



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

THE EXPERIENCE OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF NIGERIA

S. Olajuwon Olayide
*(Professor & Head, Department of Agricultural Economics & Extension)
University of Ibadan, Nigeria)*

Country Setting

The Federal Republic of Nigeria, with an area of 923,773 km² has its greatest east-west length of over 1,127 km, the greatest north-south length of some 1,046 km, and a coastline of some 800 km bordering the Atlantic Ocean. Its broad latitudinal range (4° - 140° North of the equator) incorporates diverse bio-physiographic features. It is subject to a tropical climate with year-round high temperatures and high humidities which pose no serious limitation to the growth of agricultural crops. The vegetational zoning which is largely a reflection of the climatic zoning influences the cropping patterns whilst land-use is essentially determined by the combined effects of soil topography and climate (1).

The social and economic history of Nigeria during the pre-colonial and the colonial periods has been such that the economy has responded significantly to its bio-physiographic setting. The economy is structurally skewed heavily in favour of primary production with a highly significant dependence on the foreign trade sector for its primary produce (2).

The country has ample resource base. First labour is the most important resource of the peasant system of primary production, since it accounts for almost 90 per cent of all farm operations. As about 80 per cent of the adult labour force is employed in primary production and 79-82 per cent of the population lives in rural communities, labour resources may have misguided people into postulating near zero marginal productivity of labour. Second, the economic resources such as land, water, livestock, forestry, wildlife, and fisheries may be said to be ample in their currently underdeveloped/semi-developed state. Third, are ample mineral resources as well as industrial resources sufficiently capable of sustaining viable agro-industries. Infrastructural resources such as access roads, railways, power, and water supply are essentially in a semi-developed stage whilst institutional structures such as the family, the village, the clan, cultural organizations, and social psychology play prominent roles in the process of the dynamics of rural change (3).

During the period 1960-69, the population of Nigeria was estimated to grow at approximately 2.50 per cent per annum and about 3 per cent since creating a population of about 72.310m. for 1973. It is noteworthy to indicate that the major cities are growing at a much faster rate, estimated at between 6 and 13 per cent per annum as a consequence of high birth rates and rapid rural-urban migration (4). (See Appendix Table 1.) This situation confirms the contention that the population of the cities is growing much faster than employment opportunities (5).

The per capita rural work-force income is about ₦67.44 (\$103.52) whilst the per capita urban income is about ₦100.00 (\$153.50). When stock is taken of the per capita rural income of ₦55.56 (\$54.58) per annum in the 1961-70 decade,

the implication for rural-urban migration becomes more serious (6). The income distribution patterns has been found to be very skewed. It is within this setting of growing urbanization without significant industrialisation coupled with declining or stagnant agricultural sector that an appraisal of the experience of agriculture and rural development within the context of economic development of Nigeria can be meaningfully made.

Nigerian Agricultural and Rural Establishment

The Nigerian agricultural establishment is characteristically traditional. It is typified by five distinct systems of cultivation each with its peculiarities and advantages: First is the system of shifting cultivation determined largely by the ratio between the length of the time the soil will sustain cultivation with satisfactory results and the period required for restoration of fertility. The shortening of the fallow period which is an inevitable consequence of the increase in population constitutes the gravest problem of the system (7). A system that requires about 40.47 hectares of forest land per farm-family and about 60.70 hectares of savannah land per farm-family cannot be said to be efficient under fixed arable land available and under high rate of population growth. It is the system most prevalent in the country.

Second is the system of rudimentary sedentary cultivation which is generally characteristic of densely populated areas (8). Here continuous cultivation is based on simple crop rotations and the use of manure on well-defined holdings. It is practised around such big cities of the northern savannah as Sokoto, Zaria, Katsina, Maiduguri and in the Kano close-farmed zone where it has attained its highest development.

Third is the system of terrace agriculture characteristic of mountainous areas and in skilfully developed terraces to protect the thin and skeletal soils, e.g., farming communities in the hilly areas of Benue-Plateau and the North-eastern State. The cropping is based on a simple three-year rotation of guinea-corn, beans and bulrush millet with some beans. Use is made of organic wastes of all types whilst cattle also play prominent roles in supplying manure (9).

Fourth is the traditional system of rudimentary mixed farming involving a balance of crops and stock on individual holdings as found among such farming communities as the Munuye of Adamawa province (10) and the Shuwa Arabs in the Dikwa Emirate (11) in North-eastern State. The ineffective development of mixed farming systems has been due to the concentration of virtually the entire cattle population in the hands of the nomadic Fulanis. The system holds out much promise if and when plans to settle the nomads are implemented.

Fifth is the system of rudimentary (intensive) irrigated farming for such crops as rice, sugar-cane, food crops, and vegetables in the seasonally flooded riverine or fadama lands, especially in the northern state of Nigeria. With the utilization of modern machinery and improved water utilization techniques, such areas under this system as in Kano, Zaria, Sokoto, and Bida Emirates, as well as farm lands in the southern states can profit from total and/or supplemental irrigation (12).

Each of these five systems of traditional farming possesses variations that are dependent on location, availability of resources, socio-cultural and ethnic characteristics/practices, and differences in eco-systemological factors. They have in turn tended to condition the structure of the rural economy. The rural landscape may be classified into types based on predominant activities or enterprises. Thus there are predominantly farming, fishing, hunting, lumbering, pastoral, gathering or collection, and craft communities of essential illiterate inhabitants who make up about 80 per cent of the country's total population. These rural enterprises are essentially small-scale and subsistence oriented. The economies are multi-enterprise dominated entities with indefinable boundary lines. Within this framework, modern *collectors*, who are tree crop farmers, have evolved with export-oriented cash-crop enterprises like cocoa, rubber, coffee, oil palm, cotton, etc. Farming enterprises as a whole are usually subject to poor yields, low productivity, small marketable surpluses in the case of food crops, and poor management.

Attempts to stimulate the agricultural and the rural establishments began with the *Ten-Year Plan of Development and Welfare for Nigeria, 1946*. This *pseudo plan* which is the genesis of economic planning in Nigeria was only designed to guide the colonial administration in its governance of the country. It consisted essentially of a series of projects involving neither coordination nor orientation to any aggregative target for the economy as a whole. The International Bank Mission (IBRD) report in 1955 constitutes the next major landmark. On this report was based the 1955-60 economic development programme. This period synchronized with the achievement of regional autonomy, and a balkanization of economic plans resulted. The third stage of planning metamorphosis came in 1962 when the various regional governments agreed to a *joint* economic plan programme which was only *joint* in the sense that there was some degree of consultation and coordination (13). Before the termination of the plan, the civil strife in the country erupted into a full-scale war which did not end until early 1970, when a second national development plan for the period 1970-74 was launched. It is being proposed to prepare *ad hoc* programme for 1974/75 so that a third national development plan for the period 1975/76 - 1979/80 will be launched by April 1975.

It is within these series of plans and essentially within the context of the first and second national development plans that one can realistically assess the experiences of agriculture and rural development in Nigeria.

The Experience of Agriculture

The 1962-68 national development plan was carried on till the termination of the civil war in 1969/70. The full implementation of the plan was impeded by lack of sufficient funds, considerable under-spending in the various sectors, inability to obtain projected foreign aid, and, more specifically, the lack of a fully coordinated and articulated primary sector plan for facilitating orderly and progressive structural transformation (see Appendix Table 2).

The 1970-74 national development plan was based on *five* quantifiable and operational goals (14). For the purposes of this paper the relevant goals are:

- (i) the creation of employment opportunities at a level of reducing the rate of unemployment significantly;
- (ii) the progressive improvement of knowledge about the economy's resource endowments through resource inventory surveys;
- (iii) the promotion of balanced development between one part of the country and another, especially between rural and urban areas;
- (iv) the rapid improvement in the level and quality of infrastructural facilities and/or social services;
- (v) the achievement of a rate of growth of per capita output in order to double real income per head in 1985.

The total allocation of ₦ 259,334m. over the four-year period amounts to ₦3.71 per capita, ₦4.63 per rural population, and ₦21.03 (or a mean annual sum of ₦5.26) (see Appendix Table 3), per farmer in the country.

One feature that is very apparent in these allocations for the period 1962-74 is the fact that they are essentially public programmes and/or projects. Apart from allocations to agricultural extension and such subsidized inputs as pesticides and fertilizers, the private sector of primary production has been largely unaffected. The few public programmes appeared as monuments which farmers fully realise were beyond their reach. Another feature is their inadequacy to meet the demonstration effects that they were supposed to perform/create, and their inability to contribute significantly to solving the country's food and nutrition problem.

Consequently, the small-scale peasant producers are going to continue to form the bulwark of food and fibre growers in the next few decades. Assuming the rate of growth of farming population is 2 per cent per annum, there will be about 16m. farmers in the country in 1985.

On a mean annual rate, agriculture contributes 15.3 per cent of the government revenue in terms of customs and excise, 58.5 per cent of GNP, 64.7 per cent of the export trade and 20.7 per cent of the import trade during the 1954/55 to 1969/70. These contributions which are significant in value terms come largely from the labours of our traditional peasant producers. Contributions from modernized plantations are infinitesimal. On the plane alone peasant agriculture must be adjudged to have performed very well in Nigeria's economic development during the first development decade (see Appendix Table 4).

The contributions presented here probably hide some aspects of the experience of agriculture in the development process. It is therefore necessary to examine the rates of growth of these components to see whether there is any justifications for expecting further/greater contributions during this second development decade. First government revenue from customs and excise present a fluctuating upward trend with a mean annual growth of 8.9 per cent whilst its agricultural component presents a slightly fluctuating upward trend with a mean annual increase of 5.2 per cent. The GNP presents an upward trend at a mean annual growth rate of 5.2 per cent whilst its agricultural component presents a declining (rate of growth) trend even though increase is at a mean annual growth rate of 3.5 per cent. The same picture is true of the export trade with a mean annual growth rate of 2 per cent and of import trade at 3.9 per cent. These rates of annual increase or decrease are pointers to the fact that our peasant agriculture could no longer hold its own unless strenuous efforts are made to engender rapid structural

transformations and modernization in agriculture. New techniques of production, breeding, protection and storage are available and the need is to educate the farmers through an *all purpose* extension service system (see Appendix Table 5).

Experience of Rural Communities

It should be stressed in terms of investment allocations in national development plan. Investment allocations to rural water supplies and rural electrification was ₦25.934m. (\$36.758m.) during the period 1962-68 (Appendix Table 2). The sum works out to a mean annual allocation of ₦3.989m. (\$6.123m.), or an investment allocation of some ₦5.10 or \$7.83 per rural inhabitant which, over a six-year period, must be considered inadequate to provide rural amenities. This is one of the significant reasons why the rate of rural-urban migration has been considerably accelerated during the decade (15).

In the 1970-74 second national Development Plan, the agricultural policy statement of "*creating rural employment opportunities*"¹ was nowhere delineated in terms of specific projects that are designed to achieve this goal in the country's rural landscape. The agro-industrial plants envisaged for industrial estates and development centres were not rural-based in terms of location. The cooperative societies and local self-help schemes for which ₦2.522m. (\$3.871m.) has been allocated are essentially urban-oriented. The goal of promoting balanced development between rural and urban areas would seem to have been provided for in the programmes for town and country planning.

Structurally, the rural landscape has derived little benefits from development plans carried out in the country from 1955-74. The communities have remained essentially poor without modern amenities. But their performance in terms of making significant contributions to the GNP and overall economic development have not been in doubt. The effects of a stagnating structure is an inefficient performance with its attendant consequences. These consequences include rural-urban migration of able-bodied youths, ageing rural/farm population, declining primary production with consequent shortages, growing food and nutrition problems, and widening rural-urban income gap amongst others.

Stimulating Agricultural and Rural Development

In achieving this aim, the planning framework must be based on a useful model that takes full cognisance of the relevant basic theories of area economic development put forward by economists. First, the classical economic theory stresses that area/rural growth is determined by the rate of return on investment and by wage rates. Second, the basic resource theory emphasizes that rural growth depends on the presence and development of local basic or natural resources, such that primary industries can generate secondary and tertiary employment in retailing and service industries.

¹ See Reference No.14, p.110.

Third, export base theory places the emphasis for rural growth on creation of industry which exports its products to outside areas. Fourth, the location theory emphasizes the role of monetary factors such as cost minimization or profit maximization in the location of economic activity, given the location of markets and natural resources, with careful examination of production and transportation costs. Fifth, the internal combustion theory stresses that growth can be generated by such other internal forces as technology, community services and facilities and series of self-help schemes even in the absence of sufficient/ample basic resources. Sixth, the external combustion theory places the stimuli for growth outside the natural resources or man-made efforts of the region but on such outside forces as increased demand for its products, military bases, government supported facilities, etc. This resumé of growth theories points to the fact that area growth is less tied to natural resources and may be more dependent on technology and on the attitudes and skills embodied in the people (16).

Whatever theories and eventual model are adopted will depend on the relative position of each area *vis-à-vis* the relevant variables of development that have to be tampered with. The policy variables of interest include full employment, decentralization of enterprises - jobs, community development in terms of infrastructural facilities, enhancement of income, and lightening the irksomeness of rural labour utilization. In this connection the planning framework for agricultural and rural development must be quantitative and target-oriented (17). The plan implementation processes must be carefully marked out and sequenced with full progress reporting systems and timing. The roles of rural and farm infrastructures must be quantitatively marked out and fully assessed, using cost-effectiveness systems to get programme priorities. The source, role, and availability on the basic inputs must be carefully laid out. Finally, the organizational and administrative framework for implementing each programme must be fully articulated with detailed specifications of the number, source, training and financial implications of the manpower resources required.

Unfortunately, none of the development plans so far implemented had followed this framework, quite apart from the fact that their specifications have been public projects without due consideration of the private sector. Under such a situation, the experiences of agricultural and rural development in Nigeria's economic development have not been too salutary, even though the performance has been such as to make significant contributions to national economic growth. The inadequacy of planned attack on agricultural and rural development has been complicated by such problems of implementation as inadequate financing, inadequate staff, lack of adequate provision of supporting facilities, bottlenecks in land acquisition due to complex land tenure systems, post bellum rehabilitation requirements, operational conflicts, constructional regimentation, and poor approach to organisational structures (18).

Summary and Conclusion

Agricultural and rural development are two inextricably intertwined facets of the development process. This short paper has tried to appraise, in broad terms, the experience of agriculture and rural development in economic development of Nigeria.

Special treatment needs to be given to the agricultural sector due to three basic characteristics which have implications for planning different from those known to general economists. First is the overwhelming importance bio-climatic and physiographic factors that complicate forecasting and pose problems of seasonality of production, price-output fluctuations, storage-marketing and the need to synchronise agricultural with non-agricultural production so as to ensure all year round employment of resources such as labour. Second is the fact that production is undertaken in our rural landscape by numerous small-scale producers who are scattered over largely isolated villages and hamlets, a situation that complicates the collection and processing of information for planning as well as the administration of planned programmes in a rural-based context. Third is the importance of institutional factors in production and the need to pay very close attention to such factors as tenure, and organisational or the social framework which could profoundly affect production patterns. It is the failure to take cognisance of these special characteristics that has affected the fortunes of agriculture and the rural landscape in Nigerian economic development from 1955-74.

Furthermore, past agricultural and rural development programmes in Nigerian possess certain characteristics which have deleterious effects on growth. These are (i) relatively low capital expenditures, (ii) considerable underspending in allocated investments, (iii) dominance of government directed projects which make very infinitesimal contributions to national requirements of food and fibre, (iv) lack of emphasis on food crops, (v) lack of coordination among regions and/or states, and (vi) the utter neglect of rural and farm infrastructures. The end-results are (a) declining productivity and near stagnation in agriculture, (b) the progressive development of ghost villages and urban - suburban sprawl due to rising rural-urban migration, (c) the swelling of the low-income class, (d) worsening food and nutrition problem, (e) mounting complexity in information gathering and planning for development, and (f) growing social tension bordering on social revolt (19).

To avert the ugly situation which might eventually be precipitated, policy instruments are needed. The essential policy issues involved in orderly agricultural and rural development planning and plan implementation must include the following (20):

- (i) careful reorganization and reassessment of governmental agencies connected with agriculture and rural communities as a means of laying down a progress-oriented and dynamic operational framework;
- (ii) maximum involvement of the private sector in agricultural and rural development programmes through a carefully worked-out and constructed scheme of incentives;
- (iii) detailed examination and assessment of the key facilitative issues in efficient production and distribution of primary products of the rural landscape;
- (iv) careful study and development of effective land and water resource use schemes with due cognisance of optimum ecological balance;
- (v) the programming of effective production schemes based on optimum enterprise combinations that maximize returns from cash as well as food crops;

- (vi) setting and implementation of a national food and nutrition policy based on nutritional targets, minimum dietary requirements, rising population, and demands of the vulnerable group;
- (vii) evolvement of definitive policies for solving the problems of increasing high quality protein from livestock, fishery and wild life resources within the framework of enhanced rural employment;
- (viii) acceleration of the pace of technical innovation in a manner conducive to rapid structural changes and consequent modernisation of primary production systems in Nigeria;
- (ix) assessment of the rapid processes of urbanisation and suburbanisation with respect to their deleterious effects on primary production and attendant needs for stringent land zoning as well as land use-right laws;
- (x) the provision of adequate rural and farm infrastructures in a manner conducive to accelerated rural development as well as increased rural productivity;
- (xi) careful examination of current price and input support and price stabilization policies and the development of better welfare oriented instruments; and
- (xii) the assessment of size-scale relationships in primary production and the promotion of such facilitative organizational framework as partnerships and cooperatives in our rural communities.

These 12 aspects constitute necessary bench-marks for the development of policy instruments conducive to rapid agricultural and rural development and hence overall economic development of Nigeria. In conclusion, any instruments thus developed must be quantifiable, testable and actually tested under a set of alternatives.

References

1. Buchanan, K.M. & J.C. Pugh. *Land and People in Nigeria*. London: Univ. of London, 1955, pp.1-57.
2. IBRD/IDA, *Nigeria: Agricultural Sector Survey*, Vols. I-III, Dec. 8, 1971.
3. Olayide, S.O. et al. *Elements of Rural Economics*. Ibadan: Oxford Univ. Press, 1974 (in press).
4. Olayide, S.O. "Government and Construction Industry: Policies for Urban Sprawl in Nigeria," *Proceedings of the Nigerian Economic Society Annual Conference*, April/May, 1974.
5. Flores, E. "The Big Threat is Not Hunger," *CERES*, Vol. 2, No.3, May-June, 1969.
6. Federal Ministry of Economic Development & Reconstruction. *First National Development Plan, 1963-68*. Lagos, Nigeria: Ministry of Information, 1970.
7. Whittlesey, D.S. "Shifting Cultivation," *Economic Geography*, Vol. 13, 1937, pp.35-52.

8. Stamp, L.D. *Africa: A Study in Tropical Development*. London: Longmans, 1952.
9. White, S. "Agricultural Economy of the Hill Pagans of Dikwa Emirate," *Empire Journal of Experimental Agriculture*, Vol.9, No. 35, 1941.
10. Russell, E.R. "Primitive Farming in Nigeria: The Munuye Tribe," *Empire Journal of Experimental Agriculture*, Vol.8, 1940.
11. White, S. "Mixed Farming as Practised by Some Shuwa Arabs in Dikwa Emirate," *Farm and Forest*, Vol. II, No. 1, 1941, pp.24-26.
12. Stewart, C.E. "Economic Evaluation of Public Irrigation Development." (Ed.) S.C. Smith & E.N. Castle, Ames, U.S.A.: Iowa State Univ. Press, 1964, pp.107-126.
13. Olayide, S.O. "Plan Formulation and Review Under Post-War Reconstruction," *The Reconstructor*, Vol. 1, April 1969, pp.17-21.
14. Federal Ministry of Economic Development & Reconstruction. *Second National Development Plan, 1970-74*. Lagos, Nigeria: Government Printer.
15. Essang, S.M. & E.F. Mabawonku. "Determinants and Impact of Rural-Urban Migration on Selected Communities in Western Nigeria," *Rural Development Paper*, No. 10, Dec. 1973, pp.30.
16. Tweeten, L. "Elements of Economic Growth in Rural Areas Research," *Application in Rural Economic Development and Planning*. Oklahoma State Univ. Research Report, p.665, July 1972, pp.1-14.
17. Olayide, S.O. et al. *A Quantitative Analysis of Food Requirements, Supplies and Demands in Nigeria, 1968-85*. Ibadan, Nigeria: Univ. Ibadan Press, 1972, p.113.
18. Olayide, S.O. "Developing Nigerian Agriculture: The Framework of a Perspective Plan," *Proceedings of FAO/NORAD West African Seminar on Agricultural Planning*. Samaru, Nigeria: January/February, 1974.
19. Olayide, S.O. "Agricultural Development and Future Food Needs", Mimeo. Paper presented at the *FAO/DANIDA Seminar on Food and Nutrition Policy Planning in English-speaking Africa*, Lusaka, Zambia: August 1973, 40 pp.
20. Olayide, S.O. "Policy Issues and Effective Agricultural Planning," *Proceedings of National Planning Workshop*, Ibadan, Nigeria: Univ. of Ibadan, July 1972.

Appendix Table I. Magnitudes of Rural and Urban Population in 1963*,
Nigeria

State	No. of Towns with Popula- tion of over 20,000 in 1963	Total Population of the Towns ('000)	Percent of Total State Population in 1963	Percent of Total State Population Residually Rural
Benue-Plateau	9	356.234	8.88	91.12
East-Central	19	879.443	12.17	87.83
Kano	3	343.685	5.95	94.05
Kwara	9	473.397	19.73	80.27
Lagos	6	1,047.249	72.52	27.48
Mid-Western	6	283.778	11.19	88.81
North-Central	6	485.465	11.85	88.15
North-Eastern	25	882.709	11.33	88.67
North-Western	17	579.918	10.11	89.89
Rivers	4	249.056	16.12	83.88
South-Eastern	7	282.600	7.80	92.20
Western	72	4,842.386	51.04	48.96
TOTAL	183	10,705.920	19.23	80.77

Note: *Total Population (1963) - 55,670 million.

Source: F.O.S., *Annual Abstracts of Statistics*, Lagos, Nigeria, 1970.

Appendix Table 2. Allocations to Primary Production; Nigeria, 1962-68

Programme/Project	Allocations in ₦ million*			
	Federal Government	Northern States	Eastern States	Western States
Agriculture, Credit, Extension, etc.	6.000	-	3.000	15.520
Fishery Department	1.770	0.344	0.454	0.286
Forestry Department	0.996	0.928	0.352	0.190
Livestock & Veterinary	0.644	7.256	5.262	0.886
Crops	2.924	10.066	62.580	19.996
Agricultural Investment	20.000	-	-	-
Agricultural Development Corporations	-	64.874	-	-
Rural Water Supplies	-	8.128	8.400	6.206
Land Use	-	-	1.994	-
Rural Electrification	-	-	1.200	-
Others	8.598	-	-	-
TOTAL	40.932	91.596	83.242	43.084

Note: * Total planned expenditure allocations - ₦258.854m. or 19.12 per cent of aggregate planned expenditure allocations.

Source: F.M.E.D., *Federation of Nigeria National Development Plan, 1962-68*, Apapa, Lagos, Nigeria: Nigerian National Press Ltd., 1962.

Appendix Table 3. Allocations to Primary Production; Nigeria, 1970-74

(NMillion)

Expenditure Item	1970/71	1971/72	1972/73	1973/74	Total
Food Crops	6.280	7.042	7.876	7.228	28.426
Export Crops	7.012	8.794	10.868	9.564	36.238
Industrial Crops	0.928	1.282	2.020	2.712	6.942
Irrigation & Research	4.484	6.328	9.376	8.822	29.010
Agricultural Credit	5.092	5.788	5.754	5.858	22.492
Farm Mechanisation	5.890	12.730	13.106	11.814	43.540
Farm Training Institutions	1.346	0.918	0.894	0.800	3.958
Agricultural Extension	9.968	11.296	9.376	8.080	38.720
Livestock	6.882	7.290	5.940	4.370	24.482
Fishery	1.094	2.902	3.740	3.862	11.598
Forestry	2.976	3.612	4.306	3.034	13.928
TOTAL	51.952	67.982	73.256	66.144	259.334
Estimated Total Per Capita (N)	0.78	0.99	1.03	0.91	3.71
Estimated Total Per Rural Population (N)	0.97	1.24	1.29	1.13	4.63
Estimated Total Per Farmer (N)	4.35	5.58	5.89	5.21	21.03

Source: F.M.E.D., *Federation of Nigeria: Second National Development Plan, 1970-74*. Legos, Nigeria: Federal Government Printer, 1970, pp. 103-132.

Appendix Table 4. Contribution of Agriculture in Economic Development; Nigeria

Year	Government Customs & Excise		Gross National Product		Foreign Trade (Exports)		Foreign Trade (Imports)	
	Value of Agric.	Percent of Total	Agric. Component (Nmillion)	Percent of Total	Agric. Component (Nmillion)	Percent of Total	Agric. Component (Nmillion)	Percent of Total
1954/55	38.4	26.8	1073.4	64.9	218.6	84.2	77.0	28.3
1955/56	31.8	21.8	1083.4	62.2	227.2	85.9	76.6	25.1
1956/57	34.8	20.1	1130.4	62.1	210.7	84.8	80.4	26.4
1957/58	28.8	16.5	1260.8	68.2	232.7	87.6	84.5	25.4
1958/59	32.2	17.1	1285.2	65.4	283.0	88.1	92.0	25.8
1959/60	37.2	16.3	1423.8	63.4	282.5	85.3	107.8	24.9
1960/61	39.6	15.6	1465.2	61.7	283.0	83.2	182.1	40.9
1961/62	36.6	13.3	1609.6	61.2	260.0	79.3	99.3	20.6
1962/63	37.6	13.6	1675.0	59.7	285.9	77.3	84.4	20.3
1963/64	47.6	16.2	1678.0	57.6	303.9	72.2	93.3	18.4
1964/65	50.4	14.1	1691.8	54.9	327.3	62.2	92.9	16.4
1965/66	55.2	14.5	1784.4	55.6	292.5	52.5	75.3	14.6
1966/67	56.6	14.3	1713.0	56.1	264.5	55.5	67.3	15.1
1967/68	52.4	15.8	1726.6	55.0	263.7	63.8	38.5	10.0
1968/69	54.8	15.3	1743.8	53.2	278.7	44.3	50.2	10.0
1969/70	72.6	14.3	1787.4	51.3	280.5	32.0	70.9	9.4
Mean 1961-70	50.3	14.0	1687.4	56.3	283.2	57.4	86.4	17.6
Mean 1955-70	44.2	15.3	1508.2	58.5	267.9	64.7	85.8	20.7

Source: (i) F.O.S., *Annual Abstracts of Statistics*, Lagos, Nigeria.
(ii) Olatunbosun, D. & S.O. Olayide, *Trends in Nigeria's Commodity Exports*, Nigeria: NISER Research Monograph (mimeo.) Univ. of Ibadan, 1971, pp. 240.

Appendix Table 5. Rates of Growth of Agricultural Components in the Development Process; Nigeria, 1955-70 (Per cent)

Year	Government		G.N.P.		Exports		Imports	
	Customs & Excise	Agric. Component	Total	Agric. Component	Total	Agric. Component	Total	Agric. Component
1955/56	-4.0	17.2	5.2	0.9	1.9	3.9	12.2	-0.5
1956/57	15.0	9.4	4.5	4.3	-6.1	-7.3	-0.2	4.9
1957/58	1.7	-17.2	1.6	11.5	6.9	10.5	9.1	5.1
1958/59	8.8	11.8	6.3	1.9	20.9	21.6	7.3	8.9
1959/60	13.6	15.5	14.3	10.8	3.1	-0.2	21.0	17.2
1960/61	17.8	6.5	5.7	2.9	2.7	0.2	3.1	68.8
1961/62	1.9	-7.6	10.8	9.9	-3.6	-8.1	-8.7	-45.5
1962/63	-4.5	2.7	6.7	4.1	12.7	10.0	2.1	-10.0
1963/64	19.6	26.6	3.8	0.2	13.8	6.3	22.3	10.6
1964/65	27.5	5.9	5.7	0.8	25.1	7.7	8.5	-0.4
1965/66	0.8	9.5	4.2	5.5	5.9	-10.6	-6.7	19.0
1966/67	-3.4	2.5	-4.9	-4.0	-14.6	-9.6	-13.0	-10.6
1967/68	-14.1	-7.4	2.9	0.8	-13.3	-0.3	-13.9	-42.7
1968/69	8.4	4.6	4.4	1.0	52.4	5.7	29.1	30.7
1969/70	45.3	32.5	6.3	2.5	39.4	0.6	52.1	41.3
Mean								
1961-70	9.9	7.6	4.3	2.4	12.1	0.2	7.5	2.3
Mean								
1955-70	8.9	7.5	5.2	3.5	9.8	2.0	8.3	3.9

Source: Calculated from data in Table 4.