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1. Introduction

This thesis attempts to study the ‘historical ecology’ of the oil industry in Nigeria. There are many sources written on the Nigerian oil industry. Each study is written from specific perspectives, political, economic or social. Thus, studies have been taking different angles to the topic (technical, economic, environmental, social instability, civil protest etc) but there is still a lack of studies that attempts to look at the issue of oil in Nigeria and its history through the integration of perspectives. This study is about the impact oil has on Nigeria’s social, environmental and economic sectors. I will begin by reviewing various aspects of the Nigeria oil industry, how it began, which actors were involved and how oil exploitation interacted with national and international companies. I will also introduce the subject of oil in Nigeria by looking at the economic market and the historical and contemporary effects of oil in the domestic economy. As will be discussed in Chapter 3, strong dependency in oil has led to the overall neglect of the agriculture sector. As reviewed by Genova and Falola (2003), there has been a shift in the literature on the oil industry. This can be seen in the early works in 1960-1970s, that was framed in a very positive manner with great expectations of the potential of the oil industry for domestic economy and public welfare in Nigeria. Later publications have become increasingly negative. The increasing negative reporting in the local communities is related to political instability. Warfare such as for instance the Biafra war that was, as some argue, ‘fuelled by oil’ (see chapter 2.2).

Throughout the 1990s there was a number of scandals related to pollution from oil, far from unprecedented, but now given intensive media coverage. Local and global social protests were rallied around a few disasters such as the Ken Saro-Wiwa and the MOSOP. These dynamics will be the focus on the fourth chapter in the thesis which will focus on the Southern part of Nigeria, the Niger Delta region because it is heavily oil based. This study will also closely look at predominate cases in Ogoniland, a city in the Niger Delta and the Ogoni people. The reason behind this is that throughout the social protests which shaped Nigeria’s oil management, the Ogoni people have been the centre of protests. This can be seen throughout the second chapter. In this chapter, I attempt to explore who were involved, what were their roles and the effects of these protests. The media coverage in the 1990s also revealed the militant tactics of international oil companies and the interlinkages between the oil industry and extreme corruption, most recently broadcasted widely in media in 2016. In this landscape of negative media reporting and scrutiny from academia, local stakeholders and other interests, and also in the days of increasing demand on sustainable practices, actors in the Nigerian oil industry have had to mediate between building an image of a company, media attention and practice. The Nigerian government has also become increasingly pressurised to create better regulatory mechanisms to counteract corruption and the covert tactics from oil companies, thus, the communication and formulation of regulatory frameworks have changed in response. In the fifth chapter, I will therefore look at the actors involved in the Nigerian oil industry and the negotiation of regulatory mechanisms in the more recent past. The oil companies that are analysed at are Shell, the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation, Chevron and Exxonmobil (see chapter 5.1). However, a strong focus will given to the oil company Shell because of the vast amount of media coverage the company has received.
1.3 Method and theory

Before proceeding to describe the layout of the thesis, I first want to describe the theoretical and methodological framework I have chosen for this study. I have chosen to call this study a ‘historical ecology’ because I believe this will build an interdisciplinary inquiry of the oil industry through combining environmental, social and economic analyses. The term historical ecology was first coined in the 1960s by Edward Smith Deevey Jr to describe a methodology that had been developed for numerous years (Deevey 1964:33-35). Crumley (2007) argues that historical ecology looks at the different relationships between species and the plant. It also includes humans as a ‘component’ of every ecosystem, analysing the social and physical past. Historical ecology takes a ‘holistic and practical’ perspective on the changes in the environment, creating a broad amount of evidence from scientific to social science and humanities, forming an understanding of human-environment relations. But, in this thesis I have used the term historical ecology more loosely. The phrase ecology has captured the relationships and networks I am interested in studying. The phrase historical is key in this thesis. This is due to my belief that these networks are evolving. Importantly, processes and structures have been shaped by the historical conditions of Nigeria as a country but the actors, process and networks in the Nigerian oil industry and its configurations continues to shape the Nigerian oil industry. The term historical ecology is used as an analyses on the history of oil and the processes shaping the oil industry which forms the means on how one can understand and query the oil industry today. The method and conceptual frame of this thesis have been formulated inspired by Actor-Network Theory and governance theory as already explained in the abstract.

Actor-Network Theory was developed in the 1980s by Michel Callon, Bruno Latour and John Law, as a theory which formulates approaches to understanding the change in networks of relationships between actors (Simandan, 2017: 1-12). As argued by Fenwick and Edwards (2012), actor-network theory is somewhat of a ‘misnomer’ as it is not a body of theory as the name suggest. Here I draw on actor-network theory rather as a method to explore actors in the Nigerian oil industry and their relationships between each other. Latour (2005) claims actor-network theory proposes nothing exists outside the relationships between the actors. All the factors involved in a social situation are on the same level, and thus, there are no external social forces beyond what and how the network participants interact at present. Therefore, objects, ideas, processes, and any other relevant factors are seen as just as important in creating social situations. actor-network theory asserts the idea that social forces do not exist in themselves, and therefore cannot be used to explain social phenomena. Instead, strictly empirical analysis should be undertaken to ‘describe’ rather than ‘explain’ social activity. For this reason I will here spend some effort and text in describing the oil industry in Nigeria. Only after meticulous description can one explore the concept of possible social ‘forces’ or governing structures, thus, actor-network theory will be used to analysis the relationships of each actor, their responsibilities, and representations to build towards an analysis of the management of oil in Nigeria and its configurations. Conceptually, I am also inspired by Michel Foucault’s theory on governance to compare and contrast the different structures of each actor involved in the oil management and production in Nigeria. Governance theory will give me an insight on why and how the impact of oil has structured each act-
ors behaviour and relationship to each other. For this reason, governance theory will be used as a framework to help understand the complicated hierarchy between the actors. The studies on governance began 1990s. Lemeke (2015) argues that governance was a response to ‘dominant forms of analysing and criticising neo-liberalism’ (Lemeke 2015: 98). In Nigeria’s oil management case, this is problematic because the structure of the actors fluctuate. Lemeke (2015) also argues that one of the challenges of the governance perspective is that it does not explore ambiguities or ‘failures’ but rather the outcome of its ‘success’ (Lemke 2015: 98). I would like to reformulate this critique in terms that governance tends to solely look at the aftermath of situations and does not focus on the actual formation of issues or structures. Nevertheless, this study is a study focusing both on formation and on the outcomes. I will analyse the formation of the oil industry, its ‘failures’ and how the oil industry has been shaped to its current state. Governance theory is used then in this study to compare and contrast the past and current issues in Nigeria’s oil management, drawing on Foucault’s definition of governance as:

“The ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power, which has as its target population, as its principal form of knowledge political economy, and as its essential technical means apparatuses of security”. (Burchell, Gordon and Miller, 1991: 102-103)

The definition of the ensemble is useful for studying and understanding the relationship between the Nigerian government, oil companies and and local communities in the Niger Delta. As I will discuss here, the production of oil created a source of economic and social power for the oil companies, later on providing power to the government (see chapter 2.2). This allowed both government and companies to oppress local communities, through violence and environmental damages. Then again, local communities at times have been far from passive in this process. Reactions have ranged from mobilisation of resistance through peaceful demonstration or obstruction to armed resistance and violence that in itself has become oppressive. These reactions (and pressure from international organisations and media) have reshaped the policies of both oil companies and government.

The methods used in this thesis are based on reviews of various empirical and social analysis on the impact oil has in Nigeria. This review has helped provide evidence and reasoning to why and how oil has been managed in the Niger Delta. There are not many sources written on oil production in Nigeria before the 1950s but, as Genova and Falola discusses there is now an amassing amount of writings and overviews of the subject (Genova and Falola 2003:133). The vast amount of literature on this subject provides different perspectives on the broad themes on the management of oil. The empirical and social review will be used to show how not only Nigeria’s policies and management but how the social, environmental and economic sectors have shifted. The influence of non-governmental organisations, oil companies reports and media reports sways mindsets, therefore altering and impact social positions. Thus, each of the actors sources influences the ideologies behind governance but in various ways. A literature review is provided in this study. This will provide a comparison on the already existing studies and formulate a new perspective on the impact oil has had on Nigeria.

In chapter 5, I will analysis the relationship between the oil companies, the Nigerian government and the local communities, reports on activities and reactions of the media and those who live in local communities with these methods. The documents used in chapter 5 are reports written by
oil companies, scientific reports, data from secondary published sources and websites, reports written by non-governmental organisations and interviews from those who live in local communities in the Niger Delta. These sources offer a deeper understanding on how oil has shaped Nigeria as well as providing a wide perspective on past and present matters. In addition, it creates a new ideas on how Nigeria can change its economy from being heavily influenced by petroleum to being agricultural (see chapter 6).

The most common documents analysed in this thesis are written reports regarding the behaviour and actions of the actors. These sources were easy to access and also provide a wide perspective and overview on the subject through an international and domestic lens. At times, more information was provided on local communities in comparison to oil companies and the Nigerian government. Information on current activities of the oil companies were published on their websites or annual reports were common in my findings. The only information that was published in the media were legal court case involving corruption or ecocide. But, when searching for information regarding the Nigerian government’s management on oil, very little was found unless it was about corruption or future investments. It should be noted that information published by the oil companies mentioned nothing about the damaged their facilities have on the Niger Delta ecosystem. Nevertheless, the media reports on the management of oil from all actors and published oil companies reports are appropriate for this study because they are official and give an insight to the programmes, situations and results on all the actions of the actors. Other sources such as written reports from non-governmental organisations such as the Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International, were used in this study due to its relevance through the investigations conducted by them. This has confirmed the already exposed information in the media regarding the human rights violations of the oil companies and the Nigerian government. The investigations used in this study are to help eliminate any bias opinions in matters such as conflicts of interest. The methods used in this study are in relation to the theories used. This is because each source influences the ideologies behind governance. The influence of non-governmental organisations, oil companies reports and media reports sways mindsets, therefore altering and impacting social positions.

In terms of media reports written on the oil companies, this thesis focuses on Shell. The reason behind this is that Shell has had extreme amounts of media attention due to the high level corruption scandals and environmental scandals which are constantly exposed, and have resulted in a number of court cases. The majority of sources on corruption in oil companies were written with regards to the Shell company and this information was easy to access and more detailed in comparison to other corruption scandals.

The theory and methods used in this study helped formulate the conclusion that in recent years, Nigeria’s oil management is largely ‘ungoverned’. Current activists who use violence as a means to change policies implemented by oil companies and the Nigerian government, have in fact created a complete change in the power pyramid. The constant conflicts in the Niger Delta has resulted in even more environmental disasters, social unrest and economic lost. It can be argued that this is due to the shift in regards to power-knowledge (Foucault 2014:V).
2. Prospecting for oil

The following chapter gives a historical background on the historical ecology of oil and the coming chapters. The history of oil exploration is reviewed from the days of the first exploration to when oil emerged as an industry and to the era of increasing social protesting.

2.1. First explorations

The Nigerian economy has experienced numerous peaks and troughs because it is heavily dependent on oil revenues. Although oil production began in Nigeria in the ending of the 1950s, the oil boom had actually started in the 1970s (Falola and Heaton 2008:1). Nevertheless, information written on the early oil and exploration of oil in Nigeria is very vague due to there being a lack of sources written on this early period. What can be deduced from the sources is the relationship between the Nigeria Bitumen Corporation and the Colonial office between the years of 1906 and 1914. The relationship is revealed from a letter sent on the 1st August 1906, by John Simon Bergheim (reviewed in Carland 1985: 184-187), who was a British business man. Bergheim, tried to convince the Colonial office and the government of Southern Nigeria that petroleum existed in the south of Nigeria and that the Nigeria Bitumen Corporation which he owned, could find and extract it. Bergheim claimed that those who helped in the exploration and finding of oil would help the colony to be in a ‘very high position’ and would help expand revenue for the British as well as provide fuel for British ships (Carland 1985: 184-187). The first exploration of oil in Nigeria then began in 1907 by the Bitumen Corporation, which was organised as a Nigerian subsidiary of a German company. The exploration was abandoned in 1914 due to the outbreak of the First World War. Nevertheless, after the war, Bitumen Corporation wished to continue the exploratory work but were denied by the British - who had colonised Nigeria at the time- who predominately allowed British companies to explore. This resulted to licenses then being given to the companies D’Arcy Exploration Company (formally known as Shell D’Arcy) and Whitehall Petroleum. By 1923, both companies returned their licenses because they had failed to find oil in commercial values (Frynas, 1999:9). But, in 1938, both British companies Shell D’Arcy and British Petroleum (BP) were given licenses that allowed them to explore the whole of Nigeria. This gave them a monopoly over the exploration and extraction of oil. Drilling started in 1951 and, by 1953, 450 barrels of oil were found in the south of Abuja, in the Imo state, Akata which is the south. Although originally being granted to explore the whole of Nigeria, in 1951 and again between 1955 to 57, the area of monopoly was reduced (Frynas, 1999:9). In April 1956, Shell D’Arcy and BP emerged together, being named, Shell-BP Petroleum Development Company of Nigeria Limited, (Shell-BP). In the same year, 1956, in the Niger Delta, Oloibiri, that Shell-BP company discovered oil in vast quantities. This discovery then led to Shell-BP expanding its drilling activities between the years 1958 and 1960. Within this period, there were numerous amounts of discoveries, but the most profound one was in 1958 in the Bomu oil field, Oloibiri (Shell-BP Petroleum Development Company of Nigeria, 1965:3; The Federal Government Printer, 1959:58).
2.2. An industry is emerging

Production of crude oil began in December 1957 in Oloibiri. In these years, a total of 3,000 barrels per day were extracted (Shell-BP Petroleum Development Company of Nigeria, 1965:3; The Federal Government Printer, 1959:58). The first ever shipment of crude oil totalled to 8,500 tons. This was transported to the Netherlands and arrived in Rotterdam on 8th March, 1958 (Steyn 2009:246-274). This extraction of oil led to Shell-BP getting back the £40 million they invested in the exploration of oil in Nigeria between the years 1936 and 1958. This started a wave of different companies taking interest in Nigeria. This licence and findings had open doors for non-British companies to be granted licenses to explore oil. Between the mid 1950’s and early 1960s, Exxon-Mobil (1955), Tenneco (1960), Gulf oil and Chevron (1961), Agip (1962), Elf (1962) also began oil exploration in Nigeria (Schätzl 1969:3-4). When ExxonMobil began its exploration, they began to explore in the north of Nigeria but, in 1957, reduced their exploration in the north and applied for a license that covered 4,000 square miles in Western Nigeria (Schätzl 1969:3-4). Not only did the discovery of oil create interest for other companies, but, it also coincided with the Suez Crisis. The Suez Crisis was the invasion of Egypt in 1956 by Israel, France and the United Kingdom to gain control of the Suez Canal and expel the President of Egypt, Gamal Abdel Nasser. The conflict induced companies to invest in Nigeria because the country was viewed as being on the correct side of the Suez Canal (Armstrong 1957).

From 1958-59, Nigeria was producing in total 15 barrels a day and held 0.08% share of the world. This slowly increased in 1960, to 20 barrels a day and 0.09%. (see figure 1) On the 1st October 1960, Nigeria gained independence from the British and the first president was Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa. Nigeria then became republic in 1963. Although no longer colonised by the British, it is clear that the British involvement was still predominant because the production of crude oil rapidly increased (Frynas 1999:19). By 1966, Nigeria was producing a total of 420 (000s barrels/day) and had 1.22% share of the world (Frynas 1999:19). During this year, the Nigerian President Balewa was overthrown and killed in Lagos during a military coup. This led to a mass genocide in the same year. The violence occurred due to the 1966 ‘anti-Igbo pogrom’ which was a period between May and September. During this period, there were mass killings of Igbo people and other ethnic southern Nigerian tribes by Northern Nigerians (Uche 2008:131). The Nigerian radio station, Radio Kaduna played political campaign speeches by Balewa and the premier of northern Nigeria, Sir Ahmadu Bello. This fuelled the conflict, and between May 29th and October 1966, over 30,000 Igbo people who lived in northern Nigeria were killed (Uche 2008:131). Igbo military officers were systematically ethnically cleansed, although it should be noted that figures on how many are not documented (Uche 2008:131). The pogrom ultimately led to the Nigerian Civil War (6 July 1967 – 15 January 1970), also know as the Biafran War. The Biafran war was a three year long war between the northern part of Nigeria and the Southern part of Nigeria. In the war, the South had separated, renaming itself Biafra. The war was based on a dispute about ethnic groups (Hausa, Yourba and Igbo) and power relations (Uche 2008:131). The war heavily impacted the oil industry because a large amount of oil was in the South and it was the government who sided and fought with the North (Uche 2008:131).
Despite the production slowing down or coming to a halt, there was an increase from 20,000 b/d to 540,000 b/d in 1969 (Table 1; Frynas 1999:19). Uche (2008) writes that the civil war significantly impacted the production of crude oil in Nigeria. In 1967, the production of crude oil had decreased to 320 (000s barrels/day) barrels being produced a day (Uche 2008:131). The decrease was smaller than what it could have been. The decline in oil production was countered as, in July 1967, the Nigerian troops and marines captured Bonny Island in the Niger Delta, which meant that they took control of main Shell-BP oil facilities (Uche 2008:131). Although, in 1968, the production dramatically decreased to 145 barrels (000s barrels/day), resulting to Nigeria only having 0.36% share of world oil production. This was due to the fact that when the Nigeria government had captured Port Harcourt in the same year, the facilities were severely damaged (Uche 2008:133–134). But in 1969, production rate rapidly increased to 540 (000s barrels/day) barrels a day. The production was increased because of the completion of a new terminal at Forcados in 1969 (Uche 2008:133–134) and after the civil war in 1970, the production of oil doubled to 1085 (000s barrels/day), seeing Nigeria have its highest recorded share of the world yet at 2.25% (Uche 2008:133–134).

After the civil war, production continued to increase in Nigeria, being over 2,000,000 b/d in 1973 (Table 1; Frynas 1999:19). But, although there was an increase in the production rates, conflicts between the Nigerian federal government and the oil companies were amassing, restricting production (Usa 2008:69). The government accused the oil company Safarp (now TotalFinaElf, but Elf until 1974) of supporting the Biafran and also criticised the aid France gave to support the Biafran cause (Usa 2008:69). Shell who had major hold concessions in Southern part of Nigeria, expressed concern to the support the Nigerian government was given by the British (Usa 2008:69). Before the 1970s, the Nigerian government had very limited involvement in the oil industry itself, despite the predominant role oil had in foreign affairs. The involvement was restricted to extracting taxes and royalties from the oil companies. The oil companies were allowed to set their own price on the oil they extracted. But, this gradually led to increasing conflicts because the oil companies dominated the oil sector to a point where the market governing the sector conflicted with Nigerian state interest (Usa 2008:69). During the civil war, the relationship between the Nigerian government and the oil companies had also dramatically changed (Usa 2008:69). After the end of the war, General Yakubu Gowon became the President. Just before the war ended, in 1969, the Nigerian government implemented the 1969 Petroleum Decree. This decree was created to halt the then existing ‘revenue allocation system’ that separated the revenue from oil taxes equally between the state and federal government. Instead the Petroleum Decree meant that that the federal government controlled the organisation of revenues to the state (Usa 2008:69). Clearly, the power relations between the Nigerian government and the oil companies shifted. The Nigerian government had more control over oil, therefore, being the dominant actor.

Within this period, the oil industry became the backbone of the Nigerian economy and arguably, Nigeria itself. In 1971, state involvement started with the interaction with Elf which led to the creation of the concept of ‘joint venturing’ in Nigeria’s oil businesses (Matori 2002:82). With this, the Nigeria government had also started to contribute financially to the production of oil and oil exploration activities. The interaction between the government and Elf paved the way for joint ventures with Agip and then Shell BP (Matori 2002:82). In 1973, during the global oil crisis (caused by the rise in oil prices by the Organisation of the Petroleum Exporting Countries countries), the American oil companies Mobil Gulf (Chevron) and Texaco also came to participate in the joint venturing of the companies with the Nigerian state (Matori 2002:82).
During this period, Nigeria’s crude oil production was 84 times the amount it was in 1958 (see figure 1). When the production of oil began in Nigeria, the production of oil was slow, resulting to billions of dollars being invested in the production of gas. From 20,000 b/d (barrels/day) in 1960, in the ending of the 1990s, it had increased to 2,000,000 b/d. In the 1960s, there was an increase from 20,000 b/d to 540,000 b/d in 1969. After this, production increased to over 2,000,000 b/d in 1973, similar to what was seen in the late 1990s (Frynas 1999:19). After the peak years 1974 and 1979, the production of oil decreased between 1980 and 1983 when the demand in the world market fell. As a means to increase oil exploration and production, the Nigerian government launched more fitting financial terms for the oil companies (Frynas 1999:19). The profit margins and international demands were increasing, which led to the production of oil increasing from the 1980s onwards. In the 1990s, foreign oil companies significantly invested in Nigeria, which helped to boost the production of oil which is the reason for the increase in production from 1992 onwards. Between 1992 and 1997, the production of oil wells increased from 1,701 to 2,251 and the oil production increased from 1,950 to 2,285 thousand barrels/day (Frynas 1999:19). The oil reserves in Nigeria were estimated at 35 billion barrels. Natural gas reserves were estimated to be 100 trillion ft³ (2,800 km³) (Odularu 2008:4). Being a member of the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries since 1971, in 2001, Nigeria’s crude oil production averaged about 2.2 million barrels per day (Odularu 2008:4).

Due to the international growth, the U.S. became Nigeria’s largest customer for crude oil, accounting for 40% of the country’s total oil exports; Nigeria provides about 10% of overall U.S. oil imports and ranks as the fifth-largest source for U.S. imported oil (Odularu 2008:4). Then again, from a historical international perspective, it should be noted that the oil production in Nigeria was not as significant in comparison to what it was and is currently. In 1960, Canada, Qatar, Brunei and Trinidad who were Commonwealth countries produced more oil than Nigerian. Nigeria had provided 1.8% of oil production in 1960. But in 1971, Niger was the largest oil producer in the Commonwealth. It produced 74,100,000 tons of oil which was 41.1% of the total oil production of the Commonwealth. Clearly, the expansion of the oil had more of an impact than that the production of oil (Frynas 1999:11).

Although the Nigerian government were more involved than ever in the management of oil, it is clear that the power structure between the oil companies has once again shifted. Due to the oil companies interests and investments, Nigeria became an international power. Clearly, the oil companies had the upper hand and without their interests, during this period, Nigerian would not have strived. Needless to say, from the beginning of the 21st century, relations between the government, corporations and communities began to led to the damaging of oil related facilities, ecological damage and issues with security in the Niger Delta, therefore severely impacted Nigeria’s oil sector. Due to this, oil companies in Nigeria have created community developing programmes. In the late 2000s, the Niger Delta Development Commission was created. This was formed to help grow social and economic developments in the Niger Delta (Odularu 2008:4).
### 2.3. Oil spills and increasing social protesting

Social protests have always occurred in Nigeria because of oil spills. Whether they were demonstrations, kidnappings, boycotts, hijackings, the Nigerian people have been vocal about the effects oil has on their lives. The protests emerged in response to the environmental, economic and social mistreatment they faced from the Nigerian government as well as the oil company Shell-BP. According to the National Oil Spill Detection and Response Agency’s Oil Spill Monitor, there has been from 2006 to 2018, 11,594 oil spills in Nigeria, 7,920 spills located in the Niger Delta (see Chapter 4 figure 2). Due to the serious health issues related to spills as well as other negative impact on their livelihood such as unemployment, the Ogoni people in particular began to protest. The growing resentment against the neglect of the government as well as mistreatment from Shell-BP led to the creation of a nonviolent organisation, Movement for the Survival of the Ogoni People (MOSOP) in 1990 (Ogoni Youth Network 2011). In the beginning, MOSOP was joined by the organisation of the Unrepresented Nations and the Peoples Organisation (Adebambo 2016). The movement was founded by Ken Saro-Wiwa, who was a writer, a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Production (000s barrels/day)</th>
<th>% share of world total</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Production (000s barrels/day)</th>
<th>% share of world total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>2055</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1715</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>2055</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>2260</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2155</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2055</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2085</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2285</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Nigerian oil production 1958-1997 taken from Frynas (1999)
media producer and an environmental activist. He and other members of the MOSOP presented the Ogoni Bill of Rights in 1990 to the Nigerian Government. The Ogoni Bill of Rights called for a measure of Ogoni political control of economic resources and the right to protect the Ogoni environment and ecology from further degradation (Adebambo 2016). Massive social protesting took place in the 1990s in the Southern part of Nigeria, Niger Delta, Ogoniland, which attracted international media attention. As a result of the human rights violations, the imprisonment and execution of Ken Saro-Wiwa and other MOSOP representatives, the Human Rights Watch report was commissioned by the U.N in 1995 finding severe violations by the oil companies and Nigerian government (Adebambo 2016). More recently, social protesting has become more violent and oppressive to residents in the area. I will analyse these events and also discuss the effects of these conflict in more detail in Chapter 4. But first I will review the possible effects of the oil industry on the national economy. In the following chapter, I will also analyse how the dependence of oil is debated in terms of possible positive and negative effects on the national economy.
3. From a farm economy to an oil economy

This chapter gives a deeper insight of Nigeria’s transformation from an agricultural economy to an oil economy and its possible effects on society and industry. It is based in part on a historical analysis on the gross domestic product (GDP). But, I also discuss the shifts in the Nigeria’s imports and exports and how the upstream and downstream oil economy has effected Nigeria in recent years. Finally, I will discuss how the impact of oil on the Nigerian economy is discussed and what conclusions can be drawn from the debate.

Nigeria is the 10th largest oil producer in the world and the third largest in Africa. As explained already in the previous chapter, oil accounts for 95% of Nigeria’s foreign exchange earnings and the oil reserves are estimated between 24–31.5 billion USD, producing 90 million tons per year (Osho 2006:62). The oil industry has been heavily impacted by the shifting social, political and economic context domestically and internationally. Before the expansion of the oil industry the main sector in Nigeria was the agricultural sector. Nigeria’s economy as a whole has a multiple sectors. These sectors are divided between: agriculture, distribution, mining, manufacturing and handicrafts, building and construction, transport and communications, general government administration, education, electricity and water supply, health services and other services (Osho 2006:62). Although, in terms of resources, the most important sector still is agriculture, oil has been the centre of Nigeria’s economy for many years (Osho 2006:62). Thus, I will begin this overview with discussing the formation of the agricultural sector before the shift to an oil economy.

3.1. A rural economy

In the early to mid 20th century, commodities other than oil, mainly agricultural exports, for example, palm oil, palm kernels, but also export of tin and coal played a significant part of national economy (Frynas 1999:9). The agricultural production was promoted as a possible strength in Nigeria’s economy in the end of the 19th century, after the abolishment of slavery (Frynas 1999:9). Britain became interested in opening markets for manufactured goods in Nigerian and were expanding the trade in palm oil.

Over the 20th century, the agriculture sector in Nigeria’s economy had always been large. In 1950, the agriculture sector was 69% of GDP. This share began to dramatically decrease after 1950s, being 49% in 1970 and 22% in 1982 (Frynas 1999:9). Agriculture in Nigeria is still and has always been the most significant employer of labour. In 1975, 64% of the total labour force were engaged in agriculture and in 1982, it was 59% (Oyejide 1986:55-64). Agriculture has essential, vital associations and connections with the whole economy. However, the agricultural sector is severely underdeveloped when looking at Nigeria’s economic growth. Oyejide (1986) has written a good summary on agricultural history in Nigeria and much of what will be written
below is based on his work. One reason is that macroeconomic policies that are not aimed at agriculture. The Nigerian development strategy in the 1960s and 70s focused on the manufacturing industry. Agriculture was regarded as a ‘reservoir’, a sector which function was to give resources for industry and other sectors. The main question for the government was how much surplus was required from agriculture endow industrial growth. Another question for the government was how much labour could be moved from agriculture without ruining the sector’s power for the continuation of self-sustained growth to support the industry. For example, an increase in the domestic food production may achieve an increase in the foreign exchange earnings similar to that of industrial growth. Output of export crops could have been encouraged, and food and export crops could have been created in the same production structure. Another policy detrimental to agricultural growth was that agriculture was taxed to create the capital for financing industrial growth, thus actual farm income and production incentives in agriculture were minimised.

Presently, agriculture in Nigeria include four agricultural subsections: livestock, crops, fishing and forestry. The agricultural crops sub-sector accounts for 70 to 80% of the total agriculture. There are two main subdivisions for the crop sub-sector. These are crops that are produced for domestic consumption as well as crops that are produced for export reasons, but they are not exclusive. Some traditional export crops have been used for domestic food, such as: tea, coffee, palm oil and groundnuts, mainly groundnut oil. Some are no longer apart of export crops as there has been a decline in the production and an increase in domestic demand for their use as food. Agricultural exports fell from 97% to 4% from 1960 to 1980. Generally, the main export crops involved groundnuts, cocoa, palm oil, palm kernel, cotton, coffee, rubber, soybeans and tea (Table 2). In the 1980s, cocoa totalled more than 50% of agricultural export earnings in Nigeria. In addition to this, domestic demand exists for exportable crops. For example, cotton and cocoa being industrial raw crops. The food crops category includes traded and non-traded. The main food crops which were traded were rice, wheat and maize. Also, root crops such as yams and coco-yams and many grains such as pulses. These were tradable and because of this, ‘incentives for their production and consumption were significantly influenced by traded food prices’ (Oyejide 1986:55-64).

In figure 2, Nigeria’s exports from 1919 —1960 are shown. The majority of Nigeria’s exports were from palm kernels, with 192 thousand tons being exported each year. This can be explained because of the versatile use of the product. It can be used to make products such as soap as well as being cooking oil. The secondly largest was palm oil. This was exported in volumes of 80 thousand tons, then groundnuts 45 thousand tons and lastly, cocoa at 20 thousand tons. From the years 1929–1931, the amount being exported from all these goods significantly increased. Between the years 1935 and 51, there was very little to a massive decline in the products palm oil, palm kernel and groundnuts. Palm oil was exported in volumes of 150 thousand tons from 1935–37 and remained the same in 1951. Similarly, there was a near to nothing change in palm kernel export, which started at 346 thousand tons and increased to 347 thousand tons in 1951. There was a massive decline in groundnuts. Between 1935 and 37, there was 242 thousand tons and in 1951, it had significantly decreased to 141 thousand tons. Although the four agriculture goods show a decrease, between these years, tin ore and columbite started to become exported from Nigeria in 1935. Nevertheless, it should be noted that tin ore decreased from 15 thousand tons between 1935–37 to 12 in 1951 and columbite steadily increased from 1 thousand tons between 1935–37 to 2 thousand tons in 1951. Clearly, in 1960, there was a rapid change in Nigeria’s exports. All exports excluding tin ore and columbite had increased (palm oil:183 thousand tons, palm kernel: 418 thousand tons, groundnuts: 333 thousand tons and 154 thousand tons: cocoa). In 1960, crude oil became Nigeria’s leading export, being at 847 thousand tons. From these
numbers alone it is clear that the extraction of crude oil was paralleled with a decline in the agriculture sector. I will now go on and discuss the impact of the oil sector on the national economy.

Table 2. Nigeria’s exports (thousand tons) 1919-1960 from Frynas (1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1919-21</th>
<th>1923-31</th>
<th>1935-37</th>
<th>1951</th>
<th>1960</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palm oil</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm kernels</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundnuts</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocoa</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude oil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin Ore</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbite</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. A growing economy fuelled by oil

The rapid growth of Nigeria’s oil exports has heavily impacted the trade structure. In 1959, the four main agricultural exports contributed to roughly around 70% of the total exports in Nigeria. The distribution of these exports, in £ million was cocoa 38.29, groundnuts, including oil and cake, 33.79, palm kernels 25.97 and palm oil 13.81) while petroleum contributed 1.7% (£2.7 million) (Stokke 1970:74). By 1965, the share of these agricultural exports had dropped to 51.6% of the total exports, whilst the share of petroleum grew to 25.9%. This increased to 33.0 in 1960 but declined due to the civil war, to 29.9 in 1967 and 17.9 in 1968 (Stokke 1970:74). As discussed in Chapter 2, the role of crude oil as an export increased rapidly in Nigeria. When Nigeria gained its independence in 1960, there had been 847,000 tons of crude oil exported, with an additional 10,000 tons of tin and 2,000 tons of columbite. By 1960s, Nigeria’s predominant export had then shifted from agriculture to oil and oil had also started to play a major role in Nigerian politics. Frynas (1999: 9) analyses of governmental debates shows that petroleum was debated by the Nigerian Council of Ministers in 6 out of 43 meetings and in 10 out of 31 meetings in 1958 as well as 1959 (Frynas, 1999: 9).

As shown above, Nigeria’s oil boom in the 1970s happened the same time as the decline of the agriculture sector, exacerbated Nigeria’s dependency on oil. In 2000, oil and gas exports in Nigeria accounted for over 98% of the export earnings and almost 83% of the government revenue.
By 2006, Nigeria became the leading oil exporter in Africa and the eighth in the world (Falola and Heaton 2008:1). Due to the new wealth that oil brought to Nigeria, the decline in other economic sectors and the abrupt change to a statist economic model which was agriculture being the prime production in Nigeria, created a catalyst for a wave of a large migration to cities as well as an increase in poverty, predominately in the rural areas (Falola and Heaton 2008:1). The effects were made more severe due to a rapid and deep decline in the infrastructure and social social services from the early 1980s. By 2000, the per capita income of Nigeria fell to almost a quarter from what is was in the middle of the 1970’s. In response to this, a decline in income and social services and as a result of taxation of agriculture, there was a continuous growth of the ‘informal sector’ that has been estimated to account for 75% of the whole economy (Falola and Heaton 2008:1).

Through the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation, the Nigerian government has somewhat control over the oil industry. As discussed in chapter 2, the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation set retail prices and wholesales. This has led to the production of shortages of refined products, resulting in Nigeria needing to meet its own quota for domestic demands (1.89 million bbl/d) (Osho 2006:62). But, Nigeria’s downstream economic problems have also impacted the pricing of petrol. A major problem lies in the fact that the Nigerian government have capped pricing on imported products. According to This Day 2017, despite the constant changes of oil and foreign exchange on an international scale, the Nigerian government capped the retail price of petrol at N145 (convert into pounds today) per litre in May 2016. Before this, the control over the price of petrol led the Nigerian government to become indebted to marketers. This situation was a result of the subsidy claims, created as an effort to make sure that the sales price of petrol for the domestic market was less than the landed cost from the international market. By the end of 2017, the Nigerian government owed 800 billion Naira in total to a number of oil market organisations the Major Oil Marketers Association of Nigeria, Independent Petroleum Marketers Association of Nigeria, Depot and Petroleum Products Marketers Association and the Independent Petroleum Products Importers. The accumulated subsidy claims and the associated unpaid interest and foreign exchange differentials, originating before the price adjustment in May 2016 led to insolvency and rendered the marketers financially handicapped to continue their operations. Though the price adjustment of May 2016 was seen as an incentive for additional investments, the marketers could not take advantage of this partial liberalisation as a result of the accumulated debt, which created liquidity challenges in the sector (This Day 2017).
3.3. The effect of oil on the Nigerian economy

Although, despite the positive outcomes oil has given Nigeria economically and internationally, oil has had more negative then positive outcomes on a grand scale. Many researchers associate the decline in agricultural production and the underdeveloped agricultural sector as a direct result of the dependence of oil (see discussion in Frynas 1999:9). The agriculture sector is in a severe state when looking at Nigeria’s economic growth (Oyejide 1986:55-64). Agriculture has essential and vital associations and connections with the whole economy. The Nigerian development strategy in the 1960s and 70s focused on the manufacturing industry which was treated as a leading sector. Agriculture was placed as a reservoir that gave resources for, as well as adopting (mainly industry) them from other sectors (Oyejide 1986:55-64). Still today as discussed by Oyejide (1986:55-64), macroeconomic policies are not aimed at agriculture. Nevertheless, it can be argued that the agricultural sector is still key in Nigeria’s economy, due the fact that it generates employment, contributes to GDP and export revenue earnings (Manyong et al 2004:1). Nigeria is still very rich when it comes to agricultural resource endowments. There has been an increase in the agriculture sector throughout the years, but the sector has been growing at a very slow rate. Then again, as argued by Manyong et al (2004:1), this economic problem could be resolved if Nigeria focused on agricultural commercialisation and investment as the main strategies for the promotion of rapid modernisation, sustainable growth and development. This would decrease the poverty rate in Nigeria due to the increase of job opportunities and food it will provide (Manyong et al 2004:1).

Corruption in Nigeria significantly impacts the oil sector (Osho 2006:62). As argued by Osho (2006:62) due to corruption, there has been a very small amount of changes in society and structural developments. A large amount of Nigerian citizens do not benefit from the money made from the oil sector despite approximately, 95% of oil in Nigerian is produced through a joint venture. The largest share holder is Shell who hold 50%. Nigeria approximately takes 60% of what is produced in the country (Osho 2006:62). However due to the dependency of the oil sector Nigeria’s GDP is constantly changing due to the demand of oil (Osho 2006:62). This is problematic due to the fact that the Nigerian government overspends and this does not work well all the time with the amount of oil that is being produced. But, it should also be noted that literacy rates and employment have increased because of the growth of the oil sector (see discussion in Osho 2006:62).
This chapter focuses on the Ogoni region, looking at the environmental and social impact of the oil industry. The Ogoni region in Niger Delta has a large amount of oil as has already been discussed in the introduction, and there are approximately 1.5 million people who reside in Ogoniland. Since the beginning of the oil exploration in the Niger Delta, the region has experienced serious environmental problems because of the over one hundred oil wells in the region (Corby 2011). In the chapter, I follow the history of social protesting from the first peaceful protests to the involvement of various current Nigerian activists groups who use violence as a means to get their point across. This chapter also features media reports on the human rights violations towards local communities and protests as well as the scandals and payouts between the oil companies; particularly Shell, the Nigerian government and security forces.

4.1. Environmental effects and its consequences

The Niger Delta mangrove ecosystem is the largest in Africa and second largest in the world. It is currently one of the world’s most fragile ecosystems (Emuedo et al 2014). At the same time, this sensitive area is the focus of intensive oil extraction with a high propensity for damaging oil spills, dumping and also with the very negative environmental and direct health effects of gas flaring.

4.1.1 Environmental effects and health

In 2010, there was an estimate of almost 4,000 oil wells that had been drilled in the Niger Delta as well as offshore areas. In addition to the issues pollution has had in this region, there are enormous amounts of health issues which are associated with pollution and contamination from the oil wells (Adeh 2010:6-7).

Beginning with the latter, Nigeria’s gas flaring produces 28% of the international percentage in the world (Adeh 2010:6). Gas flaring is when there is a release of a cocktail of toxic substance, including benzene into the atmosphere. With some exceptions, gas flaring is prohibited in Nigeria under the Associated Gas Re-injection (Continued Flaring of Gas) Regulations (AGRR) since 1984 (Adeh 2010:6-7). Nevertheless, despite this, Nigeria gas flares approximately 95% of the world’s total and is the main reason for air pollution in the country (Adeh 2010:6-7). Figures from 2010 show that there was roughly around 8 billion cubic meters of gas being flared every year from different oil sites in Nigeria. The flaring from natural gas produces various air pollutants such as particulate matter, ozone, nitrogen oxides, volatile organic compounds, sulphur dioxide and metals (Chuwah and Santillo 2017:4). Due to these air pollutants, there has been
changes in the concentration levels and emissions which has severely impacted the local climates. Furthermore, gas flaring releases millions of tons of carbon dioxide and black carbon into the environment, causing extreme environmental pollution because of the toxins and metal released in the atmosphere (Chuwah and Santillo 2017:4).

Another environmental problem is that water from rivers, streams and lakes are contaminated and polluted because of the activities of the oil companies and people. Most of the oil wells lead to many sites, becoming polluted due to the fact that drilling wastes, drill cuttings, oily sludges and various toxic hazardous chemicals have been dumped in these areas (Chuwah and Santillo 2017:4). In the Niger Delta, oil sludges and radioactive material are continuously dumped into rivers by oil companies (Adeh 2010:8). Due to the fact that oil companies disregard the environmental ethics in the Niger Delta by not updating technology and polluting the region, it is right to state that in the Niger Delta, the environmental laws and standards are not being followed or taken seriously (Adeh 2010:10). Due to soil pollution, land degradation is a serious problem in the Niger Delta. There are many sites where toxic wastes that has not been cleaned up or cleaned up properly. This has resulted in the long term pollution of groundwater and land, which has been damaging the environment over time.

The most well known and debated environmental effect of the oil industry are the oil spills. The Department of Petroleum Resources estimated 1.89 million barrels of petroleum were spilled into the Niger Delta or Ogoniland between 1976 and 1996 out of a total of 2.4 million barrels which had taken place in 4,835 incidents (Vidal 2010; Figure 2). According to Adeh (2010:9) the effects of oil spills has not been treated seriously by the oil extraction companies or the state, and victims of oil spills and those effected by contaminated water have been neglected for a long time. An oil spill in 1981 resulted in large scale contamination of groundwater from hydrocarbon spill. There was also a large amount of environmental degradation that was still there 18 months after the spill, the effects of which were largely ignored (Adeh 2010:9). In the Niger Delta today, there is no data that shows the percentage of people who do not have access to clean water despite vigorous research. Although, in the analyses presented by Adeh (2010), there is only a small percentage of people have access to clean water, and access heavily depends on the financial income of the individual. Those who are finically able to have access to clean water move away from the heavily polluted areas in the Niger Delta. For example, majority of the policy makers in the heavily polluted regions of the Niger Delta live in cities such as Abuja and Lagos.

Those people who are living in the polluted areas in the Niger Delta are continuously exposed to chemicals in the soil and water which severely affect their health. Illnesses include respiratory illness, communicate diseases, cancer related deaths, premature births and deaths, guinea worm are found throughout citizens in the Niger Delta (Adeh 2010:6). Other diseases related to lack of clean water is typhoid, cholera, and diarrhoea are common in drinking water which is infected. Other diseases such as bilharzias; guinea worm, roundworm and schistosomiasis are found if one was to bath in contaminated water. Hughes and Lovei (1999) argue that if there would be enough water that is of a certain quality fit enough for drinking and using for personal hygiene, it reduces the amount of diseases being transmitted. But in the Niger Delta, not only are many exposed to these diseases, but local people in the Niger Delta are exposed to extreme hot weather conditions and continuous daylight which create physiological and psychological disorders. As discussed by Hughes and Lovei (1999) oil companies catalyse these health issues.
4.1.2 Environmental consequences

The Niger Delta is made up of four ecological zones. These are: coastal barrier islands, mangrove swamps forest, fresh water swamps and lowland rain forests. The Niger Delta is known for its flora, fauna, crops, trees, and fresh water fish. Before the extraction of oil in the region, local communities relied on this (Maddie and Ashley 2016). The region also has the highest fresh water fish species in West Africa (Emuedo et al 2014), but because of the polluting of ground water explained in the previous chapter, this has led to those who rely on water from lakes, rivers and streams being exposed to harmful chemicals (Adeh 2010:8). Wet and dry deposition of acidic and acid particles damage mental roofs which effect fish, water nature and micro organisms in the soil (Chuwah and Santillo 2017:4). Emuedo et al (2014), in a recent paper, have compiled existing knowledge on the environmental state of the delta. Emuedo et al (2014) assessed water pollution from three different locations in the Niger Delta. The water samples had been collected within a two year span from three swaps around the crude oil exploring areas, two swaps with a large amount of oil activities taking place and one swap that no longer had oil activities taking place around it. The paper concludes that oil activities have led to poor water quality in the Niger Delta, which has negatively impacted the mangrove ecosystem with an extensive decline of fish stock in the region. High concentration of heavy metals together with low pH values, indices high levels of pollution. Also, in the Emuedo et al (2014) study, samples of water were taken from several locations. It was found that the pH of water samples from the study were highly acidic and that numerous metals such as lead, zinc, chromium, cadmium and copper in high quantities, were found in the water samples. This data suggest that not only are oil companies damaging the environment and livelihood in the Niger Delta through oil extraction on its direct effects, but are also damaging the environment with the poor handling of products in their oil facilities. Oil spills similarly often spread over a large area. This destroys the crops and aquacultures because the soil and groundwater are contaminated. In addition to the damage of marine life, the consumption of dissolved oxygen by bacteria feeding on the spilled hydrocarbons destroyed the crops and aquacultures (Emuedo et al 2014). The Emuedo et al (2014) study showed that the water was contaminated and because of the deterioration of the water quality, there has been a severe impact on water species, altering the distribution of plankton, fish and benthos. In the water, there were several heavy metals found. The levels of Chromium, zinc, copper, cadmium and lead found in the water samples were extremely high levels, and way above the levels which are deemed acceptable by WHO/FAO (1976)\(^1\).

The pollution has had damaging effects on flora and fauna. The majority of the rainforest -which once took up 7,400 km in the Niger Delta, no longer exists (Emuedo et al 2014:1-9). Large amounts of the mangrove forests has also destroyed. An estimation is that 5%-10% of the mangrove ecosystems in Nigeria has been completely destroyed due to oil spillage. The pollution created from crude oil, mainly light crude, not only damages the water quality but creates damages to the mangroves (Emuedo et al 2014:1-9). The crude oil produced in Nigeria is light crude. It has been shown to have a severe impact on the mangroves in comparison to heavy crude. The reason behind this is because the mangrove sediment oil. It holds the oil which leads to oil being on or inside the sediments. The effect of oil pollution is long term and can last up to 50 years (Emuedo et al 2014:1-9). In addition to the oil activities which have been impact the ecosystem,

\(^1\) Due to the fact that the water quality in an aquatic environment being important for flora and fauna the thrive, the range of pH in an environment can be used to assess the various impacts of pollution. In the study, the pH water samples were acidic. This ranged from 5.03 in Nembe to 5.6 in Okpare. The low pH levels assessed in the water samples would indicate that the water in the Niger Delta was poor quality (Emuedo et al 2014).
other activities such as dredging of channels and canals that have led to physical felling and or death of trees (Emuedo et al 2014:1-9). In the Okonta and Douglas (2001) study, it is reported that by 1999, Shell had cut over 24,000 miles of seismic lines through mangrove forests. This has led to the massive reduction of mangroves in the Niger Delta. In 2005, a FAO study reported that the mangroves in the Niger Delta has the fastest declining rate in the world (idem.). The mangrove species identified in the affected area are Rhizophora Racemosa, Rhizophora Horrisonii and Rhizophora mangle (Adeh 2010:11-12). Omoweh (1998) claimed that there was a virtual ‘extinction of cat fish, manatee or sea cow, electric fish, hippopotamus and shark in the Niger Delta’. Emuedo (2014), sated that ‘iguana, edible frog and small red crayfish have also become virtual extinct in the region’. Moreover, poor water quality has led to the bio-accumulation of heavy metals by common fish species found in the region (Emuedo et al 2014:1-9).

This has evidently caused conflicted between the oil companies and local communities. The constant pollution of resources by oil companies has led to disastrous effects on those who live in the region. Clearly, in this case, in terms of the governance theory, the companies management of oil is defective and dangerous because of the lack of handling oil and unconcern attitude towards local communities livelihoods. This shows that the oil companies have direct control over local communities, governing their livelihoods through environmental conduct.

In communities that are heavily dependent on agriculture in the Niger Delta, a year supply of food can be destroyed because of the oil spills. Due to the carelessness of oil companies when managing oil, the environment in the Niger Delta is becoming rapidly uninhabitable (Usman 2017:426). Overall, pollution not only has long negative impacts on the environment, but, affects a great amount of economic activities and food for communities. The loss of mangrove in the Niger Delta has led to the reduction of the use of wood (Usman 2017:426). The mangroves provide resources for various species of fin fish, prawns, and as habitat for crabs and molluscs. The large loss of mangrove and the bad quality of water has led to the reduction in fish. This has ultimately led to the decrease in fish catches in the Niger Delta, therefore impacting jobs. (Usman 2017:426).

4.2. Social protests

As discussed in chapter 2.3, social protests have been the answer in attempts to create change in Nigeria’s oil industry. The most predominate protests began in the latter half of the 1990s, with the Movement for the Survival of the Survival of the Ogoni People (MOSOP) presenting the Ogoni Bill of rights which stated their ideologies on how oil should be managed in the region. The MOSOP used peaceful methods to get their point across. Nevertheless, this attitude shifted throughout the 21st century with other activists groups, such as the Niger Delta Avengers and the Niger Delta Greenland Justice Mandate who use violence as a means. This chapter describes the changes in social protests and how the oil companies and the U.N have responded to this.
4.2.1 Emergence of social protests in the Niger Delta

With amassing environmental problems and associated health problems, the Ogoni people in particular began to protest. The growing resentment against the neglect of the government as well as mistreatment from Shell-BP led to the creation of MOSOP in 1990 (Ogoni Youth Network 2011). In the beginning, MOSOP was joined by the organisation of the Unrepresented Nations and the Peoples Organisation (Adebambo 2016). The movement was founded by Ken Saro-Wiwa, who was a writer, a media producer and an environmental activist. He and other members of the MOSOP presented the Ogoni Bill of Rights in 1990 to the Nigerian Government calling for political autonomy of Ogoniland and the right to protect the environment. The bill called for:

“Political autonomy to participate in the affairs of the Republic as a distinct and separate unit, provided that this autonomy guarantees political control of Ogoni affairs by Ogoni people; the right to control and use a fair proportion of Ogoni economic resources for Ogoni development; adequate representations, as of right, in all Nigerian national institutions, and the right to protect the Ogoni environment and ecology from further degradation” (Ogoni Youth Network 2011).

With the creation of this bill, it is clear that there was once again a shift in governing. As presented in previous chapters, both the Nigerian government and oil companies governed oil. In the 1990s, this had changed when local communities began to voice their opinions and demand change. Although facing oppression, it is clear that Nigerian citizens had an advantage because of the international media attention received which will be explained in detail further down this chapter. When applying actor-network theory to this shift in behaviour, it is evident that a continuous change in the networks of relationships is ongoing because of the are created and influenced by each other.

According to Adebambo (2016), the MOSOP as well as smaller organisations from Ogoni, demanded 10 billion dollars in damages and royalties to the Ogoni people. In addition to this, they also called for a stop of all the three companies damaging the environment in Ogoniland. If the companies did not comply, MOSOP threatened that the Ogoni people will protest. In response to these demands and threats, the Nigerian government passed a law that meant that all boycotts and damages towards oil production would be charged with treason. All meetings and protests in regards to boycotting oil production, was also banned. As a result, in 1992, the confrontation reached a higher level because very little had changed after the bill was presented. This led to MOSOP to take up front actions towards the oil companies Shell BP, Chevron, and the Nigeria National Petroleum Company. Out of the three companies, Shell had the largest share, and because of this, made them the easiest target. Despite the ban on protests, on 4th January 1993, MOSOP organised a peaceful protest with 300,000 Ogoni people, demanding environmental change, social justice and political autonomy. This day has been dubbed as the First Ogoni Day. After this, MOSOP created the One Naira Ogoni Survival Fund. This was a fund that relied on the Ogoni people contributing towards the support of the Ogoni Bill of Rights and future protests. Numerous protests took place after the survival fund, and because of this, Shell no longer operate in this region. The protests severely impacted the amount of oil being extracted. It also impacted the oil companies profits by 200 million dollars in 1993. As a result, the Nigerian government used violent tactics to stop the Ogoni protesters. In April 1993, 10,000 protesters were shot at by Nigerian soldiers, resulting in the death of ten protesters. The Nigerian govern-
ment also put a blockade round the Ogoni area. The government also sent military forces into villages in the Ogoniland, and ordered the murder of civilians. In December of the same year, the government ordered the killings of a mass amount of Ogoni people that resided in Port Harcourt. In 1994, villages surrounding Afam were raided and the people were killed. It is evident that violence was means for the Nigerian government in attempt to gain control over Ogoniland, forcing governance over the Nigerian people in order to maintain their management of oil. This, once again, saw a shifted in the power relations of the management of oil, clearly showing that the Nigerian government wanted to maintain dominance over the local communities and would do this by any means necessary. By mid-June 1994, the government had destroyed 30 villages. On the 30th June 1994, the Nigerian government ordered the removal of all Ogoni police officers and five days after this, the southern town of Benue State, Kaa was destroyed and those who resided there were killed. The Nigerian government explain the attacks as a result of intervention in an ethnic clash between the Ogoni people and the Adoni people. Then again, many believe that this conflicted was fabricated and that the reason behind this attack was the Nigerian government’s attempt to oppress civilians. 750 people were murdered in the attacks and 30,000 people were left homeless. Nevertheless, this did not stop protests around the region. (Adebambo 2016).

Adebambo (2016) also writes that the domestic violence led to international support. In 1994, World Ogoni Week was organised by the Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organisation (UNPO). The backlash of Nigeria’s treatment towards the Ogoni people was severe. But, problems within the MOSOP movement created a division between Ken Saro-Wiwa and other leaders. In May 1994, four Ogoni chiefs who opposed Ken Saro-Wiwa were murdered. This led to the arrest of Ken Saro-Wiwa alongside eight other activists. They were all held without charges and were denied legal representation and medical care. The organisations Amnesty International and Greenpeace began international campaigns in order for him and the others to be released. In response to the crisis, Nigeria was suspended from the Commonwealth of Nations. There were also numerous protests outside the Nigerian embassies and Shell offices worldwide. Numerous world leaders called for economic sanctions, a ban on arm sales and oil embargo on Nigeria. The social protest and ensuing violence from the state caused the International Finance Corporation to withdraw its proposal of an 100 million dollar loan and a 80 million dollar equity deal to build a pipeline and gas plant in the Niger Delta. There has been annual protests since 1995 on the anniversary of the First Ogoni Day. Although the government were unable to find any evidence against Ken Saro-Wiwa and the other activists, they were sentenced to death on 31st October 1995 and executed. In 2009, Shell paid 15.5 million dollars to the families of the eight activists and Ken Saro-Wiwa.

As a result of the increasing social protests in Ogoniland, the U.N commissioned a Human Rights Watch report. The report ,Ogoni Crisis: A Case Study of Military Repression in South-eastern Nigeria, came out in 1995 and recommended a number of actions were to address the human rights violations in Nigeria. Firstly, the report recommended that the U.N should allow a decision throughout the ‘fifty-second session’ of the UN Human Rights Commission condemning the human rights violations made by the Nigerian government to local communities (Human Rights Watch 1995). Secondly, the report stated that the U.N Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities should scrutinise the human right violations made by the government including unjustified. A report of this was to be given to the U.N Human Rights Commission. Thirdly, the UN Special Rapporteur on Extrajudicial, Summary, or Arbitrary Executions should travel to Nigeria and personally look into the violations. The UN

2 due to that fact that Adoni people are able to speak other languages and not just Adoni, claiming that it was an ethnic war (Adebambo 2016)
Special Rapporteur on the Independence of the Judiciary had to attend the Ogoni Nine trial and report the trial to the U.N Human Rights Commission (Human Rights Watch 1995). The UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention had to look into the imprisonment of other Ogoni protesters who had not been charged or arrested and lastly, the UN Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women should look into the reported rapes of women from local communities by military forces (Human Rights Watch 1995). However, violations had continued and another report from 2000 titled *Oil for Nothing*, by Essential Action and Global Exchange, observed how social protests often resulted to repression from the military and death. It also reported that military forces been supported by the oil companies (Essential Action and Global Exchange 2000). This is because of the role the Nigerian government and security forces played in tackling protests. The same report also listed price inflation, loss of property, prostitution and irresponsible behaviour from oil workers as causes for human rights violations. In another 2004 report, published by the *International Herald Tribune* titled *Peace and Security in the Niger Delta*, a similar observation was made. The article stated that Shell complained had worsen the violence in the Niger Delta. They did this through payments for damaging the environment, corruption and paying off Nigerian security forces (Shah 2010). It is clear that Shell were a catalyst of the conflict. This also questions the position of the actors when governing oil in Nigeria. Although the Nigerian government are seen as dominate up front, it is actually the oil companies who control the government’s policies, therefore making them the key holders in the management of oil.

All in all, despite, the fact that the Ogoni people suffered in extreme numbers and the casualties were high, there was a successful removal of Shell in the region and a significant decrease in the drilling of oil in Ogoniland. But, there are still environmental damages from this that effect Ogoniland in present years (Corby 2011).

The article also reports that violence in the Niger Delta because of the management of oil, kills approximately 100 people every year. It argues that because of this, Shell in Nigeria has become a predominate part of the Niger Delta conflict (Shah 2010). For a long time there has been concerns surrounding, in particular, the company Shell, its relationship with the Nigerian government and security forces. Shell has been accused numerous times of using bribes and paying officials to stop protests and damage towards company facilities. It is important to state that, throughout the years and also in the present, there has been an ongoing investigation on the true extent of Shell’s involvement with the mistreatment of local communities in the Niger Delta.

According, to an article published in 2009, by the Independent Newspaper, the investigations involving Shell are damaging. Rowell (2009) claims that according to documents found on the matter, Shell allegedly supported and provided Nigerian forces with logistical support and aid to oppress local communities. Shell allegedly paid $15.5m (£9.6m) in a ‘humanitarian settlement’ on the day before the 2002 U.S lawsuit. An allegation on this scandal was that Shell was involved in the murder of local citizens. The company denied these allegations and claimed that it ‘settled to help reconciliation’. But, the documents contained explain the full extent to which claimed to have ‘co-opted the Nigerian military to protect its interests’. Rowell (2009) writes that a document written on May 1993 from Shell to a local governor states that Shell asked for the ‘usual assistance’ due to the extent of the Ogoni protests. In addition, there is said to have been a stand-off between the Ogoni people and Willbros; a U.S contractor, in regards to a pipeline that was being built. Nigerian forces were called to repress the issue which led to one death. Shortly after this, Shell allegedly met up with the director general of the state security services to ‘reiterate our [Shell] request for support from the army and police’. Also, Shell had allegedly wrote a secret note, claiming to be encouraging the ‘follow-through’ of the action. This led to the Nigerian government sending the Internal Security Task Force to deal with the matter.
The Internal Security Task Force was a militant group led by Colonel Paul Okuntimo, violent colonel who’s style and force had been widely disapproved by human rights groups due to the alleged actions of soldiers raping pregnant women and girls as well as brutally torturing citizens. Rowell (2009) also writes that it has been alleged that Okuntimo would boast about having knowledge on killing a person in numerous ways.

Clearly there are multiple scandals that Shell have been involved in. The evidence provided in both extracts clearly indicate that Shell had knowledge and were advocates for the violent methods used towards local communities in the Niger Delta. This can also been seen in the 2010 text published on the Human Rights Watch, explaining the conditions in the Niger Delta. Shah (2010) states that in 2009, a pardoning of militant forces in the Niger Delta led to a vast amount of men from different rankings to give their weapons up to the Nigerian government. This was the resulted of an attack on the military in the outskirts of the Niger Delta which left many dead and many homeless. The violence started in 2006 and since this, many people have been killed because of the attacks of rival groups and corruption scandals between officials and militant forces. Violent gangs have attacked oil facilities and kidnapped over 500 oil workers and those in local communities. The article also claims that the government’s blanket amnesty, the pay offs to the Nigerian military and an offer to provide oil companies 10% ownership in government petroleum ventures provided a break from local attacks, but failed to give an oration to corruption on official levels and environmental problems that fuel issues in the Niger Delta. The governance of oil in Nigeria can clearly be seen as being controlled by new activists groups. The use of violence by these groups has resulted in a change in the management of oil. The protests are no longer non-violent such as those from the mid 1990s. Although the government and oil companies financially and politically govern oil, it is clear that Nigerian citizens have formed a new behaviour to govern oil, which is economically destroying facilities that allows them to be in a high position in comparison to the other actors.

4.2.2 Social protests turns into violence

The oil companies’ debasement of the Niger Delta land and environment; the military’s defilement of the Niger Delta women and girls, the government security infringement of the fundamental rights of the Niger Delta people, the political and economic deprivation and enslavement of the Niger Delta Area; the state siege and caging of the Niger Delta elites have combined to create tension, fear, frustration, hunger, anger and provocation, hence, the restiveness in the area and the massive youth militarised activism to defend, protect and demand for their rights (Asuquo et al 2010:26). Clearly, the approach use by MOSOP is non-violent and has been so for many years. But, in the 21st century, there has been a shift in methods on how activist groups protest in comparison to those in the late 20th century. In 2006, many companies paid large ransoms for the release of workers who had been kidnapped. A large amount of the money was allegedly paid through corrupt officials who would take out a portion of the money before giving it to the kidnappers. Although the companies interest was in the safety of their workers, it is clear that this method of payment contributed to governmental corruption and also, created more kidnappings3 (Lackey 2007:106). Oil companies environmental safety regulations assess pipeline
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3 Kidnappings which some government officials are to have alleged be apart of (Lackey 2007:106).
integrity and solutions to improve oil spills. Financially, these cost reduction decisions can be seen as being ‘penny wise and pound foolish’. This can be seen in the large payouts oil companies pay to local communities or those effected by the spills. It is clear that the oil companies think of the short term effect rather the long term effect, therefore resulting in violence protests (Usman 2017:426). Reports from the media, articles and opinions on oil in Nigeria usually link issues in the Niger Delta to the environmental issues. According to an interview conducted by Edwin Clark (2006:30), Thomas Tunde who is a farmer in Ogoniland stated ‘if they have no jobs, no food to eat, they become restive and dangerous’. The failure of attempting to solve the issue earlier has resulted to local communities desolate, leading to the creation of other alternatives in attempts to stop the environmental negative impacts in the region (Adeh 2010:3).

The continuous ecological damages and crimes against humanity have resulted in the birth of activist groups such as the Niger Delta Avengers. Based on the ideology of regionalism, the Niger Delta Avengers is the most infamous activist group that have participated in the act of hijacking and destroying pipelines in the Niger Delta. According to a recent post on the Niger Delta Avengers website from 18th January 2018, they announce a attack pending with the aim of bringing down FPSO which is a floating production storage and offloading unit which is used by oil companies to contain oil. On the Niger Delta Avengers webpage, it states that:

“This round of attacks will be the most deadly and will be targeting the deep sea operations of the multinationals which include Bonga Platform, Agbami, EA Field, Britannia-U Field, Akpo Field; amongst others littered across the deep waters of the Niger Delta region”.

It is evident that social protesting is reaching a new peak, becoming violent and targeting corporations in comparison to previous methods of protests. The Niger Delta Avengers have committed a series of attacks against corporations, but, it should be noted that the announced attack above is yet to happen from the current date of writing this thesis. Another activist group that uses violence as a means of social resistance is Niger Delta Greenland Justice Mandate. This is a militant group who operation in the Niger Delta and were found in August 2016. They also hijack oil companies and blow up pipelines. According to The Guardian Nigeria, On 29th September 2016, the Niger Delta Greenland Justice Mandate stated in a statement that they had ‘bombed the Unenurhie-Evwreni delivery line in the Ughelli area of Delta state at about 1:00 am (0000 GMT)’ (Editor 2016). The militant group stated that the attack was ‘to prove to the wicked and ungrateful multinational oil companies and their Nigerian military allies’ and that they own their our lands. (Editor 2016). This activist group share similar ideologies to the Niger Delta Avengers. The use of violence as a means for social and environmental justice is a key method for both groups. This heavily impacts oil management. This is because it alters the actors power, creating economic instability and environmental damages. Then again, the use of violence from these activist groups do not only strain the management of oil and put fear into the oil companies, but this also impacts local communities. This has created fear for many Nigerians currently. The high level of terrorist threats and attacks have impacted the livelihood of many residents and have also resulted in oil spills from the pipeline bombings, which has also continued to damage the Niger Delta’s ecosystem (see discussion in Chapter 6).

According to an interview conducted by myself with Obi Chukuwu (2018), (a 42 year old mother three who is an accountant that lives in Lagos), when asked about the role activist groups play in the management of oil, she stated that:
“Militant groups believe they are doing good but they are not. By bombing the pipelines and hijacking the oil facilities, they are creating more problems. Not only for the oil companies because of the lost of the production rate and money being spent in efforts to stop their violent activities, but they damage our land and our homes. They scare us because we are not sure how the Nigerian government and oil companies will react. There is only so much someone can do by paying off these groups to stop what they are doing. The Nigerian government may retaliate by sending troops like how they did in the 1990s. I believe that the government really needs to improve its relationship with us. I do not condone the behaviour of these activist groups but I do understand them. We have been suffering for many years and we are being ignored”.

Clearly, Obi’s (2018) opinion on the actors network in the management of oil is on the bases of the influence of violent protests. It is evident that this new attitude towards the management of oil in the Niger Delta has created uncertainty and fear communities who share the same ideologies but not methods. But, social protests have not only been from violent militant groups, younger generations have also use blockage as a method to stop oil companies from continuing to extract oil. According to Bassey (2017), in 2017, a suspected oil spill from one of the facilities of ExxonMobil caused social protests. Local youth blockaded the facility for three days in protests demanding that ExxonMobil acknowledge the spill and amend the situation. Protests in highly effected areas such as Ogoniland are continuously growing. According to the online article, Vanguard, in August 2017, hundreds of people from different ages and genders who lived in Ogoniland protested against Shell’s oil exploration in their area (Iheamnachor 2017). The article states that this took place a couple of days before the expiration of the week ultimatum given by the MOSOP to stop Shell from returning to Ogoniland. The president of MOSOP, Legborsi Pyagbara allegedly begged the Ogoni people to not allow the oppressors to win and to only use non-violent methods (Iheamnachor 2017). Clearly, discontent has not just been about environmental pollution and human rights violations but also job opportunities and livelihood. Throughout the media reporting, news has also circulated around the actions of communities on protest to change their livelihood. For example, Owolabi (2017) wrote in a online article published by the Reuters, titled Hundreds of protesters storm Shell oil facility in Niger Delta that hundreds of Nigerians stormed into one of Shell’s oil facilities, demanding for jobs and infrastructure development. In the article, it is written that a called Anthony Bouye claimed that he had been a graduate for eight years, but still unemployed. He claimed that Shell would not employ him despite there being large amount of oil in the region4. It is evident that are some who are not befitting for the opportunities oil should bring to the region. But, according to the same article, Shell stated that
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4 According to the Bloomberg Market article published on December 2017 titled Nigeria’s Pengassan Oil Union on Strike to Protest Job Cuts, it states that ‘a Nigerian oil union said it began an indefinite strike to protest unfair labor practices at a local petroleum-exploration company’ (Gbogbo 2017). This shows issues in the employment in oil facilities. Clearly, those who work in oil facilities are being treated unfairly. Although the strike did not effect the production of oil in Nigeria internationally, it did domestically. The article states that because of the strike, ‘long lines of cars were forming at fuel stations on Monday following the strike as people anticipate supply shortages because of the strike’ and that ‘strikes won’t immediately impact crude production and loading, it may worsen local gasoline distribution’ (Gbogbo 2017). In relation to this article, Sherif Apuntaku (2018) (see chapter 6.1), who is a 32 year old man that works in a printing company in Abuja, stated this issue in his interview. When asked about the impact of the oil companies, he stated that ‘fuel in Nigeria is very expensive. You have the queue for a very long time’.
its commitment to help local communities in the Niger Delta had not changed. It is clear that many local residents are unhappy with the welfare being provided to them, if at all provided.
5. A changing industry?

For decades, continuous protests against mainly Shell and other oil companies has negatively affected the oil industry in Nigeria. For instance, Shell has been the focus of worldwide public boycotts for several years - whilst the accusations of complicity between the Nigerian government and oil companies and numerous court cases of corruption from the oil companies and the government has resulted to both actors responding to these accusations and convictions in numerous ways. In this chapter I will focus on how each oil company presents themselves in reports or on their websites despite the previous chapters presenting the environmental disasters and human rights violations they have been accused of. This chapter consists of an analysis on the similarities and differences between each company and also media reporting to counter balance the representations of the oil companies. The chapter focuses on how the companies reply to previous debates on misconduct and how they explain their efforts to maintain oil production that ensures environmental and social benefits or resolves bad consequences. The four oil companies discussed in this chapter are Shell, Chevron, ExxonMobil and Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation. I will also discuss involved government agencies and their roles.

5.1. Shell

The history of the Shell company and its engagement in Nigeria has already been explained in Chapter 2. Shell Petroleum Development Company of Nigeria Limited is the largest company from Shell in Nigeria (SPDC 2018). Shell Petroleum Development Company of Nigeria Limited is the operator of a joint venture with the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation who owns 55% share while Shell Petroleum Development Company of Nigeria Limited (which will be referred to simply as Shell) itself holds 30%, Meanwhile Total E&P Nigeria Ltd owns 10% and the ENI subsidiary Nigerian Agip Oil Company Limited owns 5%. Shell explains their company’s engagement in the Nigerian oil industry focuses on onshore and shallow water oil and gas production in the Niger Delta (SPDC 2018). On the same webpage, under the heading Shell Interests in the Nigerian Oil & Gas Sector, the company begins to explain the different shareholders in its company who operate in the oil and gas sector. Shell writes that a branch of its company, Shell Nigeria Exploration and Production Company Limited is a deep water oil and gas that is an operator of Bonga Field (55% Shell share) and Bonga floating production, storage and offloading vessel. The company also states that it has a joint venture with Nigeria Liquefied Natural Gas Company Limited (25.6% Shell share) and that Shell Nigeria Gas Limited domestic gas distribution is 100% Shell share (SPDC 2018).

5.1.1. Media reporting

An extract from court documents published revealed that despite Shell’s continued denial of any involvement in human right violations in the Niger Delta, they were indeed apart of corruption and human rights violations (as discussed in Chapter 3.3). Shell routinely worked with Nigeria's
military and police to suppress resistance to its oil activities, often from activists in Ogoniland, in the delta region. Vidal (2011) reported that in the 1990’s court case, a letter from 1994 shows that Shell agreed to pay the Nigerian army to retrieve a truck which resulted in the death of an Ogoni man and two people hurt. Shell claims that the payment was made to ‘show of gratitude and motivation for a sustained favourable disposition in future assignments’ (Vidal 2011). Although Shell have continuously denied these allegations, the director of Shell Nigeria during this time, Brian Anderson claims that within this period, Shell had paid the Nigerian military on two occasions (Vidal 2011). In relation to this, according to the 2012 The Telegraph article *Shell paying tens of millions to Nigerian security forces*, Shell paid significant large amount in order to protect staff and buildings in the ‘volatile African region’ (Trotman 2012). This extract comes from the viewpoint that Shell paid Nigerian officials as a means to only protect its buildings and not to incite or advocate violence. This source solely focuses on Shell’s attempts at enabling security. Nevertheless, Trotman (2012) claims that Shell allegedly spent 40% of its near one billion dollars worldwide security budget between 2007 —2009 on protecting staff and oil facilities from damage in the Niger Delta, later claiming that ‘the scale of Shell's global security expenditure is colossal’. Shell also allegedly has a 1,200-strong internal police force in Nigeria, plus a network of plainclothes informants. Trotman (2012), continues to state that there are also alleged documents that suggest Shell’s world-wide security almost doubled in the space of three years because of the increase in social unrest in the Niger Delta. In 2008, it was reported that 62 shell employees were kidnapped in the Niger Delta and three were killed. In the same year, it was reported that 99 million dollars was spent on ‘third parties’ for security reasons. This was double the amount that the company had spent on its personal security for staff. It is also alleged that these ‘third parties’ include 600 Nigerian government police and 700 members of the joint task force, which is made up of army, navy and police officials. Nevertheless, Shell has denied any relationship between the company and the joint task forces. The company claimed that protecting staff and assets is its main priority, and that the company’s security spending is used on this bases worldwide. In Shell’s statement replying to the Trotman (2012) report, the company responds that its main priority is protecting its people and assets; monitoring how its expenditure is spent. But, they company also states that the company has ‘always acknowledged the difficulties of working in countries like Nigeria’. This statement alone is extremely problematic because it supports the argument that Shell knew of the corruption and violent issues Nigeria as a country deals with, enabling or allowing human right violations. On the other hand, this statement could solely mean that because of the difficulties Nigeria faces politically and socially, it means that problems will surface for oil companies. Despite these negative media reports, the oil companies written on in this study all claim in their reports that they are helping improve the livelihood of local communities through programmes.

In comparison to the previous chapter, in 2017, Amnesty International wrote an article titled *Was Shell complicit in murder?* In this article, Amnesty International question’s Shell’s involvement in the Niger Delta during the 1990s. The article claims that Shell was involvement in human right violations such as murder, rape and torture committed by the Nigerian military government. The article explains the violence the Ogoni people underwent despite protesting peacefully. It is written that despite the cases surrounding this event, no representative from Shell has commented. The article later states that Shell was never held accountable for their involvement because if companies had ‘enough money and were powerful’, they can get away with violations (Amnesty International 2017).

The Amnesty International case study clearly argues that Shell partook in the human rights violations against the Ogoni people. Shell has been widely criticised in the media for its contribution to the tragedies, human right violations and failing to use its influence over the Nigerian gov-
ernment to obtain clemency (Verbeke 2013:541). In terms of governing oil, it is clear that the Nigerian government and oil companies used violence and unethical behaviour to have dominance over local communities. When analysing the actors network, it is evident that this behaviour is the result of pressure to maintain the production of the government and, in this case, Shell see fit.

Amnesty International (2017), claim that Shell were aware of what would happen if they asked the military to intervene. This refutes the previous argument that Shell only wanted to protect its assets. The report claims that in 1990, Shell requested help from a paramilitary police unit to deal with people who were protesting at one of its facilities in Umuechem. The police used excessive force, using guns and grenades which resulted to the death of 80 people and 595 houses were destroyed. Despite this, Shell repetitively asked forces to stop the local communities protesting against the oil activities. Again in Amnesty International’s report, it states that a memo written by Shell was sent on the 18th March 1993. This memo allegedly claims that Shell employees ‘pleaded’ for military guards to intervene in protests over a pipeline that was being installed. On the 30th April, militant forces attended to local communities protests who were against the pipeline. This resulted to 11 people in the Biara village being shot at or wounded. On the 4th May, Shell asked for ‘assistance’ from the governor which resulted in militant forces shooting protestors in Nonwa village, resulting to the death of one person. The report continues to explain that shortly after this, Shell directly requested for more help. A letter from the 11th May 1993 indicates that senior staff members in Shell had a meeting with senior government officials in Abuja, to allegedly ‘mobilise support at top government levels’. The head of security had apparently informed Shell that the protests in Ogoniland ‘would be over soon’. Two months after this, the Nigerian military attacked Ogoniland. Clearly, Shell contributed to the Nigerian government’s efforts to stop protests through corruption. This was done through the military rule, being institutionalised corruption as a tool of governance, ultimately meaning that Shell’s involvement in this corruption was almost inevitable (Lackey 2007:105). In response to this, the report writes that in a statement from 1995 from the ex-chair Brian Anderson, it was explained that at the time of the events, it was the company’s policy to provide logistical support to the Nigerian government which included transport such as boats, buses and helicopters (Lackey 2007:105). Nevertheless, Amnesty International (2017) refutes this, claiming that Shell’s role in these violations were direct. The report writes that in October 1993, Shell provided the Nigerian army with transport to Korokoro village and troops shot at protestors. Then again, if Shell were unaware of the human rights violations, why did they continue to ask for assistance knowing the outcome of the previous military intervention. This, therefore, shows that Shell is liable for its actions. Frechette (2002:119) writes that the Nigerian military officials also claim that Shell put pressure on the Nigerian government to deal with the protests in Ogoniland.

From the evidence provided, it is clear that Shell paid money to the Nigerian military in order to stop the protests. Amnesty International (2017), writes that in December 1993 after a military coup, Shell wrote to the administrator of Rivers State about the economic results of protests. In this, Shell allegedly named numerous local communities, including Ogoniland. A month after this alleged letter, a new Internal Security Task Force, under the leadership of Major Paul Okuntimo was created (see chapter 4.2.1). The Internal Security Task Force then began to violate the human rights of local communities straight after. The report states that on 21st February 1994, soldiers had shot at peaceful protestors outside of Shell’s headquarters. Also, on 3rd March 1994, Shell had allegedly paid Major Okuntimo and 25 other military officials a ‘honorarium’. According to the report, an anonymous source claimed that the payment was a show of ‘gratitude and motivation’ for how to deal with local communities who protested and future assignments.
Similarly, Shell gave this reason for the payments (Vidal 2011; see above). It is clear that this explanation has a double meaning. Amnesty International (2017) continues to explain that after this, the Internal Security Task Force began a wave of terror on local communities, raiding, killing and raping residents in Ogoniland. The report alleges that Shell recruited Nigerian forces to attack villages and minimise opposition who intervened in its oil activities. The report also claims that Shell allegedly insisted that the government imprisoned, kill and torture Ken Saro-Wiwa and those accused with him (see chapter 4). Shell also illegally took land and polluted the water and air as well as providing the Nigerian military with equipment to carry out the violent crimes (Bassiouni 2008:426). The report further continues to provide information on how Shell was involved in the violations. In July 1994, the Dutch ambassador informed Shell that the Nigerian army had killed almost 800 Ogonis. Shell allegedly had inside sources reporting to them about the violations. The company executives also allegedly had various meetings with government officials about the protests. The report continues to explain that Shell were the ones who initially raised the concern about Ken Saro-Wiwa, ultimately leading to his execution and the Ogoni people. It is claimed that during the peak of the crisis in Ogoniland, Shell encouraged the Nigerian military to used extreme force on local communities in the Niger Delta and the execution of the Ogoni Nine (refer to chapter 4; refer to previous page). Amnesty International (2017) continues to write that there was a memo from 30 April 1994, between the then Nigerian President, Sani Abacha and the Shell CEO, Brian Anderson. This memo discussed and raised ‘the problem of the Ogonis and Ken Saro-Wiwa’. Also, apparently, Anderson reported that he came away from the meeting with the sense that Abacha ‘will intervene with either the military or the police’. Evidently, this supports Shell’s involvement in the human rights violations. This is due to the failing of engaging to the local communities, and instead, bribed officials (Parboteeah and Cullen 2013:458). This source presents an understanding between the Nigerian government and Shell’s relationship in the 1990s. It can be seen that the government were merely puppets that Shell controlled in order to maintain its production of oil. Both actors influenced each other, sharing the same values when it came to governing oil.

It is clear that all of these media extracts support the claim that Shell partook in multiple corruption scandals which violated human rights. Nevertheless, all previous sources focus on internal corruption, not taking into the consideration that oil companies such as Shell have faced enormous loses due to protests. It can be argued that Shell are simply protecting its oil facilities, due to the fact that they alleged to have a large internal police force, informants and immense global security expenditure which is rapidly growing, supporting the idea that Shell partook in such corruption scandals due to the significant lost they encountered. Not only are the protests affecting Shell economically, but the kidnapping and murder of employees evidently takes a toll on the company. Then again, the fact that 99 million dollars were spent on third parties, being twice the amount of what Shell spend on its own security staff, supports the claim that Shell are fully aware and support the idea of the Nigerian government and forces using extensive violence and violating human rights, supporting a new claim that the global security expenditure was actually be a cover up.

5.1.2 Shell’s website
Despite the bad media attention, the fines and unethical scandals, Shell still continues to do business in Nigeria. Shells claims that it supports and is helping to improve local communities (more information below). According to Shell (2017), the company has also claimed to have contributed almost 31 billion US dollars to the Nigerian government since 2008. Also, Shell states that the Nigerian government receives 95% of the revenue after what has been produced from Shell’s joint venture. In addition to this, the company promotes and donations to projects such as education, agriculture and small businesses (Parboteeah and Cullen 2013:461).

In Shell’s briefing notes extracted from the company’s website (Shell 2018), it focuses on Ogoniland and the company’s dealings in the area. In terms of the environment, Shell states under the heading Memorandum of understanding with Ogoni communities that in 2015, Shell and the Bodo community signed a Memorandum of Understanding which allowed Shell to begin cleaning up areas that were affected by oil spills in 2008 (Shell 2017). Shell (2017) continues to explain that the process of dealing with environmental and social impact of the oil spills.

According to Morgan (2017), in August 2008, a 55-year-old pipeline owned by Shell bursted twice, leaking up to 600,000 barrels. Vidal (2011) wrote that Shell denied this, claiming that a weld broke in September 2008 in the 50-year-old trans-Niger pipeline that takes 120,000 barrels of oil a day at high speed across the Niger delta. Either way the spill was not stopped until 7th November 2008. By that time, as much as 2,000 barrels a day may have been spilled directly into the water. Although, in Shell (2018), it is stated that Shell are committed to the clean up of the areas in Bodo ‘when access is granted’. Clearly, in Shell’s briefing notes, it is accepted that the company is at fault. This statement can be the result of theft and sabotaging of Shell’s resources. Clearly, Shell’s main concern is to stop the sabotaging of its company and claim that this is a reason for them prolonging the clean up of the Bodo village. This is the only piece of information on cleaning up the oil spill in the briefing notes. Throughout the briefing notes is information on how Shell are improving its relationship with local communities that have been effected by the oil spill. It is written that in 2014, Shell’s joint venture with Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation signed numerous agreements with local communities in Ogoniland using the Global Memorandum of Understanding model. This is an agreement that was established in 2006 to help improve relations between the actors. This changes the governance of oil to a different relationship to what has previously been seen in Nigeria. The involvement of all actors sees a shift in the relations.

Shell (2018) continues to explain that under the Global Memorandum of Understanding, its joint venture with the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation provides funding to support non-violent communities who patrol and report possible sabotage activities to the government security forces. Shell alleges that it has successfully communicated with 150 communities in Ogoniland since it began this campaign to combat environmental issues from the result of pipeline sabotages and damage to its oil facilities as a response to UNEP report recommendations on Ogoniland. As a means to further the improvement in the relationship with local communities, Shell extended its youth entrepreneurship programme, Shell LiveWIRE to Ogoniland in 2014. Shell (2018) expresses that the aim of this extension was to improve living standards to limit oil theft, and by doing this, were promoting a different livelihood. Shell continues to write that in 2015, the company formed an Agricultural Youth Entrepreneurial Programme to increase the youth’s involvement and interest in farming. Shell focused on Ogoniland to increase economic growth in the region. It can be argued that Shell is only trying to improve relations with local communities based on personal interest.
Crude oil theft and sabotaging is a severe economic loss for Shell, reportedly costing them one billion British pounds in loss (Vidal 2013). Nevertheless, it is evident that Shell has portrayed itself in this briefing note as a company who is trying to strengthen relations but, seem to be unable to due to social unrest and sabotaging. Clearly, there are efforts being made but if one was to analyses the undertone of the text, social attitudes from local communities are being accused of the reason behind the slow progress between Shell and local communities instead of the the environmental, economic and negative impact Shell’s oil management has on local communities livelihoods. Clearly, Shell has not fully taken into account the impact it has on the Niger Delta’s environment and society. They have not commented on the court cases and allegations of corruption in the briefing notes, only commenting in the articles provided in previous chapters.

Similarly to the briefing notes, in Shell’s Oil Spill Data (Shell Nigeria 2018), the company again takes very little responsibility for their actions. Shell Nigeria (2018) states that oil spills due to theft, sabotage of its facilities and illegal refining, cause the most environmental damages in the Niger Delta. Shell claim that despite this, Shell and the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation clean up areas affected by oil spills created from its facilities (Shell Nigeria 2018).

5.2. Chevron

According to the Institute of Developing Economies Japan External Trade Organisation (2018), Chevron’s operations in the Niger Delta consists of a 40% interest in six oil fields which are referred to as the Onshore Area. Chevron owns 40% of the oil plant, Escravos Gas Plant and 40% of the Escravos Gas Project Phase 3B.

Chevron (2016) corporate responsibility report; Partnership for Creating Wealth, is heavily based on the positive impact the company has on the region. In the report, it states that the company’s ‘values are diversity and inclusion, high performance, integrity and trust, partnership, protecting people and the environment’. Similar to Shell, Chevron focuses on its ethics and how its attempts to have a positive relationship with local communities. Under the section Social Investments, Chevron further elaborates on these efforts. It claims that the company has created various programmes that help public health in Nigeria. It is written that Chevron’s health strategy in Nigeria is to help create ‘sustainable and accessible solutions’ for Nigeria’s health care system. This is done through the improving education and creating a universal awareness of a healthy lifestyle. An example Chevron gives in its report of this is its 2006 programme, Roll Back Malaria. The focal point of this programme is to help pregnant women and children below the age of five. Chevron allege in the same report that in 2016, this programme helped 59,189 people who live in Lagos and six ‘Chevron core fence line communities of Warri North Local Government Area of Delta State’. Further on, Chevron (2016) states that they collaborated with the Delta State government through the River Boat Clinic programme. This programme was created in 2001, in attempts to help provide health care directly to communities within the Escravos area in Delta State. The report states that ‘an average of over 35,000 community members yearly’ (Chevron 2016) are provided with medical services through this programme. In 2016, the River Boat Clinic recorded 31,545 direct beneficiaries and 17,911 indirect beneficiaries. Chevron’s claim that its contribution has not only helped local communities but has led to the ending of infant and maternal morality. The report continues to discuss the different health programmes installed but Chevron. The third programme mentioned in this report is HIV/AIDS campaign. In 2016, Chevron Nigeria and other organisation teamed up to create programmes to help deal with
the HIV/AIDs epidemic across Nigeria. Although, in the report, there is very little written about this campaign in the report, it does explain that the company continues to support the campaigns efforts. In the same year, Chevron created the Prevention of Mother-to-Child Transmission of HIV. The report states that the company gave 1.43 million dollars in funding to a PACT, a non-governmental organisation that deals with health in Nigeria. The report claims that for two years, this programme will take place in three local government areas in Bayelsa State. During this period, 2000 pregnant women will be tested. Despite the duration of this programme being short, the long term effects will benefit a significant amount of women. There is a strong correlations between management of oil its effects on women’s health in Nigeria. Study’s such as Bruederle and Hodler (2017) *The Effect of Oil Spills on Infant Mortality: Evidence from Nigeria* show that there is a strong correlation between oil spills and the rate of infant mortality. They state that ‘oil spills double the neonatal mortality rate’ (Bruederle and Hodler 2017). Without these efforts being made by Chevron, it is clear to state that this would be a huge act of human rights violation due to the impact the oil drilling and spills the company partakes. Therefore, despite taking action to prevent these oil activities from happening, Chevron are focusing on minimising the negative side effects whilst continuing to partake in the destructive production.

Chevron (2016), continues to explain that the programme will help increase awareness to prevent mother-to-child transmission of HIV services in target populations. This will be done through ‘community-based mentoring and support’ (Chevron 2016). Additionally, the report further discusses Chevron’s health programme with Star Deepwater Petroleum Limited and others in the Agbami field. It is written that Chevron and indigenous non-governmental organisations partnered up to campaign and provide attention to the dangers of tuberculosis. This was done through training, counselling, management and treatment on the disease. The campaign took place in four government areas: Kano, Kaduna, Lagos and River States. N35.2 million was invested in it. In relation, the report claims that Chevron has fully supplied equipment to 25 hospitals in Nigeria since 2009 in efforts to increase Nigeria’s health infrastructure.

The report then discuss the 2016 health intervention in the north of Nigeria. Chevron (2016) claims that they focus on supporting the health sectors of areas in Nigeria with a high internally displaced persons population. Ambulances worth N47.6 million were donated to the states Yobe, Borno, Adamawa and the Ajiran community in Lagos State by Star Deepwater Petroleum Limited and its co-venturers in the Agbami field. The report later says that Chevron helped deworm 60,000 school children in four local government areas of Lagos State. It is written that the programme is aimed for children aged six to twelve to get rid of harmful worms that live in gastrointestinal system, which is the result of poor hygiene and a poor diet. Chevron write that it has donated a large amount of money towards health in Nigeria. The donations towards public services such as ambulances show that Chevron’s main concern is improving public health in Nigeria due to the fact that Nigeria has one of the worst health care systems in the world, ranking at 187\(^5\).

In terms of economic development, Chevron (2016) reports that its ‘companies promotes sustainable development, self-sufficiency and address local needs through participatory partnership and stakeholder engagement’ (Chevron 2016). Through the Global Memorandum of Understanding, Chevron claim that this helps address the challenges of sustainable development in communities surrounding their facilities, whilst contributing to the improvement of local communities.
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5 The figures are extracted from the World Health Organisation according to thepatientfactor.com/canadian-health-care-information/world-health-organizations-ranking-of-the-worlds-health-systems/
livelihoods. The report writes that the Global Memorandum of Understanding is based on six principles. These are: Participatory partnership and Stakeholder engagement, Transparency and Accountability, Sustainability assurance, Peace building and Monitoring and Evaluation. With these principles as a framework, in 2016, Chevron invested a total of N98 million sponsoring activities and programmes of government and reputable non-governmental organisations. These include: the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Nigeria, Nigerian Institute of Public Relations, Nigeria Employer Consultative Association; Society of Petroleum Engineers, Society of Chemical Engineers, Nigeria Society of Engineers, Nigerian South African Chamber of Commerce, Wole Soyinka Centre for Investigative Journalism, Nigerian Business Coalition Against AIDS; Women in Business, Nigeria Association of Petroleum Explorationists, Musical Society of Nigeria, National Youth Service Scheme, Ake Book, the Art Festival and many more. Nevertheless, these efforts can be speculated. This is on the bases on whether the nature of these donations are out of kindness or are made based on hidden agendas. It is evident that corruption is a major issue in Nigeria, and, oil companies are not portrayed in a good manner, often alleged to be involved in scandals.

The report claims that Chevron are also making efforts to improve agriculture in the Niger Delta. In 2010, the company created the non-profit organisation, the Foundation for Partnership Initiatives in the Niger Delta. This was formed to help ‘building dynamic, innovative programmes and multi-stakeholder partnerships to promote peace and equitable sustainable economic development’. The Partnership Initiatives in the Niger Delta pond project helped almost 3,610 farmers. The aim of the project is to improve catfish farming. Due to this, the farmers income increased to N531.4 million, which helped 3,838 people who lived in poor conditions. Due to success of previous mock-up models, seven more ponds were created within a year. This supported local content and helped local businesses grow. With funding of 50 million USD, the Partnership Initiatives in the Niger Delta has helped improved the socio-economic development of the local communities. It has provided opportunities for citizens to find jobs and help solve other negative livelihood elements that are the result of poverty. Due to innovative technology and ideas, Partnership Initiatives in the Niger Delta focuses on four thematic areas. These are: Economic Development, Capacity Building, Peace building and Analysis, and Advocacy. The results of the Partnership Initiatives in the Niger Delta’s campaigns are predominate reasons from why the social license for Chevron is continuously renewed. Chevron’s numerous programmes to help local communities has create a good reputation for the company. Chevron (2016) goes on to explain that in 2016, the Partnership Initiatives in the Niger Delta invested in helping practices that significantly benefitted local business owners. These investments mainly focused on aquaculture, palm oil, and cassava. Activities were also created to help improve the agronomic practices of many farmers, which led to the improve of the production rate. Technical support was provided to small business who reside in the Niger Delta. Partnerships with those involved negotiated and organised contrivances to improve access to water and hygienic products.

Chevron (2016) claim that the strategy of the Partnership Initiatives in the Niger Delta is to assess the outcomes of the projects on the local communities in the Niger Delta. Surveys that have been conducted on this show that the 3,250 farmers that started to use the practices learnt from the pond project, resulted in a 30% increase in income worth N63.7 million. Also 1,308 jobs were created. There was also a payout of loans worth N118.6 million from three small institutions. Chevron claim that the support of farmers was not only for the those in the agriculture sector, but was also for palm oil farmers. This support was shown through the programme Best Management Practices which is said to help improve the ‘agronomic practices in the farming of oil palm’ (Chevron 2016).
Chevron (2016) claims that in order to make this possible, the Partnership Initiatives in the Niger Delta worked with various different private sector partners. In 2016, the Best Management Practices programme achieved various goals such as a large number of people attending seminars, training for palm oil farmers located in areas such as Abia, Delta, Cross River, Edo and Imo States. This created awareness to farmers which led to the improvement of agronomic practices and information provided to help increase the efficiency of production. The technologies provided to help increase production were: Mechanical Adjustable Harvester and Malaysian Knife which helped harvest palm fruits and small scale processing equipment which was used to improve the efficiency of processing palm oil. In the same year, 908 palm oil farmers took on board management practices, which they adopted best management practices and developed technologies. The availability for better technologies resulted in the production of 2,448 metric tons of palm oil. This led to farmers making an overall income of N531 million which helped 3838 people in the Niger Delta. The role of Chevron when analysing the actor network between itself, the Nigerian government and local communities, can be argued as playing the “good samaritan” role. This is because of the continuous programmes and donations being implemented in the Niger Delta region. This role is positive for both the government and local communities. This is because it provides money, jobs and eases tensions between the actors.

The report explains further that the Partnership Initiatives in the Niger Delta helped improve cassava farmers’ soil management and crop production through a cassava demonstration pilot project. In 2015, Partnership Initiatives in the Niger Delta formed a partnership with Notore, Jubaili and Harvest Field agricultural input companies. Partnership Initiatives in the Niger Delta formed a pilot intervention in Ubulu-Uku, Edo State, which led other interventions. In this intervention, 40 agro-dealers were trained. This improved the relationship between farmers and oil companies, creating profit from other crops besides cassava and Partnership Initiatives in the Niger Delta partners, Notore and Harvest Field. The training provided was for cassava and maize farming were from guidelines created by the National Root Crops Research Institute. This resulted to an increase of 125% (2.1 ton/0.2ha = 10.65 ton/ha) in yield. The average income also rose by N115,675 per farmer.

Chevron (2016) then writes about the development of Appropriate Technology Enabled Developed. The programme was created to help promote Biosand Filter. This is a filtration technology. This filter helps local communities to have access to clean water by removing 99% of the germs in the water. This has led to the prevention of water borne diseases which can be passed through drinking dirty water. In 2016, 467 households in Nigeria had this technology. This led to UNICEF donating 80.7 millions Naira to help improve delivery service in water, sanitation, and hygiene across five states. Chevron claim that in relation to this, the Partnership Initiatives in the Niger Delta began to work with Proctor & Gamble, H2O for Life, and international Rotary Clubs in order to improve the education on water, sanitation, and hygiene in 30 Niger Delta schools. This is meant to be apart of an USD 800,000 water, sanitation, and hygiene programme for schools. Through the Partnership Initiatives in the Niger Delta, other organisations have invested in total, 19,000 dollars on water, sanitation, and hygiene based libraries in schools.

5.3. ExxonMobil
Bassey (2017), *Nigeria Exxonmobil Denies Oil Spills in Ibeno As Youths Protest, Block Workers* article states that the individuals: Peter Peter Afaiko who was the president of Mkpakan (a village in Akwa Ibom, Niger Delta), Itrechio Kingsley and the Chairman of Ibeno Youths Presidents' Forum, Moses Imoh all agree that the operation to occupy Exxonmobil would continue if their demands were not met. They stated that they wanted Exxonmobil to speak to them about how the oil spill will be cleaned up and ‘adequate compensation’ for the damages on the environment the spills has caused. Bassey (2017) states that in efforts to communicate with ExxonMobil, The Paramount Ruler of Ibeno, Owong Effiong Achianga explained that he had communicated with the Chairman of the Council of the spills and that ExxonMobil was ‘reluctant to claim the spill emanated from its facility’ Bassey (2017). The Chairman of the Akwa Ibom State Council of Chiefs claimed that they were ‘waiting for ExxonMobil to clean the spill and to negotiate for compensation’ Bassey (2017). In order for the protests to not become violent, Roman Esin, the Commissioner in-charge of Transport and Petroleum Affairs, claimed that he communicated with the protestors, claiming that they should ‘remain calm and peaceful’. This led to a representative from Exxonmobil, Ogechukwu Udeagha, to issue a statement, stating that the company claims that no oil was spilled from its facility.

ExxonMobil (2018) state on its website, that the company’s affiliate, Esso Exploration and Production Nigeria Limited owns 56% in the Oil Prospecting Lease and another ExxonMobil partner owns 20% in the Bonga development which is a project that is meant to extract 560 million barrels of oil and produce almost 200,000 barrels per day from subsea manifolds. Like Shell and Chevron, ExxonMobil which is the fourth biggest oil company in Nigeria, portrays themselves as environmentally and social aware. The company claims that:

“At ExxonMobil, we are at the heart of the Nigerian economy. ExxonMobil upstream subsidiaries power the economy of our neighbouring communities as well as that of the nation with significant investments and financial commitments to economic growth. One of such investments is the new Owowo oil field discovery which is projected to boost Nigeria’s crude oil reserves by 1 billion barrels, with a potential earnings of over N3 trillion, in addition to various direct and indirect employment opportunities for Nigerians” ExxonMobil (2018).

Similar to Chevron, ExxonMobil contributes a lot to improve Nigeria’s public health. ExxonMobil (2018) write that between 2007—2017, the company had donated almost N49.8 billion in attempts to reduce malaria. Clearly, public health is a common factor for Shell, Chevron and ExxonMobil. ExxonMobil continues to explain its partnership with other organisations in attempts to fight malaria. It mentions on its site that more than 48,000 pregnant women received treatment and more than 27 health facilities around 163 communities have benefited from the company’s efforts. On the site, it also states that the company has contributed to the training of numerous health facility workers on programmes such as Preventive Treatment of Malaria in Pregnancy and Rapid Diagnostic Test. ExxonMobil (2018) explains that the company’s attempts to improve its relationship with the local communities are done with ‘think-tanks and thought leadership platforms’ through organisations such as the Lagos Business School Breakfast Club, Nigeria Economic Summit Group, Society of Petroleum Engineers, National Association of Petroleum Explorationist and the Nigeria Oil and Gas conference. These are done to in attempts to improve Nigeria’s economic growth. ExxonMobil (2018) continues to write that during the
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2017 Nigeria Oil and Gas Conference in Abuja, they showcased new ideas and projects. It is also written that in the 2017 Oil and Gas Opportunity Fair held in Uyo, the capital of Akwa Ibom state, the company had presented success of projects, the near-future benefits. In addition, Exxonmobil (2018) gives writes about the success of the Erha North Phase 2 project. It states that the 2006 project is a ‘deepwater subsea development located 60 miles offshore Nigeria in 3,300 feet of water and four miles north of the Erha field’ (Exxonmobil 2018). It states that the project creates almost 65,000 additional barrels of oil everyday at peak production. Due to the fact that the project was completed ahead of schedule and under the given budget, this benefitted the project’s spending and employment. The success of this project can also arguably help improve the Owowo field discovery. The Owowo field could potentially uncover up to one billion barrels of oil and N3 trillion in revenue. The oil field could provide numerous jobs, improving the national economy. Due to this, ExxonMobil received an award for the ‘Excellence in Oil and Gas Industry’ at the 2017 Nigeria Oil and Gas Conference.

The production of oil is the focus of the oil companies. This is done through education and programmes to help provide local communities with resources to improve their livelihood. Although, it is clear that Shell, Chevron and Exxon-Mobile fail to mention the impact their companies have on land degradation. The reason for this is because of the it evidently due to the mismanagement of oil by the companies. Nevertheless, it should not go unnoticed that each company claims that they are giving donations towards Nigeria’s public health sector. ExxonMobil’s efforts showcase prospectives in upstream, midstream and downstream sectors of the petroleum industry in Nigeria, by providing stakeholders with information on projects that could help business developments.

5.4. Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation

The Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (2018), which is the state oil corporation, claims on its website that its joint venture between itself (60%) and Chevron (40%) has been the second biggest producer, estimating at 400,000 barrel per day (bpd) and has been reported to increase the production to 600,000 bpd. There is also a joint venture between Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (60%) and Exxon-Mobil (40%) which focuses on shallow water off Akwa Ibom state in the southeastern delta. Unlike the other companies, the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation provide very little information written on the company’s impact on services such as public health and education. Under the heading About Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation, the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (2018) claim that the company’s mission it to integrate oil and gas companies and do this by ‘engaged in adding value to the nation’s hydrocarbon resources for the benefit of all Nigerians and other stakeholders’. It is written that the company’s goal is for it to come a predominate oil and gas company ‘by shared commitment to excellence’. The Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (2018) that it has four core values. These are: Respect for the Individual, Staff development and growth, Integrity, transparency and accountability and Professional Excellence. In terms of the actors networks, these core values are essential to understanding actors motives and behaviours. With these core values, the he Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation could help improve relationships, therefore, improving the management of oil.

Throughout the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (2018) text, it is clear that the company’s main concern is economic gain. This is similar to the other oil companies but is not the pre-
dominate focus in their descriptions. The Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (2018) vaguely mentions the company’s efforts to improve social livelihood in the Niger Delta, only mentioning in when describing the company’s mission. Nevertheless, under the heading, Corporate Social Responsibility, the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (2018) writes that it works at the ‘highest social, environmental and safety standards within the country’s oil and gas industry’. This can be argued as false due to the ongoing social unrest the company and it joint ventures create due to oil spills (see chapter 4.4), but the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (2018) fail to go into details about what the company actually does to meet these standards. Under the same heading on the webpage, the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (2018) claim that the company’s strategy is on the bases of supporting education, improving public health, and developing local economies in the areas it operates in. The only information written in detail about the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation’s impact on local communities livelihood is education. The Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation write about the importance of the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation’s Annual National Quiz Competition, stating that:

“The study of science, technology, engineering and mathematics is a fulcrum of the Corporation’s efforts to participate in the nation-building process due to the key roles these fields of learning play in the growth and stability of the Nigerian economy. Accordingly, the Corporation introduced an annual quiz competition which commenced in 2000 with participants drawn exclusively from the Niger Delta. However, in recognition of the strategic importance of this competition to the actualisation of Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation’s corporate social responsibility objectives and its role in supporting the local content development goals of the Federal Government, especially as it relates to the oil and gas industry, the competition was transformed into a nationwide exercise in 2001” (Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation 2018).

This is the only information written on the site that mentions social efforts. Nevertheless, the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation state that currently the competition is positively impacting Nigerians. They argue that an example of this is of a past winner who came in 2nd place in a contest which involved people from the Organisation of the Petroleum Exporting Countries, to celebrate the 50th Anniversary. The Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation claim that since the change in the company’s leadership, there has been continuous improvements towards the competition. Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (2018) claim that these changes have led to. This places the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation is a good position when analysing how the company is viewed internationally. Due to the fact that is is government owned, it can be argued that the corporation do not have the best publicity due to the alleged scandals it has been involved in (see chapter 4 onwards).

The Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (2018) state that the company’s partnerships with the West African Examinations Council, the Junior Engineering and Technical Society, and the Science Teachers Association of Nigeria improve the standards and quality of the competition. It is stated that in 2017, the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation will hand out a ‘one-off’ grant for education. Each of the winners will receive N100,000 and a school scholarship award of N300,000 will be given to an overall winner. Those who come in 2nd and 3rd place would receive a scholarship of N250,000 and N200,000.
Like the other companies, the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (2018) mentions nothing in regards to the environmental violations implemented in the Niger Delta. Clearly, from the information provided, the company’s main goal is to maintain a significant position in Nigeria as well as to generate money. In comparison, Shell’s undertone in its briefing notes are similar to the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (2018). Although it provides vivid information on its involvement in improving Nigeria’s health sector unlike the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation, Shell blames the slow progress of the improvement on the Niger Delta’s environment on social violent methods (see chapter 5.1.2). But, Chevron does not present itself in this way. In the company’s notes (see chapter 5.2), they have discussed numerous programmes that help support local communities. Whether is based on good will or not, it is clear that this oil company is doing much more than the others based on this information.

Oil companies that work in the Niger Delta are pressured to diversify their profits into local communities. This has significantly risen because of the failure of the Nigerian government appropriately intervening. In addition, oil companies are also pressured into correctly compensation local communities for the social and environmental damages their facilities have caused. Although this is fair, the response of the oil companies are often problematic. Projects and donations are often viewed as methods used to create peace for a short while and not to actually improve development. There have been situations were scholarships have been given to the younger generation of Nigerians in order to stop hijackings and sabotaging of the oil facilities. This increases the chances of corrupt officials and different violent activists becoming involved in scandals. These groups often use wealth and violence to control local politics in the region (Lackey 2007:105).

5.5. Government Agencies

Environmental ethics demand corresponds with the basic goals of postmodern science which is characterised by ‘tolerance, discipline, clarity and solidarity within divergent views’ (Oshita 2001). However, within the Niger Delta, these basic characters are absent. The government, the oil companies and the local communities are intolerant of one another. There is no discipline, clarity and solidarity. These constitute to the ongoing issues in the region, therefore creating difficulties when governing oil in the area. The government has been unwilling to implement the policy goal of the national policy on the environment. The objectives of this policy which aims at sustainable development are as following:

“(1) To secure for all Nigerians a quality environment adequate for their health and well being; (2) To conserve and use the environment and natural resources for the benefit of the present and future generations; (3) To restore, maintain and enhance the ecosystem and ecological processes essential for the functioning of the biosphere to preserve biological diversity and the principle of optimum sustainable yield in the use of living natural resources and ecosystem; (4) To raise public awareness and promote understanding of essential linkage between environment and development and to encourage individual and community participation to environmental improvement efforts; and (5) To cooperate in good faith with other countries, international organisations/agencies to achieve optimal use of transboundary natural resources and effective prevention of abasement of transboundary environmental pollution” (Asuquo et al 2010:25).
It can be argued that there is no precise way on how oil extraction is monitored in Nigeria. From the evidence provided above, the extraction of oil is mostly done discreetly, only coming to light when social protests arise which catches the media’s attention. There are very few sources that are written on how the extraction of oil is monitored. Although, the Organisation of the Petroleum Exporting Countries is used to integrate petroleum policies to create an efficient economy (Organisation of the Petroleum Exporting Countries 2018). Nevertheless, there are some cases of the Nigeria government monitoring the extraction of oil. For example, in 2008, the government issued a statement saying that a new company is needed if the extraction of oil is to begin in the Ogoniland region again (Corby 2011).

The Emuedo et al (2014) article argues that problems in oil operations by Shell in the Niger Delta show that although the company in Nigeria accounts for 14% of its oil production worldwide, it also accounts for 40% of oil spills worldwide. Clearly, the lack of management the oil companies, in this case Shell, is extremely problematic because an enormous amount of oil is being spilt. Emuedo et al (2014) later state that between 1976 — 2005, 3,121,909.80 barrels of oil in around 9,107 incidents was spilt in the Niger Delta.

Figure 1: Oil spill monitor of the Niger Delta from the National Oil Spill Detection and Response Agency

The map presented in figure 1, shows the results of the ‘Oil Spill Monitor’ provided by the National Oil Spill Detection and Response Agency based on data provided by the oil companies. According to the map, the majority of the oil spills are located in Benin City, Warri, Owerri, Port
Harcourt and Yenagoa, all in the Niger Delta. On the map, the National Oil Spill Detection and Response Agency show that the majority of oil spills in Nigeria are the result of third parties. The map shows that the reason behind these oil spills are more predominate to the small amount of spills caused by oil companies and sites that have not been investigated. Also, in the map, the agency shows the vast amount of the oil spilt has been cleaned up, refuting the arguments that have been presented by ongoing social protests and studies (see chapter 4).

According to Shell’s letter to Human Rights Watch (1998), charges against those who destroy oil facilities are rare. This is because in order to press charges, those who commit the crime must be caught in the act or have concrete evidence against them. Also, because the penalties against this crime are severe, it is not in the company’s interest to press charges even if there is evidence against the perpetrators. The company ELF, stated that ‘sabotage cases are normally reported to the police, but we [the company] do not enforce prosecution for the interest of peace’ (Elf petroleum Nigeria LTD letter to Human Rights Watch 1998). But, it was reported that Shell paid Nigerian government hush money for the company’s input in the destruction of the environment in the Niger Delta (Vidal 2011).

Many cases in the Niger Delta result in a small amount of compensation being paid to the leaders of the communities. Once this is done, the developers are given a license to find a way around environmental laws and standards (Adeh 2010:11-12). One example of the complexity of interactions is the building of the bridge from Ogoniland to Bonny Island. Adeh (2010) writes that according to the Nigerian government, this project is being built in order for liquefied natural gas to be transported via land as well as ‘personnel’ reasons. Adeh (2010) further writes that Gitto Costruzioni Generali Nigeria Limited, an Italian multinational firm were given permission to conduct this project. Various Nigerian’s such as the ex Vice President of Nigeria, Alhaji Atiku Abubakar are said to be major shareholders in the firm. In this case, Gitto Construzioni Generali Nigeria Limited had ignored making the required environmental impact assessment (EIA) mentioned in the EIA Decree (1982), which makes it compulsory for large scale projects to do an environmental impact assessment or a baseline study to examine the social and environmental impact of this project. This led to many farmers, fishermen and local conservationists expressing their view on the project, arguing that it may lead to the extinction of animals and plants in the area. Adeh (2010) claims that experts in the region believe that the Niger Delta coastal terrain would move 30km inland and the sea level would rise up to a metre if the project took place. This will further the negative impact on the land and soil, ultimately leading to a loss of mangrove ecosystem and marine habitat which is also explained in Emuedo et al (2014) (see chapter 4.1.2). There has been numerous media reports on rising sea levels due to the mismanagement of oil in the Niger Delta. For example, Adeh (2010) writes that ocean surge has taken over a significantly large about of the landmass of Ayetoro in Ondo state in land spots where buildings such as schools and churches are at the bottom of the sea. Adeh (2010) continues by arguing that pipeline explosions and oil spillages have become common disasters in the Niger Delta. There has been over 4000 oil spills since 1991, and in 2002, there was a cholera outbreak in Ondo due to the water being contaminated because of an oil spill. Thus, in the process of building the bridge the Nigerian government have allowed large amount of creeks, ecological sanctuaries, rivers and farmlands to be destroyed.

Although very little justice has been served when dealing with corruption and scandals, according to the BBC online article (2015), Nigeria’s former oil minister (2010-2015), Diezani Alison-Madueke had been charged with money laundering and bribery. According to the article, Alison-
Madueke was accused by the Nigeria’s central bank governor, Sanusi Lamido in 2014 who himself, had later been fired for the same reasons. The article states that $20 billion of money from the oil sector had gone missing under Alison-Madueke’s leadership. BBC (2015) wrote that President Muhammadu Buhari ‘vowed to trace and recover’ the ‘mindboggling’ amount of money that had been stolen and prosecute those involved. It is clear that there has been a shift in the Nigerian’s government behaviour when dealing with corruption and scandals. This is a breakthrough from the government’s past behaviour. This then led to the Petroleum Industry Bill (2017). In May 2017, according to the petroleum industry bill’s website (2017), the Nigerian Senate passed the Petroleum Industry Governance Bill. This bill is a legislative reform bill for Nigeria to improve its governing of oil and tackle issues such as corruption. Clearly, the Nigerian government efforts to change its way of governing oil. The fact that this bill was passed clearly shows that the current government are attempting to reverse policies (see chapter 7).
6. Local voices

In this chapter, I will be addressing how the oil industry impacts local communities. In this section, I will analyse newspaper articles and present interviews I conducted myself to give a full insight on how local communities deal with the environmental impacts of oil. This chapter will focus on the interviewees viewpoint on the actions of the Nigerian government and oil companies. To compliment my review on research papers and journal paper articles as well as the reporting from the companies themselves, I also wanted to represent some local voices. I will therefore highlight interviews with local resident from the Ogoni Delta from various sources. To complement these, I have carried out telephone interviews in the spring 2018.

6.1. Impact of the oil industry on everyday life

The AllAfrica (2017) article quoted in Chapter 4, it states that fishermen were also protesting because of the damage oil spills have on marine life, ultimately significantly impacting their livelihood the most. In the article, AllAfrica (2017) wrote that a fisherman named Asuquo Edigheyong claimed that ‘our [agriculture workers] farmlands, fishing and other maritime activities, which remain our only source of livelihood has been completely disrupted’. Due to the governing of oil being poor, this has significantly impacted the aqua-life in the Niger Delta, ultimately and directly impacting local communities. This creates further problems in the actors network because of the blatant impact it has on health.

In the interview I conducted, I asked the interviewees about their own views on the relation between the oil companies, the Nigerian government and local communities. There was an overall discontent with the relationship between the actors. This can be seen in Obi (2018) response. When asked about the impact the oil industry had on her life, she answered:

“I myself cannot fully explain the impact the oil industry has had on my life because it is all that I know. The constant protests, the poverty, the lack of jobs. This has been going on for years. There has been scholarships created for us [Nigerians] to apply for but only very few get it. I myself have a masters degree and I still do not have a job. Unemployment its a big problem in Nigeria and it only seems to be getting worse. I believe the oil companies and the government need to do something to stop our suffering. We have all this money and all these resources but nothing is being given to the people”.

Due to the fact that oil has been the centre of debate in Nigeria for decades, it has become a norm for Nigerian’s such as Obi (2018) to state that oil has had a negative impact on Nigeria. From the information provided (see chapter 4.2.1), It is clear that not only environmental damages of oil impact the livelihood of local communities, but their own economic gain due to the
fact that unemployment is a significant problem in Nigeria. Clearly, the frustration amongst those who do not benefit from oil are voiced through social protests which have now spiralled into extreme violence. Clearly, many are not benefitting from the region’s oil wealth and demandig jobs and infrastructure development (Owolabi 2017).

The participants were then asked if the oil industry had effected their lives personally. One of the interviewees was Benson Wenenda Garshon (2018), a 26 year old from the River States who is currently doing his masters in the University of Port Harcourt. He also works part time as a contractor with GBN Nigeria Enterprise. Although partly employed through the oil industry, Benson replied: ‘as an individual their has been no real or significant impact of the oil industry on my life. The negatives outweigh the positives’. Obi (2018), who was already quoted above replied that the oil industry has ruined her and her family’s livelihood. She stated that majority of her family are from Ogoniland had to move to Lagos because of the environmental damages. Obi (2018) wrote that ‘although life is better in Lagos because of the job opportunities and living standards, we had to leave our homes behind. We had lived there all our lives’. Sherif Apuntaku (2018), who is a 32 year old man that works in a printing company in Abuja, also described how he had been personally affected by the oil industry. He stated that:

“I have been personally impacted by the oil companies. I used to live in Bodo but I had to leave because of the damages they were doing on the roads from transporting things for the oil companies. I had to leave my job and me and my family had to start again. It was really hard. Luckily we are ok now but it was very stressful because no matter who we spoke to and begged to stop, they did not listen”.

All three participants agreed that oil companies have huge impacts on the development of rural areas and local communities when asked to describe the role of oil companies in Nigeria currently. The programmes and projects created by companies are used to control local communities and management in the region. All the interviewees also agreed that the oil industry had contributed to the GDP and sustaining Nigeria’s economy. When asked about the benefits from the these programmes, Benson (2018), replied that the benefits includes improvement of rural life through provision of clean water supply, infrastructures and scholarships, whilst Obi (2018) and Sherif (2018) mentioned the supply of clean water and the scholarships.

6.2. Oil industry and the environment

In 2002, Chief Ime Titus Okopido, who was then minister of state for environment, stated that:

“Over the past decades, the Niger Delta terrain has been overrun through deliberate over exploitation carried out in total disregard of the basic principles of sustainable environmental management” (Adeh 2010:6).

He also added that:

“A large of part the Niger Delta region has been turned into an ‘environmentally barren’ wasteland, which has led to loss of lives and pollution of drinking water and loss of income from fishing for lots of people in the region” (Adeh 2010:6).
According to Adeh (2010), The Nigerian government labelled these crimes as ‘heinous environmental crimes of multinational oil companies’. The environmental effects on flora and fauna was reviewed in detail in Chapter 4.1. It is clear that the environmental consequences of oil production and management in the Niger Delta has been key in mobilising social protesting. Adeh (2010) written that in an conducted interview with an environmental non-profit organisation, a resident in the Niger Delta named Daniel Akpere who lost all his belongings in an oil pipeline explosion, explained the issues such as water contamination and poverty. He stated that:

“If you see the food that I eat now, you will be surprised. There are no crops left on our farms and we have no money to buy food because we no longer have a source of income. Some children have been dropped out of school because their parents no longer have the money to retain them in school. As you have come here, we cannot give you our water to drink, if we give you we are poisoning you” (Adeh 2010:9).

As stated before, the oil industry, despite the economic gains, creates consequential problems. Emuedo et al (2014), made an extensive survey with residents in three villages in the Niger Delta (Nembe, Okpare and Okirka). When questioned about the impact of crude oil on fish catch, the results showed that almost 75% of the respondents saw a decrease in fish catch and 8% claimed fish catch had actually increased in the region. In the same study, when asked about the condition of the mangrove wood, 77% of the respondents claimed that mangrove wood has become scarce, whilst 7% said there was no scarcity of mangrove wood.

In reaction to Emuedo et al (2014) study, in the interviews I conducted, I asked the interviewees what/how(if) has environmental problems affected the oil industry in Nigeria. All three participants agreed that the major environmental problem from oil spills is the destruction of the marine ecosystem. They simultaneously agreed on the destruction of marine ecosystem heavily impacting their livelihood because of the health issues created from it. When asked about the biggest impact the oil spills have on land, they all said black soot, pollution and deforestation.

6.3. A changing industry

In the interviews I conducted, I asked the participants how they perceive the management of oil in Nigeria and to define the relationship between the government and local communities in the context of the oil industry. All three interviewees agreed that the relationship between the local communities and the Nigerian government was hostile. They all claimed that the reason behind this was because very little to no attention is being paid towards the social and environmental disasters of oil (refer to chapter 4).

When asked if the oil industry had changed over the years, Benson (2018) responded that the oil industry has not changed much. He claimed that the ‘significant changes are in technological advancements and more oil exploration in different regions in Nigeria’. Sherif (2018) also agreed with this, responding with the same answer.

When all three interviewees were asked to give a statement on the relationship between the Nigerian government and oil companies and if they have seen a change in the relationship, Ben-
son (2018) answered that ‘relationship with government and oil industry hasn't really changed much, only policy reviews and licensing to oil block ownership’. Obi (2018) stated that ‘the relationship between the government and oil companies is based on continuing to produce oil’, informing me that from her viewpoint, this has always been their relationship. Sherif (2018) responded that he has seen no change in the government and oil companies relationship, agreeing with Obi (2018) that the main focus has been on the production of oil. Clearly, each interviewee claims that the network between the two actors have not changed, only influencing each others policies because they share the same ultimate goal of producing oil efficiently.

When asked to comment on the role of the Nigerian government in the oil industry as a whole, Benson (2018) replied that the relationship between the Nigerian government and the oil industry has remained the same, stating that this relationship is on the bases of ‘limited involvement of the government whom are only confined to royalties and taxes’. It is evident that from Benson’s (2018) view, not much has changed from when Nigeria was decolonised or from the joint ventures (see chapter 2.2). Nevertheless, Obi (2018) and Sherif (2018) disagree with Benson (2018). Both agree that the relationship between the government and the oil industry has changed due to the Nigerian government recently diverting their policies, focusing and committing to agriculture. Both claim that although the Nigerian government is still involved in the management of oil, they have started to focus on agriculture and minerals (see chapter 7.1).

When questioned to describe the power relationship between national organisations and international organisations when dealing with the monitoring and regulating of the extraction of oil, Benson (2018) claimed that national organisations have limited power in monitoring/regulating the oil industry in Nigeria but the Organisation of the Petroleum Exporting Countries which is an international organisation, has significant regulatory and monitoring impact’. When analysing the role of the government in the management of oil, it can be argued that they have no control over the oil because they are overlooked by the Organisation of the Petroleum Exporting Countries. This can also been seen in the influence oil companies have on policies (see chapter 5). Due to this, the government cannot implement policies, therefore questioning its authority. Both Sherif (2018) and Obi (2018) agreed with this. Obi (2018) stated that ‘national organisations have very little control over the oil in Nigeria. International organisations are the ones who control most’ and Sherif (2018) responded that ‘international organisations are the ones that control the oil management here [Nigeria]. National organisations have to live up to the rules given by the the international organisations’.

I asked the interviewees if current social protests and media has altered the oil industry in Nigeria. Benson (2018) replied:

“The major social protest is done by the various militant groups in the Niger delta, whose activities such as the destruction of pipelines and oil company facilities has almost crippled the nations oil dependent economy and reduced the output from oil in the region”.

This is in agreement with chapter 4.2.2. The impact of the activists violent methods has created more damage than good, not only affecting the social well being of Nigerian citizens and the environment but the economy which has already been discussed. In response to this, Obi (2018) replied that:
“Social protest and the media attention has created fear for us [Nigerians]. The actions of groups such as the Niger Delta Avengers has led to a lot of money going to waste because of their activities”.

Clearly, the ongoing social aspects have exposed the negative effects of the oil industry. This has created fear for Nigerians because of the violence it creates. This is problematic when analysing the actor networks because it alters the behaviour of local communities, therefore, impacting the relationship with the oil companies and government, therefore influencing their behaviour.

Sherif (2018) agreed with both interviewees, stating that:

“It creates fear throughout Nigeria. A lot of money has been spent and lost because of the violent social protests and the media creates fear and anger because many Nigerians are suffering and cannot afford things. Money is being spent due to the violence of these activists, it’s upsetting because it should be used to help us”.

When questioned on what the biggest factor each interviewee believed the oil companies and the government fail to see when managing oil in Nigeria, all participants believed that the actors failed to see the concept of peace. They argue that this is because the government and oil companies fail to improve the environment by following guidelines and implementing new policies.

When asked if the participants believe the problem/s associated with the oil industry can be amended or mitigated, the interviewees all agreed that the relationship between the actors need to change and differed in an approach. Benson (2018) claimed:

“To solve this requires a participatory approach whereby the communities are actively engaged and their issues listened to with solutions offered according to their needs. They’re duly compensated and the oil companies should ensure that any activities that my result in environmental impact and loss of the source of livelihood for the Niger delta indigenes are limited”.

In response to the question, Obi (2018) responded with a similar solution. She stated:

“A better relationship between the Nigerian government and people is needed. I don’t think the oil companies should be involved because this is an issue only Nigeria can solve. We have had a lot of interventions with others and nothing has worked. Only we can solve this. The government has to listen to us and take action when needed. Not only when the oil companies complain”.

Obi’s (2018) approach is more domestic in comparisons to Benson’s (2018) Benson (2018), focuses on all actors, believing that all are necessary to change the management of oil in Nigeria. It is clear that Benson (2018) believes that local communities should have more of a say when on the management of oil and how it should be governed. Obi (2018), on the other hand, believes that the oil companies should have no involvement. This can be explained because of the influence the companies have and the scandals that they have been apart of (see page 25). Sherif (2018) agrees with both Benson (2018) and Obi (2018). He states that ‘the government needs to listen to us [Nigerian citizens]. Instead of ignoring or half-heatedly doing things, they need to take on board our concerns’.

Lastly, the interviewees were asked to define what the Nigerian government has done to tackle the the negative side effects (eg in terms regulation of actors/environmental monitoring/social
justice/corruption) of the management of oil. All three agreed that the Nigerian government has done little. Benson (2018) stated that there is not any ‘proper environmental monitoring and the little social justice is amnesty for the agitating militants forgetting the real settlers of the Niger delta. In terms of corruption, there has always been media trial with no major conviction’. Both Obi and Sherif stated that corruption was the reason to why the Nigerian government has done little in improving the oil management. It is evident that this is a significant factor as to why nothing has been done about the damaging effects of oil (see chapter 3.3). The fact that corruption has always been an issue in regards to this matter and still nothing has been done about it, clearly shows that the internal issues in the Nigerian government has to be tackled in order for progress to be made.
In this discussion, Genova and Falola’s (2003) *Oil in Nigeria: A Bibliographical Reconnaissance* will be used as a blueprint to assess and understand in detail, the impact of oil in Nigeria throughout literature. Foucault’s theory on governing will be discussed in this chapter as a means to understand the structure of each actor. This chapter will also assess the significance of the role oil has played in Nigeria, and whether the agricultural shift the Nigerian government is currently undergoing, will be able to achieve a similar economic impact.

It is evident that oil sustains Nigeria’s economy because it provides revenues which empower oil exporters to go forward in creating micro and macro economic growth. If Nigeria was not an oil-deprived country, it can be argued that the advancement rate would be set back and life would be harder. Due to this, oil is a crucial element in legislative issues, which is why it is predominately in the centre of political and economic procedures (Ndimele 2017:343). This can be seen in the literature provided in this study. Genova and Falola (2003) argue that ‘the richness of writings on oil in Nigeria, a country that call no longer be understood without considering the ambiguous role that oil has played in its history’ (Genova and Falola 2003:156). Clearly, for there to be an understanding on the management of oil in Nigeria, different sources on the subject have to be taken into consideration for there to be a conclusion on how it is managed and how it can improve. Genova and Falola (2003) argue that from the literature provided on oil management in Nigeria, it is clear that oil has created ‘permanent features of Nigerian society’ (Genova and Falola 2003:156). They argue that literature shows that Nigeria is dependent on western countries and that this needs to be limited.

Genova and Falola (2003) overall argument is that, the understanding of oil in Nigerian history has shaped perception and knowledge today. Without the literature that has been provided on oil in Nigeria, one will be unable to understand the growth and obstacles the country has had to face. The literature on oil in Nigeria gives a timeline and frame of the policies of the country. Due to the fact that it plays a significant part in social and economic life, it has and will always be the focal discussion of political debates. From this, it is clear what the actor-network theory bases on the oil management of Nigeria is. The constant shifts in the actors dominance in the oil management shows that despite their differences in attempts to govern oil, they all have one thing in common, the improvement of livelihood.

### 7.1. Summary

This thesis has assessed the impact the petroleum industry has on the Nigerian political, environmental and social sectors through the analytical findings, scientific data and written reports. Nigeria has always been significantly economically dependent on oil since the late 1950s. Shell-BP, the leading oil company in the petroleum industry has played a dominant role in this dependence, influencing the shift from agriculture to petroleum. This thesis focuses primarily on the governance theory and actor-network theory - as well as other arguments, which analysis the relationship between all actors - and an investigation on past and present issues which could provide an awareness and new outcomes. The fifth chapter begins with an analysis on the social
impacts of the oil industry such as how the oil companies portray their activities, what they contribute to Nigerian education and health, and how local communities and the non-profit organisation, Amnesty International view the actions and behaviour of the oil companies. This is a response to chapters three and four which are close studies on the environmental damages in the Niger Delta because of oil. The sixth chapter continues to provide information on this matter but from those who lived in the local communities affected by the disastrous impacts of oil in recent years or from those who reside in the Niger Delta. Currently, there have been violent activists movements which has caused more social and environmental issues. There has been continuous media reports on pipelines being blown up and oil facilities being hijacked. This has led to an enormous amount of money being spent to pay ransoms and damages.

The findings were extracted from online newspaper reports and websites which helped provide an insight on mostly the social activities. These sources were used continuously throughout this thesis to help create a vivid understanding and a broader picture of the impact the management of oil has on local communities.

The policies regarding oil are implemented by the Nigerian government but, are heavily influenced by oil companies. It is clear that both of these actors depend on each other. This then fuels anger amongst local communities who live in oil based areas because the government are working with people who negatively impact their livelihoods. Lack of transparency, neglect, and taking responsibly from the side of both the Nigerian government and oil companies continues to fuel the vicious cycle that contributes to the social unrest. It is clear that the lack of communication between the actors enables the distrust and violence within local communities and the actions of officials. This is difficult to resolve due to the different agendas of each actor, causing controversies in the Niger Delta. When assessing the impact of oil in Nigeria, it is clear that there are several, both positive and negative. In terms of the economic impact, oil provides a high GDP for Nigeria. It should not go unnoticed that because of oil, developments, programmes and training have been provided to citizens in the region. Donations and efforts have been made to better Nigeria’s health, education and technology sector, but, it can be questioned whether these actions are genuine or the result of international backlash the oil companies have received due to actions towards their management of oil. Although, oil has shaped Nigeria because it is the foundation of the economic advancement that has led to achievements through the opportunities the resource has created. It is clear that without oil, Nigeria would not be at an advanced level it is today internationally. Nevertheless, in recent years, the Nigerian government has changed its attitudes towards petroleum. According to the online article Africa African Media Agency (2018), it claims that Nigeria has introduced a recovery plan in the sectors: agriculture, manufacturing, and solid minerals, including iron, gold and coal. The article states Tonye Cole, the co-founder and CEO of the Sahara Group claims that:

“We [Nigerians] must free the potential, free the diaspora, and allow the free flow of ideas. Nigeria should allow its states to be autonomous. We have a growing young population with huge talents but who are leaving. They have to come back and invest in the country”(African Media Agency 2018).

Clearly the strains from social unrest has impacted the governments actions to diversify economy. The need to endorse in other sectors and move on from past activities is crucial because it offers various opportunities. The worry of younger generations not partaking in agriculture in Nigeria significantly increases the chances of the sector failing again. Currently, there has been
signs that Southern Nigerian youths leaving the region in comparison to those in the North. This results in an older generation of farmers who are less technologically aware in comparison to the younger generation continuing to work (Ejiogu 2018: 91). Education is needed in order for older farmers to become technologically aware. The Nigerian government needs to focus on this for the agriculture sector to flourish. Although programmes have been placed, these predominately focus on younger generations who are not interested in farming. In order to spark the interest of agriculture to the younger generations, the Nigerian government needs promote this. Therefore, education is a necessity for this problem because it can be argued that many are unaware of the benefits of agriculture or have lost hope due to the continuous damaged on the ecosystem they reside in.

On the domestic level, oil has then led to the neglect of other sectors which are vital to the livelihood of Nigerians and risks. Although the oil industry has contributed to the growth and development in Nigeria, it should not exclude the fact that the oil exploration activities and oil management activities have severely destroyed the Niger Delta (Kadafa 2012:1). Environmentally, oil has had no positive impact on Nigeria. The continuous oil spills as shown in Chapter four and thirst to expand the exploration has resulted in marine life declining, land degradation and pollution with immediate health problems that are long term. The majority of the environmental problems focal issues are: Air pollution and gas flaring; water pollution; land and forest degradation; and oil spillage from pipeline explosions (Adeh 2010:6; Osho 2006:62). This is clearly ecocide. Nigerian citizens rely on water from lakes, rivers and streams which are being exposed to harmful chemicals because of this pollution (Adeh 2010:8). In order for the management of oil to be resolved, it is evident that the relation between the government and local communities is required. Local communities want to be compensated for the loss of their livelihood, but, are forced to accept compensations valued by oil companies, ‘with no meaningful way of obtaining an independent determination of their loss’ (Manby 1992:201). In this sense, local communities have no power when governing oil, although protests and media attention has been used as a tool to get their voices heard, economically, they have no source of power.

Socially, due to the results of the environmental impact of oil, Nigeria has seen continuous issues surrounding human rights violations. From the oppression of those who protest to the imprisonment, living displacement and murder of those in local villages, it is evident that oil production has both fuelled these horrific problems. Shell supported and the Nigerian government’s violent actions towards local communities. Both Shell and the government did not attempt to use non-violent methods to stop the protests like their opposition. Clearly, both actors concern was and still is economic growth and because of this, found multiple ways to maintain their position when managing oil. Local communities continuously face pressure from not only the oil companies mismanagement of oil, but from Nigerian forces and the government. It is valid to state that this is systematic oppression and corruption. This can be argued because the ‘oil companies act as a destabilising force, pitting one community against another, and acting as a catalyst’ (Shah 2010). In addition, this can also be seen through the relationship with militant forces. Violence is a method that has now been taken up by the latest wave of activist groups. It can be argued that this has happened because of the endless human right violations, damages the oil companies and the Nigerian government actions have had on the environment, as well as increasing unemployment rates has constantly burdened local communities. Then again, the militant groups can be seen as doing more damage than good. Although their agenda is to stop further damage of the Niger Delta’s ecosystem and improve their livelihood, they themselves are damaging it further. The use of violence should not be a means of trying to get a point across, although nothing had changed through peaceful protests, the shift in present day activism to activism in the 1990s, has had more negative then positive impacts internationally.
The attitude of the actors in the oil industry are the main contribution to the management of oil. The oil companies are influence not only on a domestic level but on an international level. Pressure from consumers, non-profit organisations and other international bodies have forced oil companies in Nigeria to reinvent themselves, taking corporate social responsibility. Rather than trying to classify each actor as either good or bad, it is more important to assess how they choose to deal with the social, environmental and economic outcomes of oil. For example, the oil companies regard themselves as positive actors in Nigeria because their facilities provide employment, GDP and various social sustainability programmes to better the livelihood of local communities. Nevertheless, these attitudes can be viewed as fluctuant because of the possibility of hidden agendas behind them. From the oil companies point of view, it can be argued that they are helping economic growth, improving the livelihoods of oil employees who are threatened and targeted against violent angry protestors who destroy oil facilities (this is similar to the motives of the oil companies) but, at the same time are also at the centre of corruption (also applies to the oil companies). The Nigerian government, on the other hand can be viewed as bad because of the very little attention that they have paid towards the local communities. This can be seen from their lack of involvement in oil issues surrounding the environment and past violent methods used to oppress local communities. Both actors can arguably view each other as those who are victims to the violent protests. This is because of the continuous oil spills and hijackings which cost both the government and oil companies large amounts of money.

Despite the government’s new attitude towards agriculture being seen as good and the oil companies recent attempts and programmes (see chapter five) being seen as a positive step forward, it is clear that the negative portrayal of both actors has left a stain, typically being labelled as the villains. For example, in a report by Essential Action and Global Exchanged (2000), it claims that consumers of Nigerian crude oil in the U.S and European Union through ad campaigns etc, illustrate the idea that oil companies are helping Nigeria because they are providing help and economic development resources. The report states that this is false, reporting that delegates who monitor major multinational oil companies in the Niger Delta have poor environmental guidelines, public health principles, human rights principles and communications with local communities. The report further states that the oil companies charitable behaviour are disrespectful to the local communities they claim to help.

As discussed in the introduction, the relationship between the state and the oil companies is a very complex one. Although the state owns most of the oil (see chapter 5), it is clear that the oil companies influence the government’s decisions, which allows the continuation of environmental damages. Although, from the evidence provided in this thesis, the oil companies, the government and in recent years, local communities through violent protests are complicit in the oil spills and environmental issues. Then again, Adeh (2010:6-7) argues that the main reason for the extreme figure of oil spills in the Niger Delta is because the Nigerian government is the largest shareholder in the oil and gas drilling. Throughout the years, the various Nigerian governments have looked at pollution as a means for profiting from servicing debts and continuous bills being charged to Nigeria.
7.1 Conclusion

According to Foucault (2014), the shift from oil to agriculture by the Nigerian government, the problems that arise for the oil companies and the obstacles for the local communities are created by the behaviour that consists of thinking that no power is ‘obvious or inevitable’, no power ‘warrants being taken for granted’ and no power has ‘intrinsic legitimacy’ (Foucault 2014: 77). Due to these attitudes creating and resulting to complex situations, it is clear the management of oil in Nigeria is uncovered. The attitudes and behaviour of all three actors creates uncertainty of who is in the right and who is in the wrong. It also creates uncertainty of who controls the oil in Nigeria because all three actors are dominant figures with different motives. Both the Nigerian government and the oil companies focus on economic activities. The economic activities of the oil industry can not be fully understood without understanding cultural attitudes. This could potentially prevent irrational economic choices if understood (Frynas 1999: 226). This further supports the argument that oil is ungoverned because despite the dominance economics plays in the management of oil, society is the one to actually follow the policies and if this is not successful, the government, oil companies and other authority facilities will no longer be able to govern (Foucault 2014:15), despite the economic power it holds. Nevertheless, the local communities are still oppressed even though changes in activist methods have given them authority, therefore not being effective to its potential capacity.

All in all, it is evident that each actor has their own agenda when managing oil in Nigeria. The Nigerian government solely focus on the political and economic aspects oil provides Nigeria, paying little and at times, no attention to the social and environmental aspects. When attention is paid to these aspects, it was often met with violence. Although, the shifts in the actors attitudes have led to predominant developments, this has not stopped or influenced each actor to change. The oil companies agenda’s heavily focus on the financial gain. Although the companies provide social help through education, technology and public health, it is evident that this is due to the mounting pressure the media and social protests have given the companies. The local communities agendas are primarily focused on social and environmental aspects of the oil. These are the reasons behind their protests through the years.

As seen in chapter two, the growing process of the extraction and management of oil led the creation of domestic problems. The focus on the oil industry drove the other sectors, mostly agriculture to the brink. Then again, on an international scale, oil put Nigeria in a strong position. The fact that the oil production rate was faster than the other commonwealth countries (see chapter 3.2) led to interest from foreign companies, therefore increasing the production and exploration of the resource. This can be arguably seen as the beginning of the environmental damage of what can be seen in the Niger Delta today and because of this, the production of oil resulted in the local communities protesting, ultimately spiralling out of control (see chapter 4). These protests led to a wave of media attention but despite this, little to nothing was changed. Although oil companies compensated to local communities arguably through programmes, donations, there are still continuous protests and many are still unhappy. The role of oil in Nigeria has led to each actor being on different sides of the fence. With the government and oil companies having similar
agendas, the local communities are fighting for themselves receiving attention only from the media.

Clearly, the roles which each actors play can be define in the following: the Nigerian government plays the role of enabling and allowing the destruction of environment in the Niger Delta, whilst the oil companies are protecting their own interest and will do this by any means necessary. The local communities play the role of protecting their livelihood at any cost.

But, it can be seen that all three actors use violence in their methods, whether physically or influentially. Although they differ, it is seen that each actor has or are currently using violence as a means to implement their ideologies on the management of oil. In the past, the Nigerian government and oil companies have supported military force to oppress local communities. Although in recent this has not occurred, it can also be argued that the current ecocide both the Nigerian government and oil companies are apart of is an act of violence because of the destruction it causes in the ecosystem, inevitably destroying local communities livelihoods. This did differ but now is similar to the local communities use of violence. In the past, peaceful protests were used as a means to create awareness of environmental damages due to oil facilities which the Nigerian government allowed. Currently, violent methods are used.

Despite the negative impacts of the management of oil has had politically in Nigeria, there has been positive impacts. Oil has put Nigeria on an international scale which has resulted in various foreign companies investing in the country. For the Nigerian government, this has created foreign relations and improve current ones through negotiating trading deals. Oil has also created revenue from the oil companies. For the oil companies, it is obvious that oil has benefitted them through being a valued resource in itself. Oil is used to fuel machinery such as planes and cars, it can be used to make various products such as plastic. This expands the oil companies business because the resource is so versatile and is needed for everyday uses. This can also benefit the Nigerian government through joint ventures. For the local communities, oil has created jobs and has led to the creation of health and educational programmes. Without oil, employment in oil based regions will be significantly low.

However, it should not go unnoticed that since the early stages of extraction, oil in Nigeria has led to corruption and mismanagement. Global Poverty Project (2012) writes that according to the World Bank, it is estimated that because of corruption, 80% of the revenues in energy benefit only 1% of the Nigerian population. Additionally, agriculture which currently accounts for 26.8% of GDP and two-thirds of employment has decreased in productively. Global Poverty Project (2012) further writes that Nigeria has potential to be a main exporter of livestock and food. Due to the agricultural neglect, Nigeria relies on imports of food.

The numerous problems surrounding oil has led to oil being ungoverned. This is because of the conflict happening between the actors. Each actor focuses more on controlling or oppressing the other through their tactics. This has not only worsen the management of oil but it has led to there being no actual ownership. Although oil companies and the Nigerian government clearly have financial control of oil through policies and other legal aspects, it can be questioned if this actually means that they themselves govern oil. The violent activism by militant groups have shifted ownership over oil, making it difficult to actually define how oil in Nigeria is governed. Foucault (2014) writes that this is difficult because ‘how could one govern without knowing what one governs, without knowing those one governs, and without knowing the means of governing both these things and these people’ (Foucault 2014:5). This applies to both the role of oil companies and the Nigerian government. Due to the rise in activists violent approach, the Nigerian govern-
ment and oil companies have no control over the oil industry despite attempts to stop sabotages to oil facilities. Due to the neglect towards social opinions, this is an increasing problem in the management of oil. Although aware of the environmental damages the extraction and management of oil has on local communities livelihood, it is still ignored. This leads to officials not taking into consideration of the full impacts of oil, therefore having no control over the resource and those surrounding it. This same analyst can be applied to local communities. The new efforts to fight the environmental damages of oil has resulted in more damage and because of this, social attempts on managing oil have worsened the environment. Without understanding the management of oil or finding new way of protesting which isn’t violent or peaceful - peaceful protests did very little but create media attention - those who participate in this violent activism, will continue to contribute to the damaging impact of oil.

Nevertheless, the Nigerian government in recent years have shift their focus on other economic sectors such as agriculture. This could be the answer to not only combating the environmental issues and the hostile relationship between all actors, but could also improve industrialism in Nigeria. If focused on, the agricultural sector has the potential to produce raw materials that are needed in the manufacturing sector (Ejiogu 2018:89). This could also lead to the creation of jobs but only through having efficient farms with good infrastructure communication networks, aspects that are poor in Nigeria despite the developments. In order for the Nigerian government to successfully improve the agriculture sector, it is clear that social investments are vital.

7.1.1 Suggestions

For the agricultural sector to thrive, it is clear that the Nigerian government needs to focus on these elements: the involvement of youths in agriculture, the expansion of agricultural enterprise, a transformation in the environment, and opportunities provided in agriculture.

Firstly, it is important to promote agriculture to younger generations. The need for people to work in this sector is key to promote and create efficient production. Although programmes have been installed to help this, it is clear that younger generations are not interested in agriculture. Ejiogu (2018) argues that ‘one reason youth do not take up agricultural practices would be structural transformation’ (Ejiogu 2018:91). The Nigerian government will have to change its attitudes towards social concerns and implement ideas and programmes to influence younger generations to be willing to work in agriculture. There needs to be a public awareness from the Nigerian government to help improve production in this sector. Nevertheless, despite efforts made by oil companies, it is clear that this only targets a few and it very problematic (see chapter 5.1.5).

Secondly, there needs to be an expansion of agricultural enterprise. Although oil companies have promoted and installed programmes to help, the Nigerian government itself has done very little. Society needs to be insured that their government is fully behind this movement. All Nigerian citizens should be able to access this and not only those from local communities have experienced first hand the lack of agriculture. A universal awareness will not only help increase the employment, but, would help grow it into a business which could promote individualism and would transform the current environmental problems. In relation to a transformation in the environment, this take that the Nigerian government could adopt would influence and ultimately change the behaviour of the oil companies. This is because the complete unification of the Nigerian people and government supporting agriculture will force oil companies to change their policies in order to keep up their production rate. In addition, this will significantly decrease hijacking and destroying of oil facilities which are not only an economic loss, but, damages the envi-
ronment and creates social tensions. This lastly impacts opportunities provided in agriculture. Although, this is heavily related to the expansion of agricultural enterprise due to the opportunities this could create. It is clear that the areas that need to be expanded have to be pinpointed. Opportunities for all Nigerians is vital. As stated before, it should include all Nigerians, whether they live in agricultural regions or not. It should be promoted to different classes, gender, age etc. This can be done through education. The Nigerian government must focus on education to help promote agriculture. This, as well as the influence from the media, are vital tools that could be used to revive the agricultural sector.
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