Capacity Building and National Development in a Post Covid-19 Nigeria: A Critical Overview and Prognosis for Action

Dr. Azalahu Francis Akwara
Department of Political Science
Alex Ekwueme Federal University Ndufu Alike Ikwo
Abakaliki, Ebonyi State, Nigeria.

Abstract
Capacity building and national development focus on how the socio-economic development processes of a nation are affected by human resource development processes in that nation. It focuses on how people learn to create new institutions, utilize new technologies, cope with their environment, and alter their patterns of behavior for the well-being of the entire society. Capacity building and national development therefore focus on the capabilities of individuals and institutions to create economic, social, cultural, technological and demographic changes in a country, and become a catalyst for the socio-economic development of a nation. This study therefore examined the concepts: development, underdevelopment, modernization and national development, their origins and usages, and their interaction with capacity building to produce a modernized state; and the problems encountered in the process using Nigeria as a case study. The study found that Nigeria's capacity building processes for national development has been adversely affected by the country's national leadership crises, ethnic rivalries, insecurity, poverty, corruption and colossal mismanagement of her human and natural resources before the 2020 covid-19 pandemic era. It therefore recommends that capacity building for national development must involve making concerted efforts by the governments and the people at all levels of governance in the country to create conducive environments for the people to develop themselves, their businesses and enterprises towards the socio-economic development or modernization of the country. The developments must be guided by the peoples' and their communities' needs and aspirations; and directed by the governments' sustainable development goals for the country. This is more so because national development involves the process by which a society's government acquires an institutional capacity to handle the political, economic and social pressures that are generated by the process of modernization. These pressures are more pronounced in the country now than ever before and are compounded by the covid-19 pandemic and corrupt national leaderships.

INTRODUCTION

Capacity building and national development focus on how the social and economic development of a nation is affected by the educational processes in that nation and on how people learn to create new institutions, utilize new technologies, cope with their environment, and alter their patterns of behavior for the well-being of the entire society. Capacity building in a broad sense improves the capabilities of individuals and the capacity of institutions, and becomes a catalyst for the economic, social, cultural, technological and demographic changes in a country which we could be referred to as "national development".

How these changes occur within a society has been variously viewed by scholars, and this problem often frustrates attempts at the definition of what constitutes national development, and capacity development (CD), or capacity building (CB) and or, human resource development (HRD). Capacity

building (CB) is the same thing as education within any given society. However, as Adams (2002) observed, capacity building in a society can help in supporting that particular society make major contributions to the complex processes of technology transfer, economic productivity, individual earnings, reduction of poverty, development of healthy families, creation and sharing of values, learning the responsibilities of citizenship, and enhancement of the quality of life of the people.

Capacity building within a society may also perpetuate and legitimize social and wealth divisions in society if it is not properly planned, if it is unevenly distributed across a society, or is based on inequitable planning and execution practices (Adams, 2002). Furthermore, CB processes often draw the citizens away from their cultural origins and traditional familial customs. An instance, is when individuals are faced with the cost of formal capacity building challenges as payment of fees and school-leaver unemployment. They often withdraw from such CB processes and seek alternative paths to their future (Adams, 2002).

Nigeria's capacity building processes for national development has been adversely affected by the country's national leadership crises, ethnic rivalries, insecurity, poverty, corruption and colossal mismanagement of her human and natural resources before the 2020 covid-19 pandemic. The pandemic which took the human race by surprise not only aggravated Nigeria's national problems but caused serious damages to all aspects of human endeavor across the country and globally, leaving in its wake losses and devastating consequences which would take the human race some decades to overcome.

Nigeria as a developing nation just like others in the league of "dependent nations" and "failed states" is worse hit because she lacks the capacity to develop the society to meet the current needs of her people. Her sustainable development capacity is highly impaired by poor leadership and socio-economic depressions when compared with other countries. Nigeria pushed herself into an ungovernable situation before the covid 19 pandemic. Today, Nigeria is still grappling with the throes of political leadership crises, political instability, insurgencies, insecurity, inflation, corruption and other socio-economic challenges that are blamed on the covid 19 pandemic. The pandemic only provided a cover for more administrative blunders, irresponsible leadership and corruption as was the case with the distribution pattern and the attendant crises that trailed the covid-19 pandemic palliatives across the country.

This conference therefore focuses on the broad role of CB or education on national development in Nigeria, emphasizing trends, issues, and problems envisaged within the CB processes in the society in relation to the problems within the society. And the foremost concern here is the implications of CB for policy making, planning and execution of national development plans in Nigeria. Because CB examines relationships between education, economic growth, poverty, social change, and the responsibility for CB decisions, it focuses on governance and management, and highlights ways to provide high-quality CB capacities, policies and techniques of execution within the society.

This paper is therefore an attempt to critically analyze the overall efforts by concerned authorities – most importantly academics and analysts - whose research works fall within the milieu of the gamut of presentations under today's conference entitled "Capacity building and national development in Nigeria: a prognosis for action in a post-civid-19 era". As a lead paper, my presentation shall dwell on making a cursory review but with some aspects of in-depth critical analysis of the major and important underpinning variables which other scholars shall engage in giving detailed scholarship individually. A critical overview of issues being discussed here centers on creating an understanding

of the impacts of capacity building on national development after the covid 19 pandemic in Nigeria with a view towards providing not only solutions that will put in place checks against future occurrences of such challenges as the covid 19 pandemic, but measures that would enable the country solve her domestic problems of political, social, cultural and economic development and stability.

CAPACITY BUILDING

Capacity Building is the ability of a person or persons, groups, organizations, societies and nations to successfully manage their affairs using the human and material resources available to them (Ikoku, 1980; Buss, 2010). It is the ways and means a society plans to utilize the country's human, scientific, technological, organizational, institutional and resource capabilities to attain her national goals. A fundamental goal of capacity building is to enhance the ability to evaluate and address the crucial questions related to policy choices and modes of implementation among various options, based on an understanding of the environmental potentials and limits, and the needs of the people of the country concerned (Buss, 2010; Nishimura et al.; 2020).

Therefore, Capacity Building is a long-term, continuing and complex process, which depends on the participation and constant interaction between all stakeholders (national and local governments, business organizations, non-governmental organizations, academic institutions, etc.) in a society. Capacity Building strategies and approaches demand a high degree of flexibility and vary between countries, regions and sectors as the demand for capacity building is constantly changing, so there is the need to regularly review, evaluate and adjust to the changing needs of the society.

Capacity building which is the same thing as capacity development or manpower development may involve a constant development and improvement of individuals' skills and abilities to ensure that an organization or society is productive, and creating institutions that would help in the optimal utilization of human, financial and physical resources for attaining individual, organizational, institutional and societal goals (GTZ, 2009 cited in Buss, 2010).

To design a capacity building process that works for an entire organization or society, certain prerequisites must be met and these are:

(1). Development of an institutional or legal framework
There is the need to make legal and regulatory changes to create an enabling environment for organizations, institutions and agencies at all levels and in all sectors to enhance their capacities.
(2). Organizational development
This involves designing elaborate management structures, processes and procedures, not only within organizations but also for the management of relationships between the different organizations and sectors be they within the public, private or community domain.
(3). Human resource development:
This is the training of individuals within the society or organization to acquire the skills, knowledge and understanding of what is required of them in whatever positions they find themselves within the society or organization. Besides the skills, they also need access to information, knowledge and training that enables them to perform optimally.

As OECD (2006) noted, there is interdependency between these three levels of capacity development (CD) or capacity building (CB) in that:

> 1). The framework conditions (or enabling environment) influence the behavior of organizations and individuals by means of the incentives it creates.

 2). Organizations can be viewed as open systems which are constantly interacting with elements in their context, which can either stimulate CB or act as disincentives for CB.

3). Finally, the development of individual's capacities, as well as the possibilities to apply newly acquired skills, highly depends on individuals' motivation and drive, and on the incentives created at an institutional and organizational level. Thus, in order for any capacity building strategy to be ultimately effective and sustainable in a specific context (sector, country, region, etc.), CB cannot be regarded as being restricted to enhancing individual ability; all target levels must be considered and, if necessary, integrated into the approach.

Any capacity building strategy that focuses on the training of human resources without taking into account the framework conditions that surround those newly created capacities, may end up achieving short-time effects and will not contribute to a sustainable development of capacities in the context it operates. This implies that new innovative technologies will face a wide range of barriers that need to be addressed in order to ensure their successful deployment. An example is the IPPIS payment system in Nigeria's Civil Service whose primary purpose is to eliminate fraud in national payment systems and save cost, but has become the most fraudulent, corrupt, ineffective and most expensive payment system ever known in the country. Project evaluations and research studies will clearly prove that the failures in implementation of such technologies are mainly found in non-technical reasons and very often related to lack of awareness and lack of capable human resources, indiscipline and corruption (Rehling et al., 2004).

THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC, CAPACITY BUILDING
1. The covid-19 pandemic
The Covid-19 pandemic came as an international health concern to the world. The uncertainty and controversies surrounding its cause, source, and cure not only give concerns to national governments, but also led to accusations and counter accusations between nations, especially China, the United Kingdom and United States of America over the source and reasons for the Covid-19 pandemic. With the collaboration between the World Health Organization (WHO) and Microsoft on the pandemic and the manner in which the Chief Executive of Microsoft speculated the number of deaths it would cause in Africa specifically, and the brandishing of a Covid-19 Vaccine within the shortest possible time which President Donald Trump rejected, clearly showed that the pandemic was an economic and political issue rather than a health issue that resulted from "capacity building or development" by Microsoft in collaboration with some American and Chinese scientists, and the World Health Organization (WHO). It was not a surprise that WHO on 30 January 2020 declare the pandemic to be of international health concern. Despite the fact that the Covid-19 is being cured with "anti-malarial drugs" the truth of the matter has been hidden from the world. But the divorce of Mr. Bill Gate by Mrs. Bill Gate points to the fact that Microsoft Chief Executive (Bill Gate) is making "blood money" out of the pandemic which is unacceptable to the wife, hence the divorce (they are free to deny this allegation). Bill Gate's recent calls for the withdrawal of the Covid-19 vaccines because the vaccines are "far more dangerous than anyone imagined" [1] proves me right.

The world's response to the Covid-19 pandemic has shown that the universe has enough resources at its disposal to take care of the entire world population in times of crises, and refutes the WHO's "Editorial" on Bull (2020) that the pandemic is "fueled by poverty, hunger, weak health systems and lack of clean water and sanitation, education and global cooperation" instead of addressing the sources and causes of the pandemic. There is no hunger in Europe, America and China because they have the best agricultural production mechanisms in the world and they export food to other

countries; their poverty levels are least in the world; they have the best educational systems in the world; they have the best environments and sanitation standards in the world compared to Africa; but the death tolls as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic in each country in Europe, Asia and America, Australia and New Zealand is by far greater than that of the African continent put together. The truth is that the pandemic is fueled by greed among some industrial giants as Microsoft and other IT giants in the world who are test-running their recent "capacity buildings and developments" (the 5G telecom network) on a global scale (some scientists can prove me wrong), and some pharmaceutical giants across the globe who stand to benefit financially from the covid-19 pandemic can also prove me wrong. The covid-19 pandemic has been complicated by the struggle for power and dominance among national governments; and national governments seeking for ways and means of settling their deficit national budgets incurred due to "national capacity buildings and developments" on a global scale. These have further mystified the Covid-19 pandemic, its motives, purposes and cure.

While the Covid-19 pandemic gave rise to intensive capacity building in the developed nations and in some developing nations, it led to capacity underdevelopment, disintegration and pauperization of people in the underdeveloped countries – Nigeria is a good example – instead of empowering our National Universities and Research Institutes to find remedies to the Covid-19 pandemic, the Nigerian Government was busy receiving covid-19 palliatives from local and foreign donors and feeding "unidentified vulnerable Nigerians" in the Northern Region of the country; while the Nigerian Government forced Nigerian University lecturers to embark on strike and the universities remained under lock and keys.

The amounts of monies given to the developing countries to "tag-along" with the developed countries in rolling out their Covid-19 development agenda, and to accept Covid-19 Vaccines produced in the West against those produced by independent African governments clearly confirmed that Covid-19 is a political and economic sickness whose solution lies in the capacity building by the developing countries to solve their national problems themselves using the materials and resources available to them – a situation Ikoku (1980) has termed "self-reliance".

Recent protests and bans by some European countries on the use of the covid-19 vaccines based on their side effects are pointers that the Covid-19 pandemic is a product of capacity building or development by some countries and firms, that went wrong on a global scale. What the developing countries need to do is to re-evaluate their capacity building strategies with their national needs in relation to the global recession caused by the COVID-19. And such capacity building strategies should be made for the post-pandemic age and the nation's sustainable development goals. Such capacity building decisions requires adapting to the current needs, and anticipating future impact in relation to the country's sustainable development needs. The sustainable developments must focus on three dimensions of sustainable development which are: (a) economic growth, (b) social inclusion and (c) environmental protection.

2. Covid -19 pandemic and capacity development

The COVID-19 pandemic according to UNDP (2020) unleashed human development crises on capacity development and human resource development's constitutive elements - education, health, agriculture, food production and supplies, social interactions, and unprecedented death tolls, especially in Europe, Asia and America. The pandemic was superimposed on unresolved tensions between people, technology and the environment making the poor more vulnerable, and created new challenges and inequalities in capacity building across the world. Only very honest responses to the

crisis can determine how these tensions will be resolved and whether inequalities in human development would be reduced or increased across the globe.

The pandemic led to school closures as mitigation measures, with almost all the students in Nigeria out of school. It caused deep economic recessions in an already ailing economy, causing a decline in human capacity development across the country. This implies that the states, local governments, communities and groups already lagging in enhanced capabilities will be particularly affected, and leaving them further behind will have long-term impacts on capacity building and human development. Thus, there is the need to focus on people's capabilities enhancement by adopting a multi-dimensional approach since the crisis has multiple interconnected dimensions (health, education, agriculture, economic, fiscal, administration and governance, social service delivery, etc.). There is therefore the need for collective action at all levels of governance in the country to tackle the pandemic through human and material capacity building.

While the effects of the covid-19 pandemic are yet to be fully understood, it is already clear that the number of daily deaths due to covid -19 is greater than that due to other common causes as cancer, malaria, suicide, road traffic accidents and HIV/AIDS. In countries at the peak of the current wave of covid -19, the virus has become the main cause of death surpassing those of other known diseases. These numbers show the immediate pressure the pandemic is putting on emergency services and health workers and the wider burdens imposed on virtually everyone around the world.

The covid-19 pandemic is more than a health emergency, it is a systemic crisis that is already affecting economies and societies in unprecedented ways. It can only be overcome through human and material capacity developments. The still largely unknown characteristics of the virus that causes covid -19 and its development from a health shock to an economic and social crisis has reduce working hours and employment; and suspension of nonessential productive activities in several countries; and caused curtailment of labour enhanced capabilities such as access to quality health at all levels, agriculture, education at all levels and access to present-day technologies. These can only be overcome through capacity building and human resource management.

DEVELOPMENT, UNDERDEVELOPMENT, MODERNZATION, AND NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Development
There are numerous definitions of the concept "development" some of which are positive while others are negative. Positively, it connotes positive changes in an organism, system, national economy, national politics and administration, international economic and political relations among nations (Abuiyada, 2018). Negatively it connotes deterioration in these conditions, and these relations with the passage of time, while it was hoped that it would have been better (positive). These positive and negative conditions are caused by human factors over time, and are seen as part of national histories. These variations over definitions, causes and effects, have given rise to diverse schools of thought who are all right in their own perspectives. Thus, such concepts as "development", "underdevelopment", "modernization" and "national development" for these schools of thought take different dimensions, magnitude, processes, and have different causes and effects. I am taking a historical review of the concepts in this paper.

In the late 1950s and 1960s most definitions of development, modernization, and underdevelopment, were largely influenced by the Social Science Research Council in the United States of America, and popularized by the works of such western scholars as Almond and Coleman (1960), Pye (1963),

Ward and Rustow (1964), Coleman (1965), Pye and Verba (1965), La Palombara and Weiner (1966), Binder et al (1971) among the liberal scholars. According to this western but dominant perspective, development is conceptualized as an orderly change towards the realization of capitalist economic and Western democratic political structures. On the other hand, underdevelopment is assumed by this liberal school to be totally conditioned by the persistence of internal factors or pre-capitalist structures in the underdeveloped societies.

Development and Modernization
The modernization theory emerged due to the economic effects of the Cold War globally, cold war scholarship, and politics of decolonization in the colonized regions. It was an American intellectual response to the Cold War competition between the capitalist West and the communist East for the ideological support of the underdeveloped countries of the World. The modernization theory derived its inspiration from the assumption "that the Western development model provided the underdeveloped countries with the shortest road to economic development as evidenced in the works of some western scholars as Rostow, (1960); Organski, (1965); and Black, (1966) among others, which gave institutional and sequential theories of development for the underdeveloped countries to follow in order to develop.

But when these liberal (bourgeois) scholars were confronted by some radical Marxist scholars within the same period with concrete realities of the underdeveloped countries consequent upon decolonization and the ideological polarization that accompanied the Cold War it was immediately realized that "development represents a particular kind of social change" namely the process of transforming the social systems of the underdeveloped societies into more developed ones (Bernstein, 1971). In short, these developing societies have to be modernized or developed. Thus, development came to be equated with modernization. But this has to be done without causing any systemic instability. It was precisely here that the relevance of the Parsonian structural functional analysis to modernization became popular (Parson, 1951).

To be sure, there were differences in the ways various bourgeois scholars approached the problem of modernization, especially in their adaptation of the structural functional framework. Almond and Powell (1966) for instance, focused on the political dimension of development and modernization and identified the basic problem of modernization as that of the development of systems capabilities. For Apter (1965) it is a question of 'information and coercion'; as well as that of 'decision-making and accountability' both of which represent the 'functional' and 'structural requisites' of the political system, respectively. Coleman (1967) summarized the political aspects with the concept of 'differentiation', 'equality' and 'capacity'.

Lerner (1956) considered development in terms of creating conditions that would lead to the psychic mobilization of the people, while Deutsch (1961) talked about "social mobilization" which includes psychological involvement in the political process and shifting of traditional bonds and loyalty from primordial attachments to the nation-status. McClelland (1961) focused on achievement motivation, while Hagen (1962) concentrated on the question of the development of "problem-solving" attitudes and positive orientation towards change. Pye (1962; 1964) approach the issue from the perspective of the development of mutual trust and cooperative attitude. For Almond and Verba (1965) the important thing is the creation of a political culture that enhances the maintenance of a stable and democratic political system.

Others, like Rostow (1960), Lewis (1955), Hagen (1963), Kuznets (1966), 1971), Kindelberger (1965) see the problem of modernization in terms of economic categories such as 'capital formation', 'labour', 'market mechanism', urban industrial growth measured in terms of gross national product or income per capita. Similarly, Riggs (1963), LaPalombara (1963), Eisenstadt (1963, 1966, 1973), and Huntington (1968) view modernization from the perspective of creating "political order" in terms of establishing complex, bureaucratic and political institutions requiring a high level of organization and differentiation. Some writers, like Shills (1962), Bendix (1963) and Deutsch (1963, 1963) focused on the importance of political power relations and nation-building, especially on the ability of the leadership or what they termed "modernizing elites" to manage with reasonable efficiency the kinds of crises that invariably accompany the process of development. Still others, like Smelser (1973) and Binder et al (1971) have attempted to highlight the problems of structural discontinuities, fundamental changes and crises which create a range of challenges that the governing elites may or may not be in the position to cope with. All these perspectives have been abandoned by contemporary writers on development and modernization in favour of a globalized concept of development and modernization that are rife on the internet.

In recent literatures, the concept "development" is seen as the process of creating or designing something new. This could be designing of new products or ideas, and methods of doing things. Within public administration and governance, it is a long-term process of structural transformation of a society. The Centre for Global Development (2012) sees it as a system-wide manifestation of the ways people, firms, technologies and institutions interact with each other within the economic, social, and political system; and as the capacity of these systems to provide self-organizing complexities.

In political, economic and sociological discuss, it refers to improvements on the management of a nation's human and natural resources by the elites of that particular nation and improvements on the peoples' socio-economic conditions. Within the social sciences it means improvements in a country's political, economic and social conditions; especially improvements in the management of a county's natural and human resources for the benefit of the entire citizens of the country. If this management brings an increase in the quality of life of the citizens, the society would be seen as "developed" or "developing". But if it degenerates, diminishes, impoverishes or pauperizes the lives and well-being of the citizens, the society is "underdeveloped" or "under-developing". Development in this study would mean positive improvements in a country's economic and social conditions over a given period of time. These positive improvements are shown in the ways and manners a nation's authorities and citizenry manage their natural and human resources in order to improve the quality of lives of the people.

Though the concept theoretically has been variously used by Marxist scholars to refer to (caused) positive and or, negative economic conditions, occasioned by exploitative political, economic and social relations between nations globally; classes within nations, and changes in an economy over time due to these relations as shown in the works of Sjoberg (1971); Gusfield, (1971); Baran, (1973); Frank, (1969); Dos Santos, (1970) and Cardoso, (1972). These similarities and dissimilarities in conceptualization have become indicators and instruments for measuring the levels of development, modernization and underdevelopment of nations and their causes (Adelman and Morris, 1972; Andrews, 1973; Baster, 1972; Drewnowski, 1972; Seers, 1972; and Taylor, 1972). And as Sabie (2016) pointed out, development has both quantitative and qualitative connotations.

National development

Most scholars see national development as an aspect of modernization, while others often referred to as "Huntingtonians" who follow the views of Samuel P. Huntington, see it as being distinct from modernization. To this later group, modernization is a complex process of social and economic change caused by and manifested in the growth of cities, the spread of mass communication and the process of industrialization (Huntington, 1965). While national development involves the process by which a society acquires an institutional capacity to handle the political, economic and social pressures that are generated by the process of modernization (Huntington, 1965). This study follows this definition of national development as stated above or expressed by the Huntingtonians because according to this view, a society can achieve some degree of modernization without an automatic and corresponding progress being made in the area of political development. This implies that a society can achieve a transitional growth in urbanization, industrialization, mass education, and infrastructural development of roads, bridges, air and sea ports, railways, etc. while its political structures and processes still retain their traditional characteristics. This imbalanced development pattern is common among the Asian, Latin American, and African countries. In Africa for instance, and Nigeria in particular, this imbalance has been one of the contributing factors to political and economic instability and is the greatest challenge to capacity building.

National development in this study, will also include what Black (1965) has called "social and economic transformation" that is, the development of economic and social change to a point where the society is transformed from predominantly rural and agrarian ways of life to one predominantly urban and industrialized. However, national political development can be seen as the technological, economic and social transformation of the society, whose focus is the development of the governmental capacity to direct the course and rate of social, economic and technological changes in a country (Lucian and Pye, 1971; Almond and Powel, 1971; Hagen, 1971; McClelland, 1971).

PROGNOSIS FOR ACTION IN A POST-CIVID-19 ERA

Capacity building for national development involves making concerted efforts by the governments and the people at all levels of governance in the country (federal, state and local) to create conducive environments for the people to develop themselves, their businesses and enterprises towards the socio-economic development or modernization of the country. The developments must be guided by the peoples' and their communities' needs and aspirations; and directed by the governments' sustainable development goals for the country. This is more so because national development involves the process by which a society's government acquires an institutional capacity to handle the political, economic and social pressures that are generated by the process of modernization. These pressures are more pronounced in the country now than ever before and are compounded by the covid-19 pandemic and corrupt national leaderships.

Nigeria has over the years achieved a transitional growth in urbanization, industrialization, mass education, and infrastructural development of roads, bridges, air and sea ports, railways, while its political structures and their functions have remained crude, outlandish, and questionable at all levels. This has contributed to the underdevelopment of Nigeria and Nigerians and the labelling of Nigeria as one of the worst places to live on the planet earth. The governments and the political leaderships of the country need to be re-oriented to meet the demands of modern-day governance – provision of security and welfare of the people. And this can only be achieved thorough capacity building and human resource development.

The country is bedeviled by security problems in all the geographical regions [2] – insurgencies in the northern region, kidnappings and abuses by uniformed known and unknown gunmen, herders-farmers attacks, and all forms of human rights abuses and abuses of the rights of minority ethnic nationalities across the country. The management of national and natural disasters - air, fire, flood, and all other forms of natural disasters which could have been avoided if the government is alive to its responsibilities. Unemployment is at its highest level [3] while those within the corridors of power sell employment slots to the jobless and those that can afford the prices, while the slogan that "we are creating jobs across the country" is a propaganda. Public administration has been bastardized through policy inconsistencies, dishonesty, fraud and corruption by the administrators as public offices become avenues for self-enrichment [4].

The Nigerian health sector is in total disarray as health personnel are in one form of trade dispute or the other with their employers – the governments – and on a regular basis. Medical personnel are always on the run from the country to other countries in search of greener pastures because the government has neglected the sector. No Nigerian within the corridors of power attends hospitals and clinics in the country because none of these health facilities is worth its name. The NHIS scheme is bedeviled with mis-management as patients groan for "non-generation of NHIS codes by health service providers" in hospitals.

The educational sector is a constant agitator because the governments are incapable of fulfilling promises and agreements reached with teachers in the educational sector. The sector is not properly funded and cannot live up to its expectations because the laboratories lack chemicals, the workshops do not have state of the art facilities and equipment, free education promised to Nigerians is a mirage, while the appointment of the chief executives of educational institutions has been politicized.

Religious bigotry and fanaticism have become the order of the day as social discontentment finds easy expression as "religious riots", "jihads" and "crusades" because human capital development is disoriented by the provision of religious education that cannot in any way contribute to capacity building and national development. This has also made science and technological developments to be limited to "social media", "WhatsApp", "Instagram" and "face book" rather than ventures that would produce food on the table, drugs for the sick, and solutions to national problems.

The influx and importation of foreign nationals into the country for political reasons has boomeranged into ethno-religious crises across the country, insurgencies and political instability. This has of course made kidnapping a thriving business in the Northern Region and turned religious clerics as negotiators for the "bandits", "insurgents" and "kidnappers" [5]. Rather than embarking on conflict resolution courses, the authorities resort to intimidation, labelling, molestation, and abuse of discordant voices. The activities of "herders" across the country and the desire of the "authorities" to turn every empty space in the country into grazing yards for the "herdsmen" has led to the abandonment of farmlands by the legitimate farmers whose crops are destroyed and the attendant food insecurity in the country today.

Every Nigerian is corrupt, even the unborn Nigerian. From the president to the cleaner in his office, the vice-chancellor to the classroom cleaner, the governor and the street cleaner, the clergy and the laity, the trader and the mechanic, the teacher and the student, the worst is even the "pure water producer" whose pure water label says the content is 50cl whereas the content is 23cl. No one is left out. Not even the PHCN and their DISCOS that will not supply electricity to their customers but would raise their tariffs on electricity. Nestle has increased the Peak Milk sachet but reduced the

content of the sachet. Is it the fuel importer or the accountant that pays out the fuel subsidy to them? No one is left out.

These are issues to be brain-stormed on in this conference as each area of life in the country is covered by the sub-themes provided. Discussants shall give us "expert testimonies" on how each of these problem areas could be remedied through capacity building to achieve national development. Their discussions must focus on the capacity building that would enable Nigerians to obtain such physical necessities as food; job; equality, justice; and participation in government. It should focus also on national integration and nationalism that would create a sense of belonging to the Nigerian nation by all and sundry – a sense of belonging in which the people see themselves as truly independent economically and politically. The provision of free and qualitative education at all levels to the people, an educational system that would make the people principal actors in human capacity building and national development. A people that would respect the ethno-religious diversities of the country as well as the autonomy of each ethnic region; the variety of development that we have experienced has largely taken a top-down approach where there is little possibility of popular participation and decision making from the grass-roots.

Conclusion
Human capacity building and development calls for a direct and participatory democracy where the state gives up its traditional paternalistic and welfarist roles in the country and become a facilitator that would enable the people solve their problems themselves utilizing the resources available to them in their localities. This would enable the people to take development beyond combating or eradicating poverty. This capacity building would create a development that seeks to restore and or, enhance basic human capabilities and freedoms and enable the people to be the agents of their own development. It would also make the people realize that there are many routes to development and self-reliance. Thus, all forms of development call for a more inclusive and sensitive approach to fundamental social, economic and political issues that affect all aspects of the peoples' lives - their collectivity, their culture, history and consciousness, and their relations with each other. These make for a balanced and sustainable development in a society.

References and notes:
Notes:
1. Bill Gate calls for the withdrawal of all Covid-19 vaccines on the ground that the after effects are by far more dangerous than the virus. (https://dailyexpose.co.uk) accessed 2 September 2021.
2. Kidnap victims pay more than N2b ransom yearly to herdsmen in Northern Nigeria (https://punchng.com) accessed 22 June 2021. See also https://t,co/IsR8vZwcAi via@todayng. Accessed 18 May 2021.
    Nigerian Government received six million N-Power scheme applications and selects one million https://punchng.com accessed 24 August 2021.
3. SERAP sues Buhari, others over missing N106b in 149 MDAs https://punch.com accessed22 August 2021. See also SERAP sues Nigerian Government , seeking details of "payment of N729b to poor Nigerians during the covid lockdown
    https://www.break.ma/news/31996679 accessed 29 August 2021.
4. See https://t.co/IsR8vZwcAi accessed 18 May 2021

References

Abuiyada, Reem (2018) "Traditional Development Theories have failed to Address the Needs of the majority of People at Grassroots Levels with Reference to GAD" *International Journal of Business and Social Science* 9 (9) 12-15 • September 2018 doi:10.30845/ijbss.v9n9p12 115

Adams, Don (2002) *Education and National Development: Priorities, Policies, and Planning.* Hong Kong: Asian Development Bank Comparative Education Research Centre (The University of Hong Kong).

Adelman, I. and Morris, C.T. (1972) The Measurement of Institutional Characteristics of Nations: Methodological Considerations. The Journal of Development Studies (London) Vol. VIII, No. 3: 111-135.

Almond, G and Coleman J. S. (1960), Almond, G.A. and Coleman, J.S. (eds.) (1960) The Politics of the Developing Area. Princeton, N.J.; Princeton University Press.

Almond A. Gabriel and G. Bingham Powel Jr. (1971) "A developmental approach to political Systems: An overview" in, Finkle L. Jason and Richard W. Gable (1971) *Political Development and Social Change*. New York: John Wiley.

Andrews, F. M. (1973) "Social indicators and socio-economic development" The Journal of Developing Areas Vol. 8 (October) 3-12.

Apter, D. (1965) Politics of modernization. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Baran, P. (1973) The political economy of growth. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Baster, M. (1972) "Development indicators: An introduction" Journal of Development Studies (London) Vol. VIII (3) 1-20.

Bernstein, H. (ed.) (1973) Underdevelopment and development. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Bendix, R. (1963) Nation-building and citizenship: Studies in our changing social order. New York: John Wiley.

Black, C. E, (1966) The dynamics of modernization: A study in comparative History. New York: Harper and Row.

Binder, L. et al (1971) Crises and Sequences in Political Development. Princeton, N.J. Princeton University Press.

Bull (2020) "Editorial" (WHO Bulletin) New York: World Health Organization 2020;98:646 doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.2471/BLT.20.263533 Editorials 646)

Cardoso, F. H. (1972) "Dependency and development in Latin america. New Left Review Vol. 74 (July-August) 83-95

Coleman, J. S. (1965) Education and political development. Princeton N. J. : Princeton University Press

Coleman, J. S. (1967) Modernization: Political aspects, in International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. New York: Collier- Macmillan 395-402.

Deutsch, K. W. (1961) Implications of social mobilization for the politics of development in, Jean Blondel (ed.) (1969) Comparative Government: A Reader. London: Macmillan.

Dos Santos, T. (1979) The structure of dependence. America Economic Review Vol. 2 (May) 231-258.

Drewnowski, J. (1972) "Social indicators and welfare measurement: Remarks on methodology" Journal of development studies (London) Vol. VIII (3) 77-90.

Eisenstadt, (1966) Modernization, protest and change. Englewood-Cliff: Prentice Hall.

Eisenstadt, (1973) Tradition, change and modernity, New York: john Wiley.

Frank, G. (1969) Latin America: Underdevelopment or revolution: Essays on the development of underdevelopment and the immediate economy. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Gusfield, J. R. (1971) Tradition and modernity: Misplaced polarities in the study of social change in, Finkle L. Jason and Richard W. Gable (1971) *Political Development and Social Change*. New York: John Wiley.

Hagen, Everet E. (1971) "How economic growth begins: A theory of social change" in, Finkle L. Jason and Richard W. Gable (1971) *Political Development and Social Change*. New York: John Wiley.

Hagen, E. E. (1962) On the theory of social change. Homewood Ill.: Dersey.

Huntington, S. P. (1965) Political development and political decay. World Politics XVIII, (3) 386-430

Ikoku, Emman U. (1980) Self – reliance: Africa's survival. Enugu: Fourth Dimension

Kindelberger, C. P. (1965) Economic development. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kuznets, S. (1966) Modern economic growth: Studies in comparative economics, No 7. New Heaven: Yale University Press.

La Palombara J. (ed.) (1963) Bureaucracy and political development. Princeton N. J. : Princeton University Press

La Palombra and Weiner M. (eds.) (1966) Political parties and political development. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Lerner, D. (1965) "Toward a communication theory of modernization: A set of considerations in, Lucian W. Pye (ed.) (1965) Communication and political development. Princeton N. J. Princeton University Press.

Lewis, A. W. (1955) The theory of economic growth. London: George Allen and Unwin.

McCLelland, David C. (1971) "The achievement motive in economic growth" in, Finkle L. Jason and Richard W. Gable (1971) *Political Development and Social Change*. New York: John Wiley.

McClelland, D. C. (1961) The achieving society. Prinnceton N. J.: Princeton University Press.

Nishimura, April, Roshni Sampath, Vu Le, Anbar Mahar Sheikh & Ananda Valenzuela (2020) "Transformational Capacity Building" Stanford Social Innovation Review Fall 2020

Organski, A. F. K (1965) The stages of political development. New York: Alfred Knopf.

Parson, T. (1951) The social system. London: Routledge.

Pye, L. W. (1971) "The concept of political development" in, Finkle L. Jason and Richard W. Gable (1971) *Political Development and Social Change*. New York: John Wiley.

Pye L. W. and Sydney Verba (eds.) (1965) Political culture and political development. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Pye, Lucian W. (ed.) (1965) Communication and political development. Princeton N. J. Princeton University Press.

Pye, L. W. (1962) Politics, personality and nation Building. New Heaven, Conn. Yale University Press.

Rehling, Uwe, Karcher, Henning and Pradhan, Merina (2004): ―Capacity Building in Developing Countries – Bringing Renewable Energy to the People‖; Science Forum 2004

Rostow, W. W. (1960) The stages of economic growth: A non-communist manifesto. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seers, D (1972) "What are we trying to measure?" Journal of development studies (London) Vol. VIII (4) 21-36.

Shils, E. (1962) Political development in the new states. The Hauge: Mbuton.

Sjoberg, Gedeon (1971) Transitional societies and the process of change in, Finkle L. Jason and Richard W. Gable (1971) *Political Development and Social Change*. New York: John Wiley.

Smelser, N. J. (1973) Toward a theory of modernization, in, Etzioni-Halevy E. and Etzioni, A.

(eds.) (1973) Social change: Sources, patterns and consequences. New York: Basic Books.

Taylor, C. I. (1972) Indicators of political development. The Journal of Development Studies (London) Vol. VIII (3) 103-109.

UNDP (2020) "Executive Summary" in, COVID-19 and Human Development: Assessing the Crisis, Envisioning the Recovery

Ward, R. E. and Rostow, D. A. (eds.) (1964) Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey. Princeton N. J.: Princeton University Press