



## PRIMARY RESEARCH

# Exploring Karl Marx dialectic materialism in the context of Nigeria state

Dike Alexander Ifunanya\*

Igbinedion University, Okada Edo State, Benin City, Nigeria

## Keywords

Marxism  
Capitalism  
Political economy  
Poverty  
Development

**Received:** 25 October 2020

**Accepted:** 13 February 2021

**Published:** 26 March 2021

## Abstract

This paper is an exposition of Karl Marx's political economy to review the philosophical, scientific explanation of historical materialism and relevance in Nigeria. The paper submitted that Nigeria's political economy history reflects evidence in Karl Marx, especially the periods that spanned pre-colonial, colonial, and post-colonial independence era. The paper concludes that Nigeria is in the full-blown capitalism epoch, and state policies have thrived. Nigeria State, therefore, reproduced capitalism and ideological repression of wage/salary workers and the masses. Notwithstanding the inevitability of capitalism and attendant consequences of poverty and socio-economic pressure in Nigeria, it is recommended that public-private partnership be a continuum in providing essential services in which consumption and demand are inelastic. State intervention is non-negotiable in essential services to mitigate the purchasing power of wages and salaries in the inflationary trend, which has soared continuously in Nigeria for decades.

© 2021 The Author(s). Published by TAF Publishing

## INTRODUCTION

The ideas and writings of Karl Marx resonate in the socio-economic discourse of the global world. Marx provided foundation of social discourse around production system and state formation. Central to dialect discourse of Marx was a form of production by which the state and citizens relate. According to the dialectic construction, society is a transition of one historical epoch to another epoch and such transition is distinguished by production system (Ritzer & Stepriksy, 2017; Wibowo & Zamzamy, 2015). The writings of Marx were preoccupied with the critical construction of relations to production and the role of state. The production system that lied at the heart of Marx was description of structural arrangement and distribution of power owners of means of production and organized labour within the production system. In this light, material dialectic is a theoretical hypothesis that justifies economic structure as determinant of superstructure and survival therein (Ritzer, 2011). In the structural analysis, Marx defined that there

are components parts classified and these parts operate at the superstructure level. Here, social institutions such as legal, religion, family, education and economic constitute the social structure which defines the superstructure (Rosen, 1998). However, economic was theorized by Marx in the light dialectic materialism and determinant of other superstructure. The analysis is that the structural arrangement of society or otherwise state is hinged on the foundation of allocation of resources that strongly determine the structure's survival. The interest of Karl Marx was therefore to identify contradiction that bedeviled allocation of state resources.

Abundantly, Marx writings preeminently identified historical epochs which differentiate economic structure and relations to means of production. In this case, social histories were classified into slavery, communalism, feudalism, capitalism and socialism. Each history was a characteristic of class formation and economic struggle. Slavery is described as prehistory which was resemblance of Thomas Hobbes'

\*corresponding author: Dike Alexander Ifunanya

†email: damilolamicah@yahoo.com



state of nature (Zhaohui, 2019). Society and state formation progressed communalism, feudalism, capitalism and socialism. Capitalism was the critical concern for Marx. The capitalism epoch offers class division and structural formation of owners of means of production and labour hired to produce the means of production (Ritzer, 2011). Marx contended that the growth of capitalism was dialectic materialism. Owners of capital and labour that produced the capital were drawn in perpetual conflict due to exploitation and desire to maximize profit for the capitalist and desire to maximize wages for the labour. Here, two polarized social class was pressed in the mind of Marx and this consisted of bourgeoisie and proletariat. The former is the class of capitalists and owners of means production; the latter is the class of labour or workers that are producers of capital, goods and services. The emergence of capitalism was a product of state metamorphosis, which transited in the hypothetical social contract. Practically, the formation of any epoch is a signature of collective conscience and consent, either consciously and unconsciously.

According to Thomas Hobbes, social contract is formed under psychological need of man to get protection from state of nature described as brutish, selfish and savagery (Ake, 1982; Southwood, 2013). Government is therefore formed to contain illicit, brutish and crude nature; and protect properties of society. Whereas John Lock in his Treatises posited that such a contract was a product of expansion in society's production size, Jacques Rousseau posited that the normative and idealized social contract was essential (Adewole, 2014). Capitalism is one of such contract that existed in the society and this was prominent in the heart of Marx. Although hypothetical theory of social contract existed in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries that predated Marx in the 19th century, Marx was an exposition that was critical of capitalism contract. It was primate in Marx's heart to construct social theory, which ultimately whittled down the power of capitalism contract due to contraction that encapsulated the phenomenon. Therefore, the goal was to theorize formation of a new state or government that promotes state ownership of capital through which government rather than individuals owns capital and redistribute wealth nation.

Marx himself and some followers in the realm of Marxism and Neo Marxism were passionate about growth of socialism as new social contract. This looks perfectly as resurrection of Lock's idea on the true original extent and end of government (Hosein, 2013). Capitalism was a form of government which to Marx was a breach of contract and cannot be suitable to benefit equitably. Socialism was predicted as

an offshoot and new government in the writings of Marx. Interestingly, Marx's idea is a subject of debate in the academic world, business angle, state policies and corporate realm.

The specific objective in this paper is to document some of the writings of Karl Marx and draw inferences in relevance to Nigeria development. It must be emphasized that the ideas of Marx were adopted by many Nations and State policies in some countries hinged to promote government regulations in critical socio-economic sector to accommodate equitable distribution and redistribution of common wealth. Nigeria is a nation within the global village especially now that neoliberal ideology has dominated the global space. This paper is significant in drawing a line of demarcation between invigorating neo liberalism and the continued relevance of Marxism in state governance. The option discretely opened to developing nations or Third World is assimilation of capitalism ideology deeply rooted in the dictates of Western World. At the same time, government in the Third World like Nigeria is careful to erode the value of collective ownership and socialism which bound government to redistribute wealth of nation as bail out for citizens. However, the literature gap is the inadequate knowledge that bridges Liberalism and Marxism as inseparable ideologies in the 21st century socio-economic governance. It is a fact that global nations are intertwined in socio-economic and political relations and this makes it difficult to undermine global summit and resolutions which place nations on the path of rapid development. It is a common academic knowledge to surrender either neoliberalism or Marxism at the realm of supremacy over the other. Literature is replete with the foregoing conclusion (Ogbuju & Eneh, 2014; Onodugo, Benjamin, & Nwuba, 2015; Rufus & Eyo, 2017). Yet each of the above ideologies is relevant and can be synthesized especially now that state intervention is important in invigorating neo liberalism.

The construct in this paper relied on a secondary source of historical books, journals and personal experience. Archival materials were searched from both electronic and manual libraries. Books and journals which related to writings of Karl Marx, Marxism and history of Nigerian society were consulted to build explanation. The writer extracted some writings of previous authors and applied to construct new explanation.

## MARX'S HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Karl Marx was keenly interested in reconstructing society in his economic theory. Although scholars before Marx constructed theories of materialism 'that offered explicit

knowledge, Marx's theory was revolutionary, especially when he lived. The philosophical disposition of Marx was designation of society as material history which understanding is derived from dialectic construction (Ritzer & Steprisky, 2017). Theorization of dialectic was major difference between Marx and theorist before him. Dialectic materialism was central to Marx in the sense in which he constructed a theory of society. According Marx, the history of hitherto society is the history of class struggle (Quigey, 2011). This theory's philosophy is that Marx was scientific to derive classification of society into components social institutions and derivation of functions performed. In the analysis of Marx, society is a composition of legal institution, political institution, economic institution and family institution. While it is possible that these institutions perform significant functions which hold society perpetual, Marx was keen to designate economic institution as the base of society which centrally determines the survival of other institutions.

Marx derived his dialectic materialism from the function of an economic institution (Ritzer, 2011; Rosen, 1998). According to Marx, all social institutions are superstructure of society due to essential functions it performed in society's survival. But economic structure is a sub structure within the superstructure which acquires deterministic status and predicts the survival of other structure (Ritzer & Steprisky, 2017; Vajda, 2015). Here, Marx argued that material structure was philosophy of existence and competition for acquisition was the base of historical epoch. Marx analysis was derivation of social history which sought to understand the configuration of material structure that described state formation. Abundantly, competition for material acquisition was Marx's intention to reduce his period of society to Darwinism, in which the fittest dominates competitive society (McNight, 2010).

Marx's dialectic predicts that interfaces between economic materialism and society superstructure is a product of history. The historical epoch is derived from contradiction in each history which inevitably birth new history. Therefore competition between social is hitherto the history of society. Marx reduced explanation of social history to the class struggle (McCulloch, 2007; McNight, 2010; Ritzer & Steprisky, 2017). This theory scientifically proved that the formation of class society was responsible for shift in history. Also, each history must be understood and analyzed by class formation within it. In this dialectic structure, material acquisition was the beginning of competition and class struggle to survive individual, nuclear family and extended family. Against this backdrop, Marx was aware

that society was once a classless type where resources were communally owned, shared and utilized for the benefit of all. The progression of social interaction to material acquisition was dialectic epoch, and Marx was critical of the histories that diminished people's equality.

Marx's writings were response to inequality of his society, the 19th century Europe. This was the period industrial revolution was widespread and waxed strong material acquisition of industrial capitalist (Giddens, 2015). Marx having the intellectual capacity and roundly from middle class parents, challenged the existence of history during his period. It was Marx's intention to underscore contradiction within capitalist society of the 19th century. Therefore, he engaged his dialectic construction to criticize justification of capitalist history, which enhanced the polarization of class division between the haves and have-nots. According to Marx, the haves is the capitalist that acquires material gains in the form of capital, wealth, factory and industrial organization. This acquisition grants owners of capital power to dominate and exploit the labour which produced the capital. However, the have-nots not represent portion of labour or individuals that produced capital and wealth of the capitalist. The labour suffers alienation due to configuration of class society. Marx's composition of alienation consciously informed his dialectic materialism and historical epochs.

### THE FIVE EPOCHAL PHASES

The interest of Marx was to mark and distinguish social histories where it could be possible to locate suitability of his theory. Remarkably, Marx was interested in constructing that every society is a product of economic history and class struggle within each history that produced the next epoch (Giddens, 2015). Accordingly, Marx traced five epochal histories to reconstruct his scientific theory. Here, Marx identified the communism stage, slavery stage, feudal stage, capitalist stage and socialism stage. Marx started his historical theory looking at the economic forces that prevailed in history. Communism appeared to Marx as first history which prevailed in human society. According to Marx, there is no human society which did not experience the communal period in which people lived in classless society and resource of the society evenly distributed. Communalism was the first history, and society during this history was close knit social relationship, small scale, and extended family was the economic base of society. Marx traced this period to prehistory and prescience of the primitive age (Estelio, 2014). It was the period of medieval and pre-philosophical age in which reason was conditioned by supernatural power. Communalism was described as era of pre metaphysics and

theological stage of reason (Cohen, 2008). Marx argued that although communalism was classless society, there was an element of state formation and government that organized society against anarchy. In Marx's explanation, the expansion of population increased competition for survival and there was rationality to define personal ownership and acquisition (Comninel, 2013). This however expanded man's knowledge and consciousness to distinguish personal ownership.

Slavery was the epoch of society that consciously established era of ownership and propertied society (Chakrabarti, 2014). Here, Marx progressed to discuss dialectic materialism which began with slavery era (Blackledge, 2017). It was the period man differentiated sense of acquisition and status which apparently ranked one above the other. There was now rationality to build self properties and fence round it having discovered the importance of power to dominate others. Marx recognized that slavery was the transition epoch to materialism. He was scientific to identify some characteristics that prevailed as preparatory for historical transition in his dialectic construction. In the slavery epoch, there was drive to acquire power and control others. Every man's natural instinct developed to dominate as much there could be less privileged people coerced in the dragnet of control (Chakrabarti, 2014). Marx recognized that the slaves were the less privileged and properties of the few in the society. Therefore, there was the imposition of ideology and creation which conveniently transited society to another history. Slavery was the beginning of materialism Marx emphasized.

The feudal epoch was conveniently achieved by having acquired slaves as property composition and class imposition. In this epoch, Marx theorized that class society was distinct. It was possible to identify social class which people belonged. According to Marx, it was the period of monarchy in which owners of slaves' reconfigured society between rulers and the ruled. 'Slaves' owners could establish territories which were convenient to pronounced government. This epoch consisted of the kings, lords and serfs. Marx's dialectic materialism was critical of feudalism as much as the stage was pre-takeoff of capitalism. Marx pointed that feudalism already contained capitalism's manifestation due to prospect to acquire private properties (Callinicos, 2011). Here, the kings owned the land and properties in the territories that fell within the government of rulers; the landlords were answerable to the kings and in turn paid rent fines to kings; and the serfs were slaves or workers in the land properties of the lords. Charles Montesquieu in his theory of government identified the three estates of his pre

society to consist of clergy, monarchy and gentry; his society also consisted of monarchy, capitalism and working class (Hosein, 2013; Southwood, 2013). The intention of Montesquieu was a draft of definition of government which could be effectively operational in a class society. Marx contested that there was contraction in each history which inevitably gave rise to new epoch.

Capitalism therefore emerged consequent upon the dethronement of monarchical society. Marx was curious to state that class struggle was driver of history. Potentially, the landlords were conscious of the need for private acquisition of properties. The landowners were also conscious of the importance of power, knowing that serfs were directly subjected to whims and caprices. It is the material acquisition that preserves the basis of the struggle. Notably, there was transition in status at the epoch of capitalism. Marx maintained that capitalism is product of two classes which he derived to consist of bourgeoisie and proletariat (Giddens, 2015; Ritzer, 2011). The two classes are derivative of German words. The bourgeoisies were former land owners and proletariats were serfs. This is transition in status acquisition as implied in Marx work. Here, the former landlords acquired full control of ownership and it was without submission to kings/government. The serfs no longer bear the tag slave; rather, it transitioned to working even though there was little or no change in economic status. Marx was convinced in his scientific hypothesis that class struggle was a continuum phenomenon. He argued that history will regularly regurgitate class struggle, potentially adequate to defeat capitalist epoch (Ritzer & Steprisky, 2017). The materialistic acquisition of capitalist resembles the previous history, which is sufficient to produce the next history Marx called this socialism.

The socialist epoch was Marx's vision in which history of class struggle reconfigures materialism to benefit all class equally. Socialism is the ultimate scientific theory of Marx which precedes the last stage return to communalism (Southwood, 2013). According to Marx, society transits capitalism to socialism which is consequent on the same conflict pattern that every epoch witnessed traceable to slavery, feudalism and capitalism (Stumpf, 2001). However, Marx was cautious about stating that socialism would consist of similar contraction as feudalism and capitalism. Marx's vision was social theory of society through which class formation will be socialized to the doctrine of equality and collective ownership. It is social theory of revolutionary thinking which organizes the proletariats in the position of leadership as the last history of history. Marx was convinced that this epoch will metamorphose from capitalism's



inevitable collapse since there were histories that predated capitalist ownership.

Indicatively, socialism was not achieved during the 19th century period of Marx. This was the period Marx lived in the mainstream capitalism and industrial revolution of the 19th century which began in the mid 18th century of cotton revolution, steam machine and factory system. Marx's prediction began more than a century after his death in communist China and Eastern Europe of the later part of 20th century.

### THE HISTORY AND STRUCTURE OF NIGERIA ECONOMY

According to Marx, every society is a product of an economic history, which is ultimately the history class struggle. Nigeria is classical economic history which is constructively relevant. Nigerian economy is a product of pre colonial, colonial and post-colonial histories. The pre colonial epoch was a period of traditional economies which was marked by reigns of monarchical system. The pre colonial history of Nigeria was replete with indigenous control of the economies. This period signified delineation of Nigeria into local geographical arrangement prior to the designation of the name Nigeria (Uzoigwe, 2008). This means there were ethnic groups which independently managed economies of territories under control. Nigeria was classified into Yoruba, Igbo and Hausa which were dominant ethnic groups. The ethnic groups were composition of other smaller ethnics that were important and channeled resources in domain area. Pre colonial Nigeria was a manifestation of class structure, and class struggle was inevitable in society's production. Like the case of feudalism in Marx's history, colonial period was an accurate resemblance. The kings and chiefs occupied domains of authority over the subjects that were largely kins of extended families, and slaves that served the avaricious gluttons of kings.

Abundantly, the pre colonial period was a production of monarchs, landlords/landowners and kings' slaves. The pre-colonial kings acquired endless authority over all land assets in the domain. The landowners were expected to pay rent and fines to kings at specified schedules. The slaves were properties of kings which could be used for menial jobs or degrading activities according to whims and caprices of kings. Marx pointed that feudalism predated his period. However, feudalism operated in Nigeria until the latter part of 19th century which marked expansion of colonialism in Africa and Nigeria. Here, the traditional rulers of the pre colonial were abruptly overthrown by colonial masters that expanded capitalism to African for exploitation of resources (Omoyibo, 2012). Marxism's interplay is a

connection of Marx's historical class struggle which was the hypothetical prediction of new epoch (Ritzer, 2011; Rosen, 1998). Nigeria feudal society was extremely resisted and reconfigured to give rise to colonial capitalism.

The colonial period was the establishment of the capitalist epoch. This was the period of early 20th century lasted more than five decades. Colonial economies were marked with years of servitude, indigenous struggles and diplomatic resistance to alter the history (Okigbo, 1998; Omoyibo, 2012). In the mean time, colonialism was the expropriation and annexation of Nigerian economies to grow European capitalist empire (Effoduh, 2015). According to Marx, the avaricious and glutton desire of capitalist to accumulate surplus labour, exploitation and maximize profit was necessary to regroup the once conscious working class to form union of collective purpose, class consciousness which was inevitable to dethrone the capitalism epoch (Ritzer & Steprisky, 2017). Abundantly, the political class of the Northern and Southern Nigeria was aware of the urgent need to terminate colonialism (Ikenna, 2009). Indeed, colonial period did not extend a century before the history was terminated to reproduce new epoch.

The aftermath of Nigeria colonialism was post-colonial state ownership which culminated the period of 1960 independence and post independence era. This period was marked by state intervention in multinational corporations, state commercialization of economies and state intervention in health services, education, security, infrastructure and social amenities (Effoduh, 2015). In Marx's ideal society, Nigeria offered checklists which fulfilled his vision of state ownership of the means of production. Nigeria in the post independence period and up to the decade which preceded the economic depression of the early 1980s, economic prospect was fantastic, buoyant and competed robustly with international capitalists' economies of Europe and America (Ajayi & Oshewolo, 2013; Effoduh, 2015). This was evident manifestation of Marxism which draws contraction of capitalism and inevitable epoch of socialism. Unfortunately, this period did not last more than two decades when globalization of the world economies reconfigured Africa's weak societies in line with capitalist ideology. The latter part of the 20th century was strenuous and stringent economic dictates of Breton-Wood Commission such as World Bank, International Monetary Organisation and World Trade Organisation, which largely conditioned Africa's socialist economies, and Nigeria in the global economy has little option.

## CAPITALIST EXPERIENCE IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY NIGERIA

Marx felt that by looking at the actual history of real human societies, one forms a very different view of the world. More specifically, Marx concluded that if we look honestly at the historical record of material (economic, social and political) events taking place from the ancient through the feudal and ultimately to the capitalist form of political economy, we find a pattern emerging. Based on this pattern, Marx felt it was possible to predict the emergence of a new form of social order (Marcus, 2014). We must begin by identifying the two prevalent classes—the bourgeoisies and the masses. Unfortunately, at independence, however, three sectors of economic activity emerged: first, the public sector, which was dominated by the activities of the government and its agencies; second, the semi-public sector in which the government joined with private enterprise as partner or sponsor; and third, the private sector for private corporate and individual activity. In each of these sectors, two major classes are noticed—the bourgeoisie and the masses. The politicians, merchants and bureaucrats occupied the upper class also known as the bourgeoisie; the workers and the masses occupy the bottom layer of poverty (Ajayi & Oshewolo, 2013).

Suffering under the hammer of the colonial mongers, the indigenous people saw the need for unity. The clamour for unity and the self-consciousness of the oppressed seem to have brought to an end the colonial powers—unfortunately, it did not (Uzoigwe, 2008). Little did the masses know that the independence of the country in 1960 will not end the long history of the very forms of exploitation, rather it ushered in a more dangerous times—a period marked by the exploitations from indigenous capitalists. Rather than ushering in a better form of economic system, it launched all into an era of neocolonialism (Azhar, 2020; Wainwright & Mann, 2020). The leadership of the blacks over the blacks became like that of the lion over the animal kingdom. It gave rise to period rightly referred to as an era of post-colonialism. Why has further developmental movement seem almost impossible? Colonial policies impeded further developmental movement. For Ogbuju and Eneh (2014), the advent of the British colonial mongers made the people to lose sense of fraternity, a sense of innocence and values of just and cooperative societies.

As Marx pointed out, the state became nothing but the management of the common affairs of the bourgeoisie (Ritzer, 2011; Weiss, 2020). Ritzer (2011) opined that the state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie. As state institutions are parts of the su-

perstructure determined by the interests of the dominant class, the state then becomes an instrument of the ruling class as defined in terms of control over the means of production. Ojukwu (1969) observed that from the moment of independence, all forms of corruption in public life found a good thriving ground in Nigeria, as also different forms of injustices, oppression, discrimination, rivalry, suspicion, and hate. Chaos was growing. Civil strife was evident. Lives and property were destroyed. All was to satisfy political ambitions and fulfill sectional interest and the inevitable consequence was a civil war. Ojukwu discovered this late because this dark cloud started gathering even before the independence. In line with this view Omoyibo (2012) wrote that this structure had its root from the colonial era, which was a deliberate policy by the colonialist to debase colonial states from productive capacities in order to export and entrenched capitalism. On this, Vajda (2015) lamented that the state is a key factor in the political economy; it determines the direction of production, distribution, and resource allocation. The fragile production base and the resultant social forces of production have not been able to support any socio-political transformation that would engineer collective mass action of an active society. And the state has been a factor that helps preserve the private bourgeois structures by this act and perhaps also help in modifying them.

The reduction of the inequality and the class struggle between the upper and lower economic class, the decade before the Babangida regime, that is the administration of Obasanjo, Shagari and Buhari, was an age of prohibitions in which the economy was almost being choked to death by controls from politicians who are indirectly working for their masters (Ajayi & Oshewolo, 2013). On the other hand, the Babangida era was an age of transition; it tried to dismantle the controls exercised on the economy by politicians and bureaucrats for over four decades (Okigbo, 1998). Unfortunately, it failed. Up till date, the disparity between the rich and poor widens. Nigeria was one of the few African countries to have realized that the survival of the people under capitalism as a philosophy of economic growth has its woes. And having gone far, it seems almost impossible moving back. Although there is alternative ideology that detachment from colonial policies and being guided by a proper national policy, capitalism's positive fruits could yield a better economic system. This ideology is faulty due to evidence that shows otherwise poor human capital development in the midst of rampaging capitalism and collaboration with internal and external bourgeoisies.

## CONCLUSION

The ultimate goal of Karl Marx is the transition of history in the realm of socialism which marks the end of epoch of the political economy. Marx was pained by the contradiction inherent in capitalism epoch which polarizes owners of corporations including top managers employed within it; and working class of the corporation that produce capital accumulation. The history of Nigeria like other countries is an imaginary picture of Marx's scientific philosophy. Nigeria has progressed through the political economy histories from the pre colonial to colonial and to post colonial periods. These stages replicated the primitive communism, slavery, feudalism, capitalism and socialism. Specifically, communism, slavery and feudalism were captured in the pre colonial; capitalism was an offshoot of colonial expansion; and socialism was abundantly captured in the post colonial period, though this period was conquered by the invigorating power of capitalism. Socialism in Nigeria was pretence of state intervention due to the fact that this epoch was not only short lived; it was mixture of state collaboration and Capitalist Corporations. Indeed, the powers of international corporations was subversive for many African nations like Nigeria especially the 21st century configuration sponsored by capitalist Western countries and its relentless power to dominate in the post colonial era. Fundamentally, human capital development in Nigeria was better during the idealized socialism of the post colonial period of the 1960s, 1970s and early part of 1980s. Abundantly, these periods marked manifestation of Marx's desire which lifted masses above poverty.

Unfortunately, Nigeria economy in the 21st century is manifestation of capitalism and production of internal and external bourgeoisies on the rampage of exploitation of the masses, high cost of living, poor wages and salary, and poverty dragnet. There is state collaboration in the metamorphosis of Nigerian capitalism. This however makes it difficult in the meant time to defeat the existing socio-economic history. Nevertheless, the contradiction in the present history can be mitigated. Against this backdrop,

some recommendations and implications are outlined in the following section.

## LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper is intended to justify the need for state intervention in the midst of invigorating neo liberal policies which permeate democratic governance in Nigeria. The paper interlock Marxism as intervention in the global socio-economic and political relations in which Nigeria operates. The writer synthesized Karl Marx's dialectic materialism to construct nexus between state intervention and neo liberalism, which mediate the capitalist world's contradiction, which mediate the capitalist world's contradiction. The intention of the writer was ideological model of intermediation between capitalism and socialism. It can expand the current intellectual discourse empirically and methodically in a large scale descriptive study.

This study outlines following recommendations:

- i. Capitalism is an invigorating reality in Nigeria and there is relentless state bureaucracy built around it to flourish in the spate of rising poverty. This paper recommends unbroken public-private partnership in the provision of essential services which consumption and demand is inelastic. State intervention must be unhindered in a capitalist economy like Nigeria whose population is largely in poverty.
- ii. Karl Marx was hopeful that capitalism will contract and shrink in size which will give rise to full blown socialism. Marx's writing was pointing to extreme polarity and unresolved conflicts between the social class which consists of capitalist and labour. There is manifestation in Nigeria given evidences of industrial strikes aimed to redistribute wealth of the nation. Unfortunately, Nigerian state is frontier and image of the capitalist given unbridled economic policies fine tuned in the interest of capitalism. Against this backdrop, it is recommended that the legislature should provide intervention in state policies which hamper human capital development. The legislature is the oldest organ of government in Nigeria and should be seen as check and balance to executive rascality which promotes capitalist ideological repression.

## REFERENCES

- Adewole, A. (2014). Social contract theory and the problems of contract vitiation in citizens and constituted authority relationship: A case study of political dissidents and ethnic Militia in Nigeria. *Journal of Good Governance and Sustainable Development in Africa (JGGSDA)*, 2(3), 1-9.
- Ajayi, R., & Oshewolo, S. (2013). Historicizing African's development crisis, In Odukoya A. O (Ed.), *Alternative development strategies in Africa*. Lagos, Nigeria: CBAAC Press.
- Ake, C. (1982). *The political economy of Africa*. Washington, DC, WA: Brooking Institute.

- Azhar, S. (2020). Consumption, capital, and class in digital space: The political economy of pay-per-click business models. *Rethinking Marxism*, 4(6), 1-21. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/08935696.2020.1750196>
- Blackledge, P. (2017). Practical materialism: Engels's anti-dühring as marxist philosophy. *Critique*, 45(4), 483--499. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/03017605.2017.1377927>
- Callinicos, A. (2011). *The revolutionary ideas of Karl Marx*. London, UK: Haymarket Books.
- Chakrabarti, A. (2014). *Historical materialism: A critical assessment*. Calcutta, India: New delhi Press.
- Cohen, G. (2008). *Karl marx theory of history: A defense*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Comninel, G. C. (2013). Critical thinking and class analysis: Historical materialism and social theory. *Socialism and Democracy*, 27(1), 19-56. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/08854300.2012.754671>
- Effoduh, J. O. (2015). *The economic development of nigeria from 1914 to 2014*. London, UK: Harper Press.
- Estelio, I. (2014). *Dialectical materialism and economic determinism: Freedom of the will and the interpretation of behavior*. Florida, FL: Noctua Press.
- Giddens, A. A. (2015). *Social theory and modern sociology*. Oxford, UK: Sage.
- Hosein, A. (2013). Contractualism, politics, and morality. *Acta Analytica*, 28(4), 495-508. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12136-013-0198-0>
- Ikenna, M. A. (2009). Understanding the crisis of development in Africa: Reflections on Bedford umezs analysis. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 3(9), 354-359.
- Marcus, E. E. (2014). Gramsci's political thought. *New Political Science*, 36(2), 245-242.
- McCulloch, H. J. (2007). *The hegelian basis of dialectical materialism*. Boston, MA: Bay Press.
- McNight, A. N. (2010). A pragmatic and pedagogically minded revaluation of historical materialism. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies (JCEPS)*, 8(2), 1-27.
- Ogbuju, S., & Eneh, O. (2014). Locating the reality of the social contract theory and the failed state concept in Nigeria's governance. *Sustainable Human Development Review*, 6(1-4), 6-19.
- Ojukwu, O. C. (1969). *Biafra: Selected speeches*. New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Okigbo, P. (1998). *The nigerian economy: An overview*. Lagos, Nigeria: Macmillan.
- Omoyibo, K. (2012). Marxism and the Nigerian state. *European Scientific Journal*, 8(11), 1-14.
- Onodugo, I. C., Benjamin, A., & Nwuba, B. N. (2015). Security challenges and the survival of democracy in Nigeria. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 4(10), 27-34.
- Quigey, T. R. (2011). *Historical materialism, encyclopedia of philosophy*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Ritzer, G. (2011). *Sociological theory*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Ritzer, G., & Steprisky, J. N. (2017). *Sociological theory*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Rosen, M. (1998). *Karl marx, encyclopedia of philosophy*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Rufus, A., & Eyo, D. (2017). The lockean state of war and the Nigerian state: A comparative analysis. *Global Journal of Human Social Science: F Political Science*, 17(3), 35-41.
- Southwood, N. (2013). *Contractualism and the foundations of morality*. London, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Stumpf, S. (2001). *Philosophy: History and problems*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill, Inc.
- Uzoigwe, D. C. (2008). *Economic development in Nigeria through the agricultural, manufacturing and mining sectors: An econometric approach* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa.
- Vajda, M. (2015). *Marx materialism*. London, UK: Sage Publication.
- Wainwright, J., & Mann, G. (2020). Capital and climate in times of coronavirus: Reply to critics. *Rethinking Marxism*, 32(4), 451-458. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/08935696.2020.1807237>
- Weiss, J. M. (2020). Understanding fascism today: Nationalism, group psychology, and the return of the old. *Rethinking Marxism*, 32(4), 496-520. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/08935696.2020.1796074>
- Wibowo, P., & Zamzamy, A. (2015). Failed state and threats to human security. *International Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences*, 1(4), 140-146. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.20469/ijhss.20002-4>
- Zhaohui, H. (2019). Directions of the chinese communist party's political reform. *Journal of Advances in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5(5), 226-235. doi:<https://doi.org/10.20474/jahss-5.5.4>