested in the issues of neo-colonialism, the quest for decolonization and sustainable development in Nigeria, which is anchored on the logical socioeconomic policy framework in Nigeria.

Concept clarification

For many centuries now after the contact between the North Pole (Euro-America) and the South Pole (Africa and other third world nations), certain concepts and phenomena have become a common popular discuss among the developing nations. Among them are colonialism and neo-colonialism, which are proxy administrative strategy to control socioeconomic policies and social institutions among the developing nations. As such, the colonized and the neo-colonized at best are now making a move for decolonization.

Colonialism is more or less the journey, which Portugal started in Africa around 14th century, that focused on the intimidation, threats, indirect and forceful domination of the overpowered territories in the quest of building business empires in African continent in some cases, other places in Asia and Latin America (Shokpeka and Nwaokocha 57). Nwanunobi was of the opinion that "colonialism appeared as social institution of a kind through which other

socioeconomic activities in the society were realized both in the colonizers' territory and in the territory of the colonized" (194). Formally, colonialism was set on motion by the 1884 Berlin conference in Germany empowering, the European nations in the so-called civilization mission. This took a form of empire building by the European nations as well as proxy administration of the colonized territories from the colonialists' abode. In the interest of the present paper, colonialism is operationalised as the politico-economic mission in Africa [with the situation in Nigeria as evidence], by the European nations aimed at facilitating the network of capitalism and exploitation in their modified forms among the so called third world societies. These were aroused by the scarcity of needed natural and human resources for industrial productions, and were powered by political will mustered by the industrialists via the political networks of the European nations.

Similarly, neo-colonialism, have been viewed as the modified form of colonialism. According to Osman,

China is a neo-colonialist entity devoid of unbridled territorial control and direct political and economic control of African nations; this stems from the appearance of China on the stage of African continents with numerous gifts and encouragements ostensibly to trap the nations of Africa in the web of insincere and permanent vertical relationship. (190)

Much like it, Arukwe has commented on the phenomenon of neo-colonialism as "the indirect route of domination of the developing nations especially the African nations" (196). For operational purpose, neo-colonialism is viewed in its comprehensibility with regard to perfecting the invisible web of continuing colonialism among the colonized. As such, neo-colonialism is the covert socioeconomic and political domination of the developing and under developed nations by their colonizers and emerging colonialists looking for territories. This is actualized through economic and political influence via the global network of power equations such as the United Nations, regional organizations such as the African Union and Economic Community of West African States (in the case of Nigeria). Indices of this include foreign aids, political cum economic advice and other vertical bilateral relationships. The symptoms include inability to make critical domestic and international decisions without the covert or overt approval from the developed nations in this relationship, domestic policy structure of the developing nations being subjected to the interest of their developed nations' allies, etc.

Public policy from where we derived the concept of socioeconomic policy can be viewed as definite course or method of action selected from among available alternatives and in the light of prevailing circumstances to guide and determine present and future decisions and actions intended to deal with particular situations or problems (Jega 58). In extension, socioeconomic policy is the sum of the method of actions selected from numerous alternatives of

actions and strategies in determining the direction and control of socioeconomic phenomenon in the society within a geographical territory.

In view of the present paper, socioeconomic policies are those decisions appearing as quasi statutory statements and documentations specific to timeframe, with regard to the numerous situations of the different social institutions of the society such as political, economic, family, education, religious and cultural institutions; putting to consideration, the availability and scarcity of resources at the disposal of the nation in question. Much like it, social institutions in the sociological and anthropological parlance is presented as the generic concept, capturing the dominant understanding of the aspects of human social existence, that covers the bunch of rules on how we survive (economy), how we relate with each other (involving the microcosm [family] and the macrocosm [the society in general]), how we learn (education), what we believe in (religion) and how we acquire and exercise power (politics).

In the 21st century era of socio-political activities of the modern society, the monologist approach to political decisions as it involves policy making process has been overtaken by the event of common masses (the electorates) constructively involving in the process. This has been captured by the ongoing intellectual exercise as populism. Populism according to Covan is “a redemptive politics for the manifestation of the sovereignty of the masses” (14). For more practical purposes of the concept of populism in the understanding of socioeconomic and political realities of our time, Laurijssen and Spruyt maintained that “populism is the theoretical and empirical option for the hapless masses in the face of ever growing selfish and group induced interests among the elites” (626). Populism is the concept capturing the activity instead of passivity of the concerned masses in the society in the face of the elite class dominating the decision-making affairs in the society.

Logical framework of socioeconomic policies as it was coined in this paper captures the covert sum of cause-effect action analogy of the basic interest, principle and agenda, guiding the initiation, making and implementations of socioeconomic policies. This usually is classified before the public but open to the originators and manipulators of the policy model in question. Policy-decolonization as it was coined in the interest of this paper captures the processes involved in decolonizing policy orientation among the colonized. Contrary to the popular concept of “policy of decolonization” among the majority of the colonized nations across Africa and Latin America, policy-decolonization focuses on changing the policy orientation, whose logical framework anchors on the colonialists’ covert intensions and strategies in exploiting the colonized during the colonial era.

Postures of Colonialism and Neo-colonialism in Nigeria

The appearance of the Euro-American adventurers in what is known today as Nigeria was with some level of hypocrisy that lured the indigenous people of the small-scale societies in the region into undesired relationship. Even though

what turned today as colonialism appeared initially as uncoordinated from the look of things, colonialism in its totality was a chain of political, economic and social agenda designed by the Euro-American empire builders and capitalists who saw Africa as the home of the majority of the world natural and human resources for the aforementioned phenomena (political, economic and social) (Rodney 169).

The illicit trade on human beings, which came back as colonialism in the foil of pseudo civilization of African small-scale societies originated on the platform of articles of trade by batter with the Europeans, who appeared from the southern axis (Niger Delta Area) of what is known today as Nigeria (Adetoro 25). As a comprehensive agenda, which was designed for economic, political and sociocultural purposes, colonialism followed the heels of slave trade, which ostensibly softened the ground for the colonial agenda. At first, missionaries appeared to be attending to the indigenous people for the purpose of salvation of their souls with some level of independence (by the missionaries) from the home government, however, it later appeared that these missionaries were faithful subjects of the home government that compelled them to psychologically induce obedience and submission to the foreigners among the indigenous people such that, when the home government of the missionaries wanted to penetrate any territory of the small-scale societies the indigenous people saw it as a welcome development. This was the covert strategy used by Portugal, Spain, Italy, France and Britain. This strategy acknowledged by the home government of the missionaries created the furrow for the government sponsored merchants of different articles to wriggle into the domestic economy of these small-scale societies located across Nigeria such as the Igbo, Yoruba, Ibibio, Ijaw, Uruo, Hausa, Nupe, etc, with the hidden interest of devastating them for their home economy (Okafor 87).

While the missionaries literally fulfilled their religious obligation of spreading the gospel with or without the knowledge of the implication of their relationship posture with the indigenous people to the future and destiny of the indigenous people in the face of covert political, economic and socio-cultural agenda of their home country, the merchants and industrialists from Europe and America were exploiting the opportunity to enrich themselves with the available articles of commercial values and human resources while the home governments were benefiting from taxation of the industrialists, the merchants and domestic industrialization at home (Chinweizu 85). The fluid connectivity of the missionaries, merchant and the Euro-American home government in the contact with the small-scale societies in Nigeria before the legitimization of colonialism in 1884 in Germany, sustained Portugal, Spain, Italy and their indirect allies in the illicit business before the legalization of colonialism. For instance, while the missionaries via the missionary schools and proselytizing the indigenous people psychologically conditioned the indigenous people for the soon to appear full blown colonialism, the merchants who gained domination over the domestic economy via the pseudo religious

evangelism by the missionaries became, the platform for quasi protectorate administration of the fragments of the small-scale societies at the onset of the colonial administration in Nigeria (Adetoro 55). As a matter of fact, the missionary schools, which gave birth to other platforms of western education in Nigeria, were originally designed to cater for the needed human resources for the colonial administration while, the merchants via the domestic market structures were to enter into treaty with the colonialists for the administration of the hard-to-coordinate disintegrated small-scale societies especially in the southern protectorate.

After perfecting the structure of the network of colonial administration such that the colony could be easily controlled from the metropolis, the colonialists set up a network of unprecedented exploitation of the human and natural resources via the domestic socioeconomic policies. Specifically, the utilization of the available human resources and the type of economic activities in the system were permanently designed to feed the administration and industrialization interests of the metropolis while, the colonized were left to the mercy of the colonizers as well as degenerating socioeconomic situation (Shokpeka and Nwaokocha 57).

At the onset of independence agitation by the indigenous people, the colonialists set up a framework to capture the colonized into perpetual socioeconomic slavery, which reflected in the pattern of decision making by the ruling class hence the neo-colonialism. The occurrence of the neo-colonialism followed the trajectory of the already designed socioeconomic policy pattern among the colonized by the colonialists. For instance, while the pseudo independence in Nigeria presented the nation as a sovereign nation before the United Nations and allied bodies, the Nigerian government still operate at the whims and caprices of the former colonial master such that no single socioeconomic policy in the country has existed without considering the interest of the United Kingdom. Equally, by the wisdom of the colonialists, Nigeria was designed to run on borrowing and receiving of foreign aids from the west and other interested nations who are in the business of impoverishing other nations via borrowing and aids (Okafor 46).

For Britain to run Nigeria successfully during the colonial era, the missionary schools have to train *ad hoc* staffs for clerical duties. These staffs unlike education for its essence were simply trained as robots to implement every stringent measure by the colonial administration even where such may be to their detriment. The policy of *ad hoc* education for the clerical tools in the hand of the colonizers continued in the form of appointment of the overseas trained fellows in the key positions, which eventually subject these fellows to run the country in the borrowed pattern from the west and by implication, become the tool of the neo-colonialists in impoverishing the country. Almost all the government and multinational sponsored scholarships currently have been streamlined into overseas studies and these has helped the former colonialist and the neo-colonialists to pattern the understanding of the youth trapped into

such scholarship into self-deprecation, self-hatred and potential sabotage to indigenous development efforts.

The policy of the indirect rule plotted in the British colonial territories, of which Nigeria is one of them, has continued in the neo-colonial strategy by both the United Kingdom and the host of neo-colonialists who studied and mastered the strategy. This is injected into the system via policy logical framework in Nigeria. The socioeconomic policies in the colonial Nigeria were designed to follow the trajectory of the “metropolis,” which is the British policy blue print. This is reflected in the types of education, natural resources extraction, production and consumption in the colony. For instance, in the colonial policy template, agricultural activities for food production among the colonized were put to a halt in so many places for rubber plantation, palm plantation and other cash crops for the needs of industrializing Europe (Shokpeka and Nwaokocha 57).

The psychology of consumption among the indigenous people was twisted to follow the taste of imported goods from Europe in order to ensure the disposal of leftover and excess goods from the European colonialists’ network. Tools, dressing and even foods that negatively changed the epidemiological history of the indigenous people were imposed on the people making the geographical setting a dumping ground for leftover and excess consumer goods. The central value of education was subverted to appreciate the European culture such that, every single knowledge and skill was to be acknowledged if it followed the European cultural orientation. To sustain this, the British colonialists simply subjected the process of serving in the administrative capacities, to mission school training and if possible, those who were privileged to have been trained overseas. In the current dispensation, production, consumption, government administration and other socioeconomic activities have followed the British laid down patterns of self-deprecation among the indigenous people. Currently in Nigeria, production activities are following the globally designated interests of which America and Europe stand at the centre of the needs, consumption in Nigeria at best is still anchoring hugely on imported goods while, government administration is dependent on mostly foreign trained experts as well as advice from oversea.

In the neo-colonialism era at which Nigeria is, the vestiges of indirect rule, that occurred during the colonial era are still visible but in a more sophisticated manner. While the “metropolis” (which was Britain alone) gave direct order via the colonial agents and the merchants on the ground, controlling the socioeconomic activities of the neo-colonized (Nigeria) in the present dispensation comes through a more diverse pattern and channels such as the British government, the United States of America and majorly the United Nations and allied bodies where the entrant neo-colonialists find easy access into the neo-colonial territories. As it stands in Nigeria currently, the policy logical framework of the country is permanently designed to consider first, the

Euro-American interest in all ramifications and merely project the indigenous people's interest as the second degree of interest. In the educational sector, Nigeria is yet to think about a policy framework, which can accommodate indigenous education and the underlying challenges of the indigenous people instead, overseas certificates are valued as "supernatural" solution to the challenges of the indigenous people. This is the fallout of the psychological war against the "third world" nations via the United Nations where education is rated not on the platform of the improvised approach to the challenges of the indigenous people of a particular region but on the platform of Euro-American dominated global rating of educational institutions with special consideration to the host countries. Our economic policies, which control our production and consumption via the importation and exportation activities, are being edited by Britain and Saudi Arabia (one of the new entrants into the neo-colonialist business) currently, with special consideration of American and other European nations' interests. This is being perfected on the platform of the United Nations (covertly controlled by America and Western Europe) with so called millennium development goals and the likes, which is always initiated by America and their European allies. In all ramifications, the policy logical framework for the Nigerian government is constantly teleguided by the neo-colonialists to permanently project their interest against the indigenous people using all available networks and this has resulted to the movement of the more you look, the less you see.

Decolonization of Policy Process for Sustainable Development

The concept of decolonization imbues in the scholarly thought, the understanding of the existence of colonialism, neo-colonialism and the need for their reversal and total eradication. While holding constant, the fact that total eradication ideally can be difficult, there is the common denominator for sincere pursuit of the agenda of decolonization anywhere in the world. The common denominator here is the socioeconomic policies. The understanding of the trajectory of socioeconomic policies in the process of colonialism and neo-colonialism, and following the trajectory in reverse order, will establish unprecedented breakthrough in restoring the dignity and development aspirations of the colonized.

Although colonialism and neo-colonialism at the surface appeared as conquest and imposition by the "superior nations," an empirical evaluation of the program and the process of colonialism and the current neo-colonialism has shown that this is a written code by men being implemented through a versed and complicated protocols. As such, military altercation, compromise and begging with cap in hand cannot really solve the problem rather, may initiate another variant of neo-colonialism. The written code of colonialism and neo-colonialism are anchored on the social, cultural, political, and religio-psychology of the colonized and these, were captured in the sum total of policy initiation, implementation and regular evaluation. In the case of Nigeria, colonialism and neo-colonialism could have failed if they were mere imposition

in view of diverse ethnic groups and multifaceted socioeconomic interests of the indigenous people. But due to the stringent and covert nature of socioeconomic policy measures from the process of initiation, implementation to evaluation, the indigenous people remained unconscious of the happenings and lived their lives at the whims and dictates of the colonialists and neo-colonialists.

In the interest of decolonization of socioeconomic policies to achieve decolonization of the colonized and neo-colonized, the socioeconomic policies, which were initiated from the “metropolis” with the interest of the colonizers at the base, during the colonial and neo-colonial era, ought to be reversed to bring the interest of the indigenous people at the base in the decolonization era. This can be done by following the stringent and complicated protocols observed by the former colonialists and the neo-colonialists in floating colonialism and neo-colonialism. Specifically, the logical policy framework and institutional frameworks of colonialism and neo-colonialism must be put into perspectives and subject to transformations.

Currently, the logical policy framework of the “third world nations” such as Nigeria follows the Euro-America covert policy agenda encapsulated with the seasonal United Nations socioeconomic policy framework for the developing nations. This was mildly and confusedly implemented through the United Nations allied bodies, dimensionally and regionally. The logical policy framework of the colonialists in Nigeria during the colonial era followed the trajectory of the Queen of England (focusing instruction on the socioeconomic necessities of the colonial metropolis), the colonial agents (such as the governor general and his subordinates receiving order from the queen and compelling the merchants and the local institutions to implement same), the merchants (who compelled the colonized to focus on the extraction and production activities important to the metropolitan government), and the colonized (the indigenous people who abandon their socioeconomic needs to work for externally imposed socioeconomic interests).

In the present neo-colonial era, the trajectory of colonialism includes the following and is maintained thus: the United Nations via the allied bodies (carrying the covert socioeconomic interests of the neo-colonialists as expert policy suggestions and recommendations), the leaders of the third world nations (who are externally imposed on the people through pseudo democracy and corrupted election processes), the multinational corporations and socioeconomic aids (while the multinational corporations operate as agents for the actualization of the covert policy agenda of the neo-colonialists, socioeconomic aids are designed to perpetually condition the neo-colonized as dependent on the neo-colonialists), the local ministries/institutions (these include what we know today as ministries of petroleum resources, agriculture, foreign affairs, health, etc., through which the indices of neo-colonialists’ socioeconomic policy agenda are actualized), and the common masses (the

indigenous people who simply act the script of the neo-colonialists in their everyday socioeconomic activities).

In view of the trajectory of colonialism and neo-colonialism, decolonization of the socioeconomic policies of the colonized should follow the trajectory but in a reversed order such that, instead of the neo-colonialists' interest at the base of the socioeconomic policy template, that of the colonized should be placed at the base. Thus, the policy logical framework in Nigeria for the purpose of decolonization should be: the aspirations of the indigenous people (captured as the dominant and emerging socioeconomic necessities of the population), the local ministries/institutions generating policy components (here the banking institution, public and other private institutions managing the different sectors of the economy are expected to bring forward policy suggestions based on overtime observations), summation of the policy indices as gathered into structured policy design (here, the filtered and compelling socioeconomic indices worthy of attention as well as empirically substantive are formulated into policy template in various sectors), the policy implementation and implementation agents (at this point, the individuals, groups and organizations/institutions operating in the system are strictly guided and guarded to operate by the policy principles for different sectors as obtainable from the policy making body), the production and other socioeconomic activities among the indigenous people, the engagement with the external world via exportation and importation by the indigenous people guided by the dominant socioeconomic activities and necessity of the local population, and the policy relationship between the indigenous people and the global organizations with cognizance of policy inputs from the indigenous people.

Conclusion

Colonial and neo-colonial programs as they were developed, appeared as a systematic structure capturing the life stream of the colonized into socioeconomic policy framework. This made colonialism and neo-colonialism a somewhat self-regulatory framework, only changing postures to capture and be captured by the ongoing global system. Many colonized societies have put some strategies in place to deal with colonialism and neo-colonialism with little or no encouraging outcome. The problem as such is embedded in the structure and complex nature of colonialism and neo-colonialism anchored on the socioeconomic policy logical framework. In some colonized nations such as Nigeria, certain efforts have been put in place to decolonize the nation; efforts such as renaming foreign owned institutions, rebranding the relationship with the former colonialists, building more networks of allies and the host of other efforts. However, it is yet to occur to Nigeria as an entity that the onus of the matter lies with the everyday implemented socioeconomic policy logical framework. At best, what Nigerian government had been rehearsing is, policy of decolonization, which in its entirety is limited to mere political campaign vulnerable to neo-colonialism. As a matter of fact, from 1960 when Nigerian

government was given pseudo political independence till date, what had been taking place in the name of decolonization is simply an act of increasing the number of colonialists within the realm of available neo-colonialists, which included America, Western Europe, china, Saudi Arabia and the host of other emerging neo-colonialists. For the true intent of freedom from colonial and neocolonial yoke among the colonized to take place, there is a need for decolonization of socioeconomic policy logical framework as this paper has proposed in Nigeria and other nations with similar experience.

Works Cited

- Adetoro, John. E. *A Primary History for Nigeria*. Macmillan, 1965.
- Arukwe, Nnanna O. *Since Equiano: History and Challenges of African Socio-political Thought*. University of Nigeria Press, 2010.
- Barker, James, A. *The Neglected War: Mesopotamia 1914-1918*. Faber and Faber, 1967.
- Canovan, Margaret. "Trust the people! Populism and the Two Faces of Democracy." *Political Studies*, vol.47, 1999, pp. 2-16.
- Chinweizu. *The West and the Rest of Us*. Vintage, 1975.
- Equiano, Olaudah. *Equiano's Travel: His Autobiography*. Heinemann Educational, 1798 [1967].
- Hughs, Matthew. *Alleby and British Strategy in Middle East 1917-1919*. Frank Cass, 1999.
- Jega Attahiru. M. *Democracy, Good Governance and Development in Nigeria*. Spectrum Books, 2007.
- Laurijssen Ilse and Spruyt Bram "Not for People Like Us?" *Social Indicators Research*, vol. 124, 2014, pp. 617-635.
- Nwanunobi, Onyeka, C. *African Social Institutions*. University of Nigeria Press, 2001.
- Okafor, Samuel O. "Colonialism and Neo-colonialism: The Factors, the Degraded, the Concept of Leadership among the Igbo." *Igbo Institutions and Leadership*, edited by Gabriella I. Nwaozuzu, Okpoko, Patrick, U., Mbah, Boniface, M. and Ahamefula, Ndubuisi, O. University of Nigeria: Centre for Igbo Studies, 2018.
- Okafor, Samuel O. "The Colonialists and Indigenous Exchange Currency: Tracing the Genesis of Socioeconomic Woes in Postcolonial Nigeria." *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Policy*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2019, pp. 37-50. DOI: 10.18488/journal.26.2019.81.37.50
- Osman, Antwi-Boateng. "New World Order Neo-Colonialism: A Contextual Comparison of Contemporary China and European Colonization in Africa." *Africology: The Journal of Pan African Studies*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2017, pp. 177-196.
- Rodney, Walter. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Howard University Press, 1972.
- Shokpeka Sarah, A. and Nwaokocha Odigwe A. "British Colonial Economic Policy in Nigeria, the Example of Benin Province 1914-1954." *J Hum Ecol*, vol. 28, no. 1, 2009, pp. 57-66.
- Ziltener, Patrick, Künzler, Daniel and Walter, André. "Measuring the Impacts of Colonialism: A New Data Set for the Countries of Africa and Asia." *Journal of World-Systems Research*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2017, pp. 156-190.