

## **Between Fantasy and Fancy: Nigeria's Mirage Journey to Industrialised State Status in the Post-COP19 Era of Climate Change**

Lere Amusan

Department of Politics and International Relations, North West University,  
Mafikeng Campus, Mafikeng, South Africa

---

**Abstract:** By 2020, Nigeria hopes to be one of the most industrialised countries in the international system as if Rome was built in a day. Corruption, the politics of delay by domestic and international contractors, kick backs by political parties and the military ingovernment that left little room for transparency are some of the issues that have affected the proper implementation of various development plans put in place in Nigeria since, 1960. The climate change crises that the international system is contending with put the much-publicised Vision 20-2020 under stress. Lack of government readiness, global financial problems and the concretisation of the Western inspired national strategy to climate change will militate against climate smart. The Western dominated technical committee on Measuring, Reporting and Verifying (MRV) does not encourage the realisation of the vision. Drought, flood, destabilisation of the ecosystem and the destruction of biodiversity are the fallouts of climate change. The implications of these are diversion of annual budget to address immediate needs in the form of disaster risk management, mitigation and adaptation. Conflicts between herders and crop farmers are a daily occurrence in various parts of the country. As much as there is a call for 'Cow Rights', the Mbororo Fulanis who hardly recognise territorial integrity in the country will always be at war with their hosts, the effects of which make peace a luxury in Nigeria. As long as the Nigerian government is prevaricating on environmental law, the Vision 20-2020 will remain a pipe dream.

**Key words:** Nigeria, climate change, COP19, Vision 20-2020, green fund

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

The importance of the year 2020 in the study of climate change is scaring and perhaps spells doom for the survival of humanity as predicted by Carson (1962) in her book entitled: *Silent Spring*. The year 2020 has been set as a target date for Nigeria to be one of the most industrialised countries. Many countries have also set the year as a target date for various sustainable development plans. For South Africa, its intention is to lower Greenhouse Gas Emission (GHG) by 34%. The United Nations Framework Conference on Climate Change (UNFCCC) set its envisaged 2015 COP21 which will replace the Kyoto Protocol to take effect by 2020. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) projected that by 2070, the Arctic region will be ice-free during summer. Recently, satellite observations have reduced the time by half to 2035. In 2012, more simulations that are sophisticated moved the date down to 2020 (Borgerson, 2013). The 2013 COP19 did not support the Vision as it agrees on the anti-supranational COP21 to be signed in Paris in 2015 that will eventually replace the Kyoto Protocol. This is expected to come into force in 2020. This agreement is expectedly to be a

pro ultra capitalist agenda to the detriment of the developing world. The pre-COP19 Summit also called for national actions by the 2015 COP 21 in addressing mitigation questions of which Nigeria may be at the receiving end (Korolec, 2013). The question that comes to mind is how a country like Nigeria and other African countries will abide by these mitigation strategies based on their precarious economic situation. Unfortunately, America, expectedly did not participate in the UNFCCC as expected of a hegemon in the global system. Rather, the states focused on the Iran Nuclear Summit in Geneva at the same time. The Philippines, India and Pakistan flood victims received financial and material relief supports from the developed countries only.

America, one of the major importers of gas and oil from Nigeria, aims at increasing its unconventional production of shale gas and oil through fracking by 2020. Between 2005 and 2013, America's oil production increased by 30%. Between 2013 and 2020, production of shale oil and gas will add \$380-690 billion (2-4%), to America's annual GDP, creating 1.7 million permanent jobs (The Economist, 2013). In 2013, oil giants in cooperation with the CIA, the Department of Defense, private intelligence team and investment bankers came up

with what is known as the Lazarus Process where >\$100 billion will be annually spent on oil prospecting from subsea. The current \$27 billion on oil production will be \$52 billion by 2016 and eventually jump to \$130 billion in 2020. Abandoned oil fields are recently discovered to have housed about 75% oil deposits through hi-tech (it is confirmed by the oil giants and department of energy in the US that because of the introduction of new technology, the abandoned oil fields are going to produce more oil and gas of which the research confirmed that only 25% of the proven oil was extracted with the new technology; the remaining 75% is for extraction. The implication of this is that alternative to fossil fuel is not in sight. For more information on this, see Oil and Energy Insider. <https://oilprice.com/premium/transcript> Accessed on 23 November, 2013). Therefore, America and the North Sea oil deposits are new sources of oil for developed countries which in a way are in tandem with the Like-Minded group of Developing Countries' (LMDC) projections and positions on climate change mitigation. The implication of this is that the global system is not ready to embark on meaningful climate change mitigation instead, it is trying to adapt to a new climate induced technology to make the planet warmer in the name of economic development. For the Nigerian situation, the vision 2020 is hoped to remain a mirage as most of the technology expected to improve the economic development is from fossil fuel and agriculture. Political instability, religious fanaticism and human security fragility are the combined factors that will affect any meaningful development in the country come 2020. The massive production of oil and gas through fracking and the Lazarus Process will affect the price of conventional oil which Nigeria depends on in achieving Vision 20-2020. Because of the volatility of the Middle East, the unreliable source of South America's oil and gas and recent politico-religious fundamentalism in Africa inspired the US to increase the production of oil and gas production unconventionally from the current 21% from gas and oil to 33% by 2020. This is one of America's and European Union (EU) energy development strategies despite the fact that a series of protests against fracking and its environmental impacts on ground water pollution are not healthy for humanity. The importance of water at domestic level is invaluable. If properly managed, it will contribute to Vision 20-2020 through the creation of a healthy environment and people. Water has an inseparable linkage with health and nutrition as observed by Jamie and Sandy (2010) as quoted from Tucker *et al.* (2013). With the possible exception of malaria and HIV/AIDS in Africa, it is hard to think of another health problem (than inadequate WASH) so prejudicial to household and national economic development.

Climate change and Vision 20-2020 are contradictory concepts in the Nigerian situation. Nigeria a littoral state is observed with negative prediction by Bond (2012). He observes that:

There is no question that climate change ensures rising sea levels, submerging coastlines and sinking small islands; extreme droughts and the melting of icepacks and glaciers (hence drying sources of mountain water and then streams and rivers); violent storms and flooding that will overwhelm decrepit stormwater drainage systems, land slides on hilly terrain; geopolitical tension and new waves of 'climate refugees' into increasingly xenophobic societies the disruption of food chains plus famines and other coming disasters

### **CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY (CCP) IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE**

Comparatively, South Africa is equally a littoral state but passed a white paper on climate change as Government's National Climate Change Response Policy. This study which was gazetted in October 2011, aims at lowering GHG by 34% by 2020. This is to sustain social, economic and environmental resilience and emergency response capacity. At the global level, the policy aims "to make a fair contribution to the global effort to stabilise GHG concentration in the atmosphere at a level that avoids dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system within a timeframe that enables economic, social and environmental development to proceed in a sustainable manner". Before CCP was passed into law, it involved relevant affected stake holders: government departments, NGOs, civil societies through a series of town hall deliberations, provinces and local government.

On the other hand, the Nigerian situation is yet to be determined as the government is dragging its feet on the need to come up with concise climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies. To achieve the much-publicised Vision 20-2020, so much ought to be taken into consideration. For instance, the location of privately-owned oil refinery in the river in Ondo State needs to be reconsidered as the low land may be consumed by a mere increase in the Atlantic Ocean. The \$9 billion that Aliko Dangote has envisaged to put into the refinery may go under drain if mitigation efforts are not put in place.

In September 2010, Nigeria's Federal Ministry of Environment (Climate Change Unit) for the first time, came up with the horrendous impact of climate change as it affects sustainable human development. Though, the issue of climate change with emphasis on adaptation and mitigation is included in the National Development Plan,

tagged as Vision 20-2020, it is confirmed by the Federal Ministry of Environment that the state is not in a position to adapt national policies, strategies and plans to address climate change problems. With regard to national emission, Nigeria is said to have contributed minimally in the oil and gas, agriculture, land use and industry. Out of the total of 100%, carbon dioxide is said to have contributed 65%, methane 33% while nitrous oxide was 2% as of 2000. Then, the issue of who should pay for the clean environment comes to the fore and at the same time that of who dominates the manufacturing industry, oil and gas sectors and recently, land use (agriculture and mining) may bring the country to another level of discussion as the MNCs have continued to dominate the sectors from the time of colonialism till date. For the country to succeed in reducing in emissions by 25% target by 2020, the state needs to invest about \$174.8 million yearly to achieve 5%. As such, mitigation strategies such as switching from fuel oil to natural gas, introduction of paraffin stove, energy saving bulbs, efficient electrical appliance at home and efficient automobiles are necessary conditions.

How can Nigeria achieve these when the country is technologically backward? The importation of second-hand cars dubbed as Tokunbo continues to be celebrated in the country. Importation of fake energy saving bulbs from China by Nigeria's importers and the compromise from the producers in China is contributing to the unsustainable climate change in the country. Corruption perpetrated by relevant authorities such as the Standard Organisation of Nigeria (SON) and custom officials add to Nigeria's environmental problem.

**The youth and climate change:** To create awareness on climate change by 2010 an NGO, Nigerian Youth Climate Coalition (NYCC) was formed with the aim of reaching out to urban youths through social media (Facebook, Twitter and ning.com) on the effects of climate change in general. Workshops, symposiums and roundtable discussions were the basic instruments due to financial and technical support from Canada and Finland. Through the Building Nigeria's Response to Climate Change programme (BNRCC), the youth were empowered through capacity building as a way of mitigation and adaptation from community, local government to national level. The World Bank Youth Forum (WBYF) inaugurated in July 2010, got support of NYCC as a sustainable development strategy (World Bank, 2010). The UN Agenda 21 Earth Summit, items 25:1 and 25:2 emphasised on the need to include the youth in any arrangements on climate change because they are the most affected and that the future of the system dependson them.

## **THE MAIN THREAT TO ENVIRONMENT AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE VISION 20-2020**

Nigeria is blessed with various climatic regions which if made use of may transform the socio-economic status of the country. The availability of mineral wealth is enough to transform the economy in a positive direction from the mangrove forests to arid regions, accommodating varieties of food production. Nigeria is "endowed with fishery resources, wildlife, timber, medicinal plants, mineral resources, water, ornamental and food crops" (Ajai, 2011). Climate change, if not well managed through adaptation and mitigation, may lead to the total collapse of the eco-system, GDP losses, security risk, cross-border migration, scarcity of resources and increase in preventable diseases and some geopolitical reordering all of which are described as age of consequence (Bales and Duke, 2008). To enhance sustainable development in Nigeria as a road map to the much publicised Vision 2020, some of the snags to be addressed were listed by Ajai (2011) as follows:

- Environmental degradation and pollution continues to grow virtually unchecked and in many cases is aided or perpetrated by every level of government and their agencies despite the environmental legislation in place
- Environmental laws are largely unenforced, corruptly enforced or sometimes enforced only with a revenue collection motive, ignoring core issues of environmental management as prescribed by law, standard or best practice
- In the formal and informal manufacturing industry, waste-treatment systems are largely non-existent and the industrial pollution of air and water and the unregulated disposal of toxic waste appears widespread
- Desertification was estimated to be advancing at the rate of 0.6 km year<sup>-1</sup> and is an acute problem in the areas bordering Niger Republic
- Excessive clearance of woodland, lowland forests, montane forests, the overgrazing of savannah habitats and the drainage of wetlands have led to the loss and probable extinction of many species
- The protected area system is grossly inadequate with many important reserves in the savannah area yet to be gazetted and marine and mangrove elements under-represented in the system
- The existing forest reserves are generally too small, fragmented, rapidly being de-reserved or degraded and unviable for many species
- Dam construction is having deleterious effects on wetlands, floodplain forests and the species that thrive in those habitats

Some of the above listed challenges were addressed in the Third Development Plan of 1975 to 1980 but corruption, lack of technical know-how and over-reliance on foreign aids reduced the plan to a pipedream.

### **HERDERS VERSUS CROP FARMERS RIVALRY**

The concept of climate of fear and the quest for dignity in a perceived dehumanised world (Soyinka, 2004) caused by the effects of climate change is worth looking into. Rivalry between farmers and herders may mar Vision 20-2020 if not nipped on bud as soon as possible. This has gone unnoticed for a very long time. It started from the competition for grazing land between foreign and local herders around the Sahel savannah. This led to an unwritten understanding between Niger Republic and Nigeria as cattle herders will seasonally cross to Nigeria irrespective of the principle of territoriality for grazing. This has always caused clashes around Kano, Katsina, Sokoto and the Lake Chad areas despite the formation of the Lake Chad and the Niger Basins in 1964 (Garba, 1987).

The impacts of climate change on grazing have caused herders to move to the erstwhile no go areas of the south despite the presence of tsetse flies. Mbororo Fulanis (Mbororo Fulanis in Cameroon qualify for the status of IPs as the Massai in Kenya because they roam around for grazing without any tendency for land claim to themselves. They can also be found in some parts of Northern Nigeria. They equally see themselves as IPs who should enjoy the rights of IPs as in the Convention 169 of the ILO) are considered to be expansionists by other tribes in the country. This is variously demonstrated by the herders even at midnight by herding on sedentary farmers' crops irrespective of the financial loss to the farmers. This contributes to the on going conflicts between the settlers and indigenes in some parts of the country. The herders believe that their cattle have some rights which should not be denied by crop farmers. Allegations of armed robbery against herders is rife in some parts of the country. They are believed to have been carrying out this with sophisticated weapons such as AK47 received from the owners of the animals who are civil servants, serving and retired military officers (Amusan, 2011). This explains why the herders have access to sophisticated weapons to withstand the indigenes whenever and wherever they force themselves to settle in the south as they value their cattle more than human life. They would readily declare war on anyone who tampers with their cattle (Suleiman, 2012).

The problem of desertification on the average of 0.6 km as mentioned above has some implications on

the survival of herders who hardly observe, even international boundaries as they cross several countries unknowingly for pasturing. The on going conflicts in the Plateau and Benue States are instructive as pointed out by Suleiman (2012) that:

The search for grazing fields which has turned Fulani herdsmen into guerrilla fighters, spreading terror and fear among farming communities in the country is generating an uproar in the National Assembly

The Third National Development Plan between 1975 and 1980 aimed at the creation of 22 million hectares of grazing reserves in northern Nigeria remains a pipe-dream. This is due to the bad implementation of the policy. The 2.84 million ha were created in 433 locations. Out of these reserves, >80% have not been gazetted. Through lobbying, the northerners want to smuggle in the creation of various grazing reserves throughout the country and at every local government of the Federation through the Senate. Expectedly, when this was tabled in the Senate, positions of the senators towed ethnic lines. While the core Northerners (North-East and North-West) want nationwide grazing reserves, the North Central, South West, South-South and South East maintained that this would run contrary to the 1999 Constitution and the Land Use Act that vested land to the states as against Federal Government. The position of the Senators was not far from that of different socio-political groups in the country, the Arewa Consultative Forum which supported the creation of nation wide grazing reserves but the Afenifere, Ohanaeze, Ijaw National Congress and the Federation of Middle Belt People differed with this position (Suleiman, 2012). This shows the poverty of federalism in the Nigerian situation.

Sociologically, conflict is a means of sending signals to government in order to improve the wellbeing of its subjects but when it is going out of hand, it tends to show the incompetence of the government in power, exposes state policy biases and highlights issues of resource management (Goldsmith, 2013).

### **GLOBALISATION OF FOOD PRODUCTION AND CLIMATE CHANGE**

Lack of available grazing land is aggravated by the privatisation of land through Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation+Ecosystem co-benefits (REDD+) where foreigners are in control of the fertile lands in Nigeria in the name of food security. This is what is described as politics of the belly by Bayart (1993) and land grabbing by Galaty (2013). Foreign Direct Investment

(FDI) in the agricultural sector is neither a way of resolving food insecurity nor a means of providing employment for the teeming population of the youth but an attempt to produce and export to their country to maintain political stability through food security and safety. This is a strategy embarked on by China, India, Europe and the Middle East (Galaty, 2013).

Land use and forestry are not a good option through sequestration of carbon. As much as it is the intention of the national government to embark on afforestation, the need by developing/emerging industrialised states and developed states to grab African land to produce industrial inputs and food are challenging. According to the 2010 report, \$1.78 billion is needed till 2020 to mitigate carbon release which is not to be equal to industrial emission at the time. This implies that deforestation for woods supply in the construction industry through logging, the balanced eco-system and wetland will continue to be negatively affected. It is scientifically confirmed that deforestation is a major contributor to GHG emissions and the release from carbon-dioxide. Efforts to preserve the rights of Indigenous Peoples (IPs) are apt according to the relevant international instruments to preserve their cultural heritage and the protection of basic human rights as enshrined in the ILO (1989) Convention 169. Effective resource mobilisation strategy based on the Private Public Partnerships (PPPs) principle is critical in enhancing national capacity to capitalise on a number of existing and potential financial inflows into climate change at national, regional and international levels. Introduction of PPPs in food production and land use continues to generate debates. If the two contracting parties incurred financial losses, it would be passed on to a third party (the citizen) in the form of higher fees (rent-seeking). This brings up the question about democratic legitimacy, since control mechanisms are largely lacking (Oberender and Rudolf, 2008). There is a need for a comprehensive and coordinated approach as against a reactive position of the government on climate change. In order to ensure Vision 20-2020, a National Development Plan aimed at moving the state beyond the present level of underdevelopment is essential. To achieve these, the incapacitated Ministry of Environment should observe the following:

- A National Climate Change Policy and Response Strategy should be finalised for the country
- The National Strategic Climate Change Trust Fund should be launched and finalised
- An extensive study for an up to date GHG emission profile, projection and mitigation strategies should be commissioned

- An extensive study on the socio-economic impacts of climatic change should be commissioned
- A detailed costing of adaptation initiatives for planning purposes should be undertaken
- A well-formulated action plan and process for the main streaming of climate change into national development plans, particularly Vision 20:2020 should be developed and implemented
- Strong national capacity at the federal, state and local government levels to plan and respond effectively to climate change impacts using evidence based and well-researched scientific information should be established

How can Nigeria adapt to the negative impacts of climate change when there are no actual statistics on the degree of vulnerability? From the Environmental Department release, the issue of degree and of its impacts are discussed as it will be mostly felt in the Northeast compared to the Southern part of the country. This is too shallow a position as heavy rainfall in the mangrove forest is not without its short comings as witnessed 2 years ago when the release of excess water in Cameroon had devastating impacts on food production, housing, health and transport activities in the Middle Belt and the riparian states of Bayelsa, Rivers, Cross River, Kogi, Benue and some parts of Ondo States. Agriculture and Water Resources Ministry is estimated to need about \$3.06 billion yearly. The Transport Ministry also needs about \$5.33 billion for the same period. The question that awaits a solution is how can the government source for this amount when other sectors are crying for attention?

There is a need to identify the most vulnerable areas for proper planning. There is a need to embark on adaptation and mitigation strategies adaptable to the Nigerian environment. For now, there is no adequate research or databank which should give a guide on the impacts of climate change on the economy. There is a need for information management system and dissemination of authentic information on the effects and how to curb the impacts of climate change. A proactive response, rather than a reactive response will best serve the development needs of Nigeria in the context of sustainable development in general and the attainment of the objectives of Vision 2020, in particular (FME, 2010).

Sea level rise of 0.3 m is predicted by 2020 in Nigeria. If it could rise by 1 m, the implication of this is that 75% of the Niger Delta will be lost. Several indigenous homes will find themselves in the sea. The signal of this is apparent in places such as Alpha Beach (OkunAafa) in Lekki area of Lagos State, Nigeria.

## **THE FUTURE OF OIL PRODUCTION AND CLIMATE SMART IN NIGERIA**

The importance of Nigeria in the international oil market will be reduced as a result of the thawing of glacier in the Arctic region. From the maritime perspective, the importance accorded to Africa will be substantially reduced when the developing alternative and effective route along the Arctic is completed. The passage between the Pacific Ocean to the Atlantic Ocean will be reduced by some thousands of kilometres. Hence, the crisis and politics of keeping Africa out of terror attack will receive little attention unlike what obtains now. On the question of mineral resources, it is estimated that the Arctic region recently housed 25% of the fossil fuel in the world. Other valuable mineral resources of commercial value have also been discovered in the region. The importance of this for Nigeria is among others that the state energy will receive less protection from the most industrialised states in the world. The state strategic location will be reduced to almost nothing as the Atlantic route towards the Southern tip will be less patronised. The need to develop the civilised nations of Greenland, Alaska (USA), Northern part of Canada, Russia Federation and Norway will be more prioritised as against the developing states where the dividend of the post-Cold War is always negative.

Also, worrisome for the actualisation of the Vision 20-2020 is the low emphasis on the Gulf of Guinea. The five states that border the Arctic met between 27-29 August 2008 where they came up with the Ilulissat Declaration through the observance of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and the Declarations of the Arctic Councils without coming up with a new international regimes despite America's non ratification of the Law of the Sea. The council appreciates the peculiarities of the Arctic region when they declared, according to the Ilulissat Declaration that:

The Arctic Ocean stands at the threshold of significant changes. Climate change and the melting of ice have a potential impact on vulnerable ecosystems, the livelihoods of local inhabitants and indigenous communities and the potential exploitation of natural resources

What these translate to is that human security concerns of the member states and the need to jointly harness the resources of the region will divert members' attention away from unsustainable rich mineral resource states in the developing world including Nigeria.

## **CLIMATE FINANCE IN THE CAPITALIST WORLD**

The issue of adaptation and mitigation that calls for climate financing is not without its lapses. The UN Forum

on funding of climate change was smuggled to be under the bank directive where the forces of demand and supply will determine the allocation of resources. The bank that is involving in dirty investment and encourages developed countries to embark on grand fathering is equally and at same time, calling for climate smart (Amusan, 2012). This is a source of argument among Climate Change Financing students (Bond, 2012; Bond *et al.*, 2009). The formation of international financial institutions, African Development Bank (AfDB) inclusive is not for the interest of Africa in general. Their objective is to exploit the resources of the continent. Though, the AfDB maintains that the effect of climate change as a percentage of GDP is higher in Africa compared to other continents, the institution is doing little to assuage the effects. This explains why fossil fuel in Nigeria is the primary target of these institutions. Their call for clean environment and the promotion of oil exploration is what is affecting the development of alternatives to energy.

As much as there is a need for climate finance, the question that comes to mind is why the World Bank should be the custodian of this project? The institution is known for its pro-West and pro-dirty investment in Africa and other developing states.

The invitation accorded to the business sector in the discussion of climate change brings about the issue of competitiveness and technological development. As it is known, the business sectors want to retain their intellectual property power at all cost in line with the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) agreement. The problems associated with Trade-Related in Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) that gives opportunity to other states to produce or import cheaper products of some items is always under contestation by Multinationals Corporations (MNCs). How this can be balanced with special interest of the developing areas is yet to be seen. REDD+ was initiated by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 2005 as a means to mitigate climate change effects. It was promoted by Papua New Guinea and Costa Rica at the COP11, Montreal, Canada with the aim of setting up special funds to help the South, mostly in the tropical region to protect the indigenous forests by facilitating investment in carbon sequestration by natural forests (IPACC, 2011; Amusan, 2009). What remains a major challenge is the financing of this project as there is a need to pay for forest conservation to the state concerned with special focus on developing states. In 2007, Nigeria and South Africa received \$100 million from the project but the question that comes to mind is who should have access to such funds? Is it the national government, farmers, IPs who are good at preserving their flora and fauna or MNCs that are making inroad to re-colonise the forest region of tropical areas? If the fund is meant for the government, corruption will not allow the

relevant stake holders to enjoy the facility. Before the money could be disbursed, certain criteria should be met in Measured, Reported and Verified (MRV) forms. Who is going to conduct this? Is it the national government, UN Forum on Forest, UNFCCC or CBD who are the major stakeholders on climate change at the global level? Or will it be under the Bank Green Climate Fund that is not to the interest of developing states? Though, records have confirmed that up to 125% increase of forest finance was recorded from ODA between 2002 and 2004 to 2008 to 2010, unfortunately the same could not be said in the post-Doha COP18 as the summit did not make any mention of REDD funding for the period of 2012 to 2020. The problem associated with REDD is the accessibility of local people, mostly IPs to the resources of the forest and also the financing of forest management with its likely effects on ecosystem of the forest/biodiversity (Recio and Bisiaux, 2013).

From Kyoto to Cancun, the instruments of the UNFCCC remained bound on the member states but from the 2010 Cancun Summit (Mexico) of the COP16, the West realised the financial and moral implications of the Kyoto Protocol, therefore, made them embark on diplomatic horse trading that eventually made the decision of the UNFCCC non-binding on the member states. At the COP19, Canada, Japan and Australia exit from the supranational Kyoto arrangement called for voluntary measure. Even at the COP19 host, Poland did not agree with EU on carbon trading but used its position as the host state to frustrate the European position on international action against national approach to mitigation (Canada relies on its abundance tar sand as a source of energy, Australia's position on climate is that of America's that calls for national strategy as against the global solution to the global problems; Japan's new exit from UNFCCC arrangement in November 2013 during the COP19 in Warsaw could be linked to its geography and lack of natural resources for industrial development. Poland's position is because of its low level of economic development compared with other members of EU). America sees the Kyoto Agreement as a challenge to its sovereignty and economic development therefore, US Senate refuses to support the move on the pretext that India and China should reduce the rate at which they pollute the environment (Rosenbaum, 2011). The Summit set up Green Climate Fund (GCF) with no enforcement on the member. Instead, the summit advocated for the participation of national governments and NGOs in the funding of climate change adaptation. The same applies to the Doha summit as those:

Who contributed almost 80% of global emissions have rejected the notion of ecological debt/reparation as was pushed by the developing states at the COP 17 in Durban, South Africa in 2011 (Sharife, 2013)

America was comfortable with the outcome of the Durban Summit. Trevor Houser aide to the American chief negotiator, Todd Stern observed that the Durban Platform was promising because of what it did not say. There is no mention of historic responsibility or per capital emissions. There is no mention of economic development as the priority for developing countries. There is no mention of a difference. Instead, the developed states are in support of carbon trading and carbon capturing. Going back to the issue of carbon capturing will it be from the source or from the atmosphere in general? As long as *laissez-faire* is in place at the global system, climate change problems will remain a time bomb for all of us.

### **WHY 20-2020 MAY REMAIN A MIRAGE?**

It is projected that Africa is going to outstrip Asia by 2050 economically. Currently it is believed that out of the 12 fastest growing economy in the world, 7 of them including Nigeria are in Africa (Devarajan and Fengler, 2013). This could have made the Nigerian government aspire for the unabated economic development of which 2020 was set as a target year to march the most industrialised states in the world. This was conceived without looking into the likely snags to this laudable projected ambition. The issue of climate change among others is the most threatening factor. As some states will benefit from the increase in the global temperature, others including Nigeria will face the wrath of climate variability. How then can Nigeria cope with annual flooding in the forest and arid regions? How can the government cope with desertification with its implications on military security of the country? Effects of climate change on neighbouring states could be employed to explain Nigeria's involvement in the Mali crisis (Keita, 1998). The existence of some pockets of Touaregs in Kano State may cause cultural irredentism as it is indirectly experienced through the solidarity for the Boko Haram and Ansaru on the parts of the National Movement for the Liberation of Azawad (MNL). Unemployment among the youths, drought that led to the killing of animals and religious influence forced some Malian Touaregs to join Ghaddafi's war in 2011 (Amusan, 2013; Francis, 2013). How can we substantiate that such will not repeat itself in Nigeria with the activities of the Boko Haram and Ansaru in the Northeast and North central part of Nigeria as observed by McLoughlin and Bouchat (2013)? These are the likely fallouts of the climate change implications for the Nigerian state. Nigeria has realised that it can not ring a territory and expect to be safe; this has contributed to the involvement of the state's army in Mali (Sharife, 2013). The unbudgeted military involvement in Mali by the

Nigerian Army is an indirect way of paying dearly for the effects of GHG emissions, among which is leaving a little surplus for development.

The need for a better understanding among various stake holders is essential. The cities, entrepreneurs, politicians and civil societies as agreed at the Cancun COP 16 are instructive. The issue worth looking into is the awareness among stakeholders. Concerning cities because of the high rate of urbanisation in Nigeria, government should come up with a plan of action to mitigate against the effects of climate change with more emphasis on the littoral urban settlements such as Port Harcourt, Calabar and Lagos.

The mangrove region in Nigeria should be protected, at least in recognition of the first international day of forest that was celebrated on 21 March, 2013 in recognition of the key roles played by the forest in carbon storage, protection of biodiversity and a means of sustainable development (Recio and Bisiaux, 2013). On the need to religiously adhere to the propositions of the western imposition of REDD+, the question that comes to mind is why are the polluters and logging companies not paying for the destabilisation they cause to the biodiversity in the mangrove area of Nigeria rather than waiting for the international community to do the payment? This position received extensive discussion elsewhere where it is maintained that the polluters should pay because the Western-inspired solution to the current logjam needs to be addressed by MNCs who have been active in environmental degradation before 1960 (Amusan, 2009). This is to ensure climate justice and equity (Oluogunorisa, 2011). The introduction of market-based mechanism has not been to the advantage of developing countries. This, argued in this study is an imperialistic mode of environmental protection. The benefit will only be accorded to developed states in the long run.

The promotion of plantation and agro-mechanism is to dispossess IPs of their land, perpetration of damaged biodiversity and ecosystem, abuse of human rights through the eviction of IPS, promotion of Genetically-Modified Organisms (GMOs) and Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) (Tung, 2013) and violation of Chapter IV of Nigeria's 1999 Constitution that advocates the rights to life.

The Nupeethnic group around Patigi in Kwara State were evicted from their ancestral home in the name of development by the government of Bukola Saraki between 2003 and 2010 and invited Zimbabwean commercial farmers to take up their land for agricultural production that hardly impacted on the lives of the local people. The farmers' productions are for export for the feeding of

poultry and animals and for the production of biofuel which hardly impacted on the lives of Nigerians in Europe and South Africa. The question that comes to mind is whether the much touted Africa as the food basket of the world is in question as the food is not meant to feed the hungry people on the continent. Many farmers are now protesting against the acquisition of their lands by MNCs through local agents (in Ileogbo, Osun State, foreign investors approached the king (traditional ruler) of the town to release some acres of land for them to embark on palm tree plantation. Possibly because of the financial promise to the king, he, without due consultation with his subject, ordered people to vacate their lands, the main source of their existence. This was resisted by the masses to the extent that it resulted to a court case of which the judgement was in favour of the local farmers). At the same time, dubious statistical information was recorded by the UNFAO that between 2006 and 2008, Nigeria had a 7% growth rate as against the projected 6% goal predicted by the Union (AU)-New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)'s Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) (Branca *et al.*, 2011).

Again, the eviction implies that the Nupe rice growers are deprived of natural food against the Genetically-Modified Food (GMF) produced by the foreign farmers (Elliot, 2013). By extension, this is a violation of the second and third generation human rights that Nigeria is no doubt a party. The African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights of 1981, particularly its Article 21 (1) and (2) which states that all people have the right to natural resources, wealth and property of their land (ACHPR and IWGIA, 2005) runs parallel to the REDD objectives. Other instruments that Nigeria is legally bonded to are to protect the rights of Nigerians, the Convention of Biologic Diversity of 1992, the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights acceded to in 1960, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination of 1966, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) of 1979 and the Convention of the Rights of the Child of 1989. Ironically, privatisation of natural resources as crafted by the West excluded Nigeria from engaging in these rights.

#### **FOOD SECURITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE: ANY PLAN THROUGH VISION 20-2020?**

The launching of Agricultural Transformation Agenda (ATA) by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Transformation encourages private companies to engage



in farming through which small farmers will eventually lose their land to MNCs. In order to promote the principles of REDD+, genetically-modified seeds are encouraged to be sold to farmers and fertilizers without government involvement. The selling of seeds and fertilizers to farmers at subsidized rates by private companies is an attempt to eliminate natural seedlings before companies come up with the market price of their products as instituted in South Africa by Monsanto (The author conducted interviews with workers at Monsanto Company at Coligny in the North West Province of South Africa between 12 and 13 August, 2013. The information available confirms that the seeds sold to the farmers cannot be stored for the following planting season. Rather, farmers need to buy new seeds from the company (12 December, 2013) (Elliot, 2013)). This is neo-colonialism as discussed above. Having captured South Africa, known to be the 10th largest producer of GM food, the turn is now on Nigeria through the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development.

The implication of achieving Vision 20-2020 is to move closer to the tenets of globalisation. This connotes the need to open up the economy to foreign investors in the field of manufacturing, mining and agriculture as well as water resources exploration. The effects of this in creating more unemployment is self-evident as the attracted technology is not only obsolete and not allowed in Europe and America but also will create capital-intensive as against labour intensive mode of production. These are some of the problems associated with the introduction of REDD+ as it will impact negatively on land tenure system and a threat to rights and self-determination of the people in the name of actualising Vision 20-2020. This approach of economic growth without economic development is problematic to the whole gamut of a just socio-economic development. This is being premised “on who gets paid for what, rather than on looking at the issues of sustainability and equality as mentioned above” (IPACC, 2011).

## CONCLUSION

Climate change damage could wipe off all the gains of economic growth which Nigeria claims to have mustered from the sales of fossil fuel. In fact, it can impact negatively on individuals with special focus on income, health, quality of life and in some cases, one's existence (Sharife, 2013). Therefore, the Vision 20-2020 may remain a mirage as the effects of environmental changes as discussed above are not in favour of Nigeria in any form.

The much publicised REDD+ that is expected to introduce functional adaptation and mitigation through finance from carbon trading and carbon sequestration is being rejected by developed countries because of the financial commitment which they are not ready to pay for. The seeding system through geo-engineering currently being developed by developed countries, mostly the USA, will aggravate climate change effects on neighbouring states (Amusan, 2009). Because of the low level of technology and the economy of disarticulation that Nigeria is contending with, hardly can the state come up with a functional climate mitigation in the near future.

For a lasting solution to the herders-farmers conflict, it is the duty of government, based on social contract between people and government, to create an enabling environment for the herders in the form of irrigation method in the North as a mitigation approach to the scarcity of green grass. This will serve as a source of rural development; discourage rural-urban drift and poverty reduction. Failure to do this will amount to the aggravation of competition over scarce resources caused by climate change. This may lead to further religious fundamentalism and the invitation of more al-Qaeda cells in the country.

Also, the government should know that the major source of protein for the teeming poor population is from cattle of which the Mbororo Fulanis are the major supplier. Allowing the cattle to die of hunger implies more pressure on the scarce foreign exchange as the state will be forced to import meat from other continents with all its vicissitude on the economy of the fragile nation. The need to address the cattle issue is that livestock production is the principal livelihood of the herders. It is also vital for agricultural livelihoods, providing draught power, manure for fertilizer or fuel and milk and meat for consumption as well as an important form of insurance and wealth accumulation (Tucker *et al.*, 2013).

Lack of relevant technology for hybrid energy calls for the inputs of developed states to relax their intellectual property concept to enable developing states acquire relevant technology in the energy sector as the largest percentage of the causes of climate change is through anthropogenic.

## REFERENCES

- ACHPR and IWGIA, 2005. Report of the African commission's working group of experts on indigenous populations/communities. ACHPR. and IWGIA. [http://www.iwgia.org/iwgia\\_files\\_publications\\_files/African\\_Commission\\_book.pdf](http://www.iwgia.org/iwgia_files_publications_files/African_Commission_book.pdf).

- Ajai, O., 2011. Balancing of Interests in Environmental Law in Nigeria. In: *The Balancing of Interests in Environmental Law in Africa*, Faure, M. and W. du Plessis (Eds.). Pretoria University Law Press, Pretoria, pp: 379-412.
- Amusan, L., 2009. Africa and Climate Change in the era of complex interdependent globalised Working Paper NO. 2. JAPSS, Florida. [http://www.japss.org/upload/Dr\\_Lere\\_Amusa's\\_Paper\\_on\\_climate\\_change\\_and\\_Africa\\_\(FINAL\)-1%5B1%5D.pdf](http://www.japss.org/upload/Dr_Lere_Amusa's_Paper_on_climate_change_and_Africa_(FINAL)-1%5B1%5D.pdf).
- Amusan, L., 2011. Local Government Autonomy and the Crises of Socio-economic Development in the Rural Areas of Osun State. In: *Perspectives on Osun State at 20*, Oyeweso, S. and K. Afolabi (Eds.). Osun State University, Ikire, America, pp: 826-861.
- Amusan, L., 2012. Knowledge and information sharing in the age of adaptation and mitigation: A Proceeding of the International Conference on Climate Change and ICT, Southern University, Baton Rouge, November, 27-28, 2012, pp: 108-121.
- Amusan, L., 2013. Libya's implosion and its impacts on children. *J. Int. Womens Stud.*, 14: 66-79.
- Bales, C.F. and R.D. Duke, 2008. Containing climate change. *Foreign Affairs*, pp: 78-89. <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/63570/carter-f-bales-and-richard-d-duke/containing-climate-change>.
- Bayart, J.F., 1993. *The State of Africa: The Politics of the Belly*. Longman Publisher, New York.
- Bond, P., 2012. *Politics of Climate Justice: Paralysis Above, Movement Below*. University of Kwazulu-Natal Press, Scottsville, South Africa, ISBN-13: 9781869142216, Pages: 267.
- Bond, P., R. Dada and G. Erion, 2009. *Climate Change, Carbon Trading and Civil Society: Negative Returns on South African Investments*. University of Kwazulu-Natal Press, Scottsville, South Africa.
- Borgerson, S., 2013. The coming arctic boom: As the ice melts, the region heats up. *Foreign Affairs* July/August, pp: 76-89.
- Branca, G., T. Tennigkeit, W. Mann and L. Lipper, 2011. *Identifying Opportunities for Climate-Smart Agriculture Investments in Africa*. FAO, Rome, Italy.
- Carson, R., 1962. *Silent Spring*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, London, UK.
- Devarajan, S. and W. Fengler, 2013. Africa's economic boom: Why the pessimists and the optimists are both right? *Foreign Affairs*, May/June 2013, pp:68-81. [http://www.rich.co.ke/rcfrbs/docs/FA\\_MayJune2013-Devarajan-Fengler-Africa.pdf](http://www.rich.co.ke/rcfrbs/docs/FA_MayJune2013-Devarajan-Fengler-Africa.pdf).
- Elliot, J.A., 2013. *An Introduction to Sustainable Development*. Routledge, New York.
- FME, 2010. *National Environmental, Economic and Development Study (NEEDS) for climate change in Nigeria*. Federal Ministry of Environment. <http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/application/pdf/nigerianeeds.pdf>.
- Francis, D.J., 2013. The regional impact of the armed conflict and French intervention in Mali. Report, Norwegian Peacebuilding Resource Centre. [http://www.peacebuilding.no/var/ezflow\\_site/storage/original/application/fl8726c3338e39049bd4d554d4a22c36.pdf](http://www.peacebuilding.no/var/ezflow_site/storage/original/application/fl8726c3338e39049bd4d554d4a22c36.pdf).
- Galaty, J.G., 2013. Land Grabbing in the Eastern African Rangelands. In: *Pastoralism and Development in Africa: Dynamic Change at the Margins*, Catley, A., J. Lind and I. Scoones (Eds.). Routledge, New York, pp: 143-153.
- Garba, J., 1987. *Diplomatic Soldering*. Spectrum, Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Goldsmith, P., 2013. The Future of Pastoralist Conflict in the Horn of Africa. In: *Pastoralism and Development in Africa: Dynamic Change at the Margins*, Catley, A., J. Lind and I. Scoones (Eds.). Routledge, New York, pp: 131-42.
- ILO, 1989. Convention No. 169. International Labour Organization (ILO), Geneva, Switzerland. <http://www.ilo.org/indigenous/Conventions/no169/lang--en/index.htm>.
- IPACC, 2011. *African indigenous peoples and REDD+: Human rights, equity and forest carbon capture in climate mitigation*. Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordinating Committee (IPACC), Cape Town, USA.
- Jamie, B. and C. Sandy, 2010. Hygiene, sanitation and water: Forgotten foundations of health. *PLoS Med.*, 7. 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000367.
- Keita, K., 1998. *Conflict and Conflict Resolution in the Sahel: The Tuareg Insurgency in Mali*. DIANE Publishing, Carlisle, PA., USA., ISBN-13: 9781428912694, Pages: 46.
- Korolec, M., 2013. Universality and fairness of commitments are the key to success. <http://climate-l.iisd.org/guest-articles/universality-and-fairness-of-commitments-are-the-key-to-success/>.
- MCLoughlin, G. and C.J. Bouchat, 2013. *Nigeria Unity: In the Balance*. Strategic Studies Institute and US Army War College Press, Carlisle, PA., USA.
- Oberender, P. and T. Rudolf, 2008. Public Private Partnerships. In: *Social Market: Economy History, Principles and Implementation: From A to Z*, Rolf, H.H., H. Schneider and K. Weigelt (Eds.). Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, Johannesburg, South Africa, pp: 371-373.
- Olugunorisa, T.E., 2011. In search of climate justice and equity. 1st Inaugural Lecture, Osun State University, Osogbo, Nigeria, January 19, 2011.

- Recio, E. and A. Bisiaux, 2013. REDDy to put the Jigsaw together? <http://forests-1.iisd.org/policy-updates/reddy-to-put-the-jigsaw-together/>.
- Rosenbaum, W.A., 2011. Environmental Politics and Policy. CQ Press, Washington, DC., USA.
- Sharife, K., 2013. Who should pay for climate damage? African Business Magazine, Nigeria, March 2013, pp: 16-20.
- Soyinka, W., 2004. Climate of Fear: The Quest for Dignity in a Dehumanized World. Random House, New York.
- Suleiman, T., 2012. Fighting for the rights of cattle. Tell Magazine, Lagos, Nigeria, November 26, 2012, pp: 46-53.
- The Economist, 2013. American industry and fracking: From sunset to new dawn. <http://www.economist.com/news/business/21589870-capitalists-not-just-greens-are-now-questioning-how-significant-benefits-shale-gas-and>.
- Tucker, J., Z. Lema and S.E. Lemma, 2013. Water for Livelihood Resilience, Food Security and Poverty Reduction. In: Achieving Water Security, Calow, R., E. Ludi and J. Tucker (Eds.). Overseas Development Institute, Warwickshire, pp: 127-146.
- Tung, O.J.L., 2013. GMOs, food security and the right to adequate food: Risks and challenges. Proceedings of the KAS/NWU Risks Posed to Protecting the Right to Food and Food Security Conference, October 24-25, 2013, Hakunamatata Estate, Muldersdrift, South Africa.
- World Bank, 2010. Rising global interest in farmland: Can it yield sustainable and equitable benefits? Report of the Agriculture and Rural Development Department, Washington, DC., USA.