

Crude Oil Prospecting and Security Challenges in The Niger Delta: A Case Study of Rivers State

Ottih, Rosecolette Ihuoma¹, Prof. H.E. Alapiki², & Dr Innocent Barikor³

¹Doctoral Candidate, Department of Political & Administrative Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria

²Professor of Political Science, Department of Political & Administrative Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria

³Lecturer, Department of Political & Administrative Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2023.70739>

Received: 09 June 2023; Revised: 24 June 2023; Accepted: 29 June 2023; Published: 01 August 2023

ABSTRACT

This paper examined the effect of crude oil prospecting on the increasing security challenges in the Niger Delta with specific emphasis on Rivers State. It was stated that the discovery of crude oil in the Niger Delta especially Rivers State has not brought to the region the anticipated socio-economic development but rather, decades of crude oil prospecting, oil exploitation, exploration, and production activities in Rivers State have led to severe environmental degradation that has created complex problems (including insecurity) in the State. While adopting the relative deprivation theory, the study argued that the relative deprivation of the inhabitants of Rivers State of a secure and safe environment that is not polluted through crude oil prospecting has invariably increased agitations by various competing groups with varying interests thereby leading to an increase in the spate of insecurity in not just the Niger Delta region particularly the State. While also applying the qualitative methods of data collection and analysis, the study discovered that there is a link between crude oil prospecting and insecurity in Rivers State. It was, therefore, recommended that MNOCs operating in the region should attach priority to payment of compensation for damages that results from operations without delay by cleaning up the damaged environments and compensating those affected.

Key Words: Oil MNCs, Environmental Violations, Niger Delta, Crude Oil Prospecting, Security challenges

INTRODUCTION

Decades of crude oil prospecting, oil exploitation, exploration, and production activities in Rivers State have led to severe environmental degradation that has created complex problems (including insecurity) in the State. Environmental exploitation has been a major point of contention between the Nigerian government, multinational oil companies (MNOCs) the Shell Petroleum Development Company (SPDC) in particular, and the communities affected by oil pollution. Recent studies have revealed that in contemporary times, the 'environmental issue' (particularly, environmental protection) is arguably one of the most important subjects on the global community's agenda.

For instance, many years of struggle between Ogoni communities and Shell to clean up oil spills from their operations have brought practically no change in the 27 United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) specific recommendations including change in regulatory framework, monitoring, operational, technical, and public health, only three have been partially implemented (Pearson, 2017). Of utmost importance were the eight emergency measures requiring urgent necessary action, and for which UNEP specifically assigned priority framework for redress. They were meant to address such matters as immediate supply of drinking water especially for people of Nsisioken Ogale community for instance, whose drinking water supply was detected to have been contaminated with benzene at levels 900 times above World Health Organisation's

(WHO) recommendation (Aaron, 2006).

Although a 2013-2014 study suggests that provisions for portable water were made at certain locations, supply was epileptic and short-lived. Community members resorted to purchasing water from retailers and using rainwater. For the poor who could not afford it, they resorted to using the polluted water, seeing they had no alternative. In fact, at some point the water tankers responsible for dispensing drinking water to Ogale and Obolo communities were observed to be empty. Some of them were perpetually parked at some other locations within Eleme.

This constitutes a substantial strain particularly in a country where approximately 60.9% of the population lives in “absolute poverty”, and about 100 million live on less than a \$1 a day. Much worse for Ogoni and other affected communities, is the fact that dwellers suffer heightened deprivation of livelihood means due to severe oil pollution and associated consequences (Gbadegesin, 2008).

Both the Nigerian government and Shell have paid little attention to the cry of these people whose ecosystems, ecology, and consequently, means of livelihood have been severely impacted. The relentless efforts channelled towards environmental justice by the impoverished Ogoni people culminated in the birth of the Movement for the Survival of the Ogoni People (MOSOP). MOSOP-led protests sustained the continued struggle to end the prevailing environmental degradation in the Niger Delta. The complicatedness of issues entrenched in the disagreement among people, politics, and the MOCs severely hindered the successful furtherance of MOSOP’s principal goal of ending further ecological damage, and the revitalisation of the polluted environment years of negotiations and protests failed to bring about the desired solutions (Okonta, & Douglas, 2001). United Nations (UN) Special Rapporteur, Ksentini (2015), observed in her report on human rights and the environment that:

The state of the environment is nowadays seen as a worldwide problem that should be addressed globally, in a coordinated and coherent manner and through the concerted efforts of the international community. More specifically, part of the current international discourse on the subject centres on the concept of the ‘right to environment’.

Interestingly, although governments contest the scientific data on the progression of global warming and climate change, experts largely agree that the earth has gradually warmed in the last 200 years due to anthropogenic human activities (Torulagha, 2007). This period is characterised by the use of dirty energy sources, particularly fossil fuel, to drive the wheels of economic prosperity, especially in the northern hemisphere.

The use of fossil fuel leads to the emission of vast amounts of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere through various activities involving burning and flaring. These gases are implicated in the progressive warming of the earth’s surface and atmosphere, resulting in the current changes in the earth’s climate system and the possibility of even more dramatic changes in the future (Omofonmwan et al, 2009).

On the basis of the foregoing, this paper focuses on the security challenges emanating from crude oil prospecting in the Niger Delta. This thrust was informed by the overly attention paid to environmental security, without a commensurate attention to human security -vis-à-vis security of lives and property.

Objectives

The paper addressed following specific objectives:

1. explore oil MNCs and environmental rights violation in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria; and,
2. examine the nexus between crude oil prospecting and security challenges in the Niger Delta: a case study of Rivers State.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

After World War II, Sociologist Robert K. Merton developed a Relative Deprivation Theory. Again, Stouffer wrote of relative deprivation theory in his study entitled *The American Soldier* (1949), part of a four-volume series entitled *Studies in Social Psychology in World War II*. Merton averred that relative deprivation theory explains the idea of feelings or measures of economic, political, or social denial that are relative rather than absolute, and it is linked to poverty and exclusion. He further explains that at the centre of relative deprivation construct, when people's expectations about life conditions they believe they are entitled to are frustrated or denied them, they are angered and motivated to seek redress for the perceived discrimination. Therefore, judgments about entitlements can only be made relatively as people compare their current and anticipated outcomes with those of others. Stouffer further maintains that relative deprivation is what individuals believe they should have compared to what others have or their own past or future (Gurr, 1970).

He also noted that when the conditions or material wellbeing of groups are not in tandem with their expectations, it fuels human desires for conditions and can spark revolutions or agitations as the group feels marginalized and excluded from the scheme of things. Expatriating on the Gurr (1970) maintained that deprivation theory assumes that feeling disadvantaged is related to a referenced group that arises from the comparison of oneself to others. Gurr believes the theory explains that one is uncomfortable with some standard accompanied by feelings of anger and resentment. Gurr noted that deprivation of any form is a potential cause of social movements and deviance, leading in an extreme situation to political violence such as rioting, terrorism, civil wars, and other instances of social deviances such as crime. From Gurr's definition, it can be deduced that relative deprivation deals with a person's belief to receive less than deserved after having contributed much and the perception that one's group is being treated less well than other groups. The theory postulates that this collective discrepancy creates frustration and, in turn, contributes to the use of protest and sometimes violence to redress the injustice.

Thus, relative deprivation of the inhabitants of Rivers State of a secure and safe environment that is not polluted through crude oil prospecting has invariably increased agitations by various competing groups with varying interests. This has led to an increase in the spate of insecurity in the whole of the Niger Delta region.

Crude Oil Prospecting

According to Otoabasi, (2019), the search for petroleum oil in Nigeria started during the first decade of the 20th century, specifically in 1903, eleven years before the amalgamation of Nigeria. It was in Ikot Akata, Akwa Ibom State, that the searchers announced "eureka – we have found it" in 1953. Indeed, oil which has changed the socio-economic landscape of Nigeria and the thought pattern of Nigerians was first discovered in Akwa Ibom State. Oloibiri in Bayelsa State was rather the first place that oil was found in commercial quantity and indeed the first site from where the product was exported (Aneeji 2000). Writing in his book, *Understanding the Niger Delta Crisis*, Ibaba (2001) posited that while oil was found in large quantity in 1956, it was not until 1958 that actual production started in commercial quantity with an output of about 5,100 barrels per day. According to him, this rose to a peak of about 2.3 million barrels per day at the height of the oil boom.

Petroleum exploration and production in the Nigeria's Niger Delta region and export of oil and gas resources by the petroleum sector has substantially improved the nation's economy over the past five decades. However, activities associated with petroleum exploration, development and production operations have local detrimental and significant impacts on the atmosphere, soils and sediments, surface and groundwater, marine environment, biological diversity and sustainability of terrestrial ecosystems in the Niger Delta (Aneeji (2000).

Discharges of petroleum hydrocarbon and petroleum derived waste streams have caused environmental pollution, adverse human health effects, detrimental impact on regional economy, socio-economic problems and degradation of host communities in the 9 oil-producing States in the Niger Delta region. Although there are other potential anthropogenic sources of pollution, some of the major environmental consequences such as air pollution, global climate change and oil spills in the Niger Delta may be regional or global in scale (Anyaeunam, 1999).

Apart from other anthropogenic emission sources, atmospheric pollution in the region is associated with emissions from flaring and venting of petroleum associated natural gas by petroleum industries (Aneji 2000). Atmospheric contaminants from anthropogenic activities can be categorized into (i) gaseous pollutants, (ii) persistent organic pollutants, (iii) particulate matter and; (iv) trace element and/or heavy metals. Release of petroleum hydrocarbons into the environment, whether accidentally or due to anthropogenic activities, is a major cause of controlled water and soil pollution and may also contribute to regional atmospheric pollution (Aneji 2000).

Generally speaking, crude oil prospecting is the very first stage in the search for oil and gas fields. Activities tend to cover large areas in an attempt to see if petroleum accumulations might be present. Crude oil prospecting is generally referred to as a complex, drawn-out process taking place in several stages and involving numerous scientific disciplines such as geology, geophysics, geochemistry, petro-physics, micro-paleontology, sedimentology etc. It is also the process of searching for petroleum. Many consider crude oil prospecting as Hydrocarbon exploration in the Earth using petroleum geology. The process of crude oil prospecting has over the years led to the degradation of the environment through gas flaring, oil spillage and other harmful emissions into the environment which has rendered the environment unsafe for human, animal and plant occupation.

Oil MNCs and Environmental Rights Violation in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria

Interestingly, studies have revealed that the exploitation of oil resources in the Niger Delta by the Multinational Oil Companies (MNOCs) is supposedly to maintain an equitable relation with the host communities. Apart from the above, it will ensure sustainable environmental management, respect for human rights, responsive and corporate responsibilities.

Poor nature of the Oil producing environment



Source: <https://guardian.ng/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Ofoin-Ama-Community-.jpg>

Multinational Oil Companies and host communities' relations should also be that of mutual collaboration and support but unfortunately, available literature all points to the contrary; hence making the situation unfriendly and hazardous for inhabitants. Scholars such as Baghebo et al (2012), in their studies, did not bring to the fore the force of the contemporary liberal democratic practices which are inevitable; especially today in the Nigerian setting. The liberal democratic practice in line with international human rights and parts also cited in our constitution guarantee some inalienable rights to the Nigerian oil host region to agitate for fair treatment of the oil proceeds in order to develop the region.

Issues of developmental challenges that culminate to underdevelopment in the Niger Delta also had inputs by key stakeholders' selfish pursuits over the years. This is characterized by mutual dispute and disrespect for one another. The emergent rancour and acrimony between the states, trans-national oil companies and oil host communities have brought negative repercussions to the host communities, government and Oil MNCs. Rather than design and implement a mutually profitable and unanimous development plan or agenda. These oil MNCs have by their actions, demonstrated envy and precipitated violent conflicts within themselves.

This situation tends to benefit the state and oil companies, including the chief stakeholders. Oil-bearing rural communities are the most vulnerable victims as every action or inaction taken by the other parties involved in oil exploitation impact negatively on their lives and habitat (Crayford, 1996). This has lasting negative effects.

Host communities' participation in oil companies especially forming part of the decision-making channel will alleviate the developmental challenges of the Niger Delta people cum address the social maladies that always lead to crippling of the oil production capacity of the nation. Although often times MOU are formulated but implementation remains a problem. An example is the MOU signed between Nigerian AGIP Oil Company and Egbema Clan in Rivers State in December 1999. The above proffered gap entails that oil host communities which are key to oil exploitation should be well treated in relation to others in the oil exploitation business since our land tenure system for now does not allow proper principle of derivation which would have curbed a lot of the issue of underdevelopment and forestalling of oil production and insurgency in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. Other factors include inability to enforce environmental policies and laws etc.

The trans-national oil and gas prospecting conglomerate have over the years as part of their social responsibility embarked on several programmes of social and economic development in their host communities. These efforts too, have never in reality gone beyond addressing the immediate demands expressed in the people's agitation for the employment of their youths in the company, provision of pipe-borne water, electricity generation, renovation of schools, hospitals, post office and bridges etc. The oil companies justify their below average performance in transforming the fortunes of their host communities by referring to the insincerity of the state that gets the lion share of the oil proceeds. Oil multinationals take advantage of the naivety, lack of political will and corruption of the Nigerian State to breach with impunity most memoranda of understanding (MOU) signed with oil bearing communities. They also violate municipal and international environmental protection laws. Over 82% of crisis between the oil companies and host communities between the years 2003 till date, are traceable to disrespect for MOU by oil company officials (Okowa, 2005).

Given the obvious and wide social and economic inequality that prevails, "Section II No, 17(1) of the 1999 Constitution (as amended) which states that, "The state social order is founded on ideals of freedom, equality and justice, and 17(2) which provides that "The independence, impartiality and integrity of courts of law, and easy accessibility, thereto shall be secured and maintained" are noble, but essentially not practicable. They are mere constitutional fictions. Hence, developmental challenges in the Niger Delta region are yet to be addressed with a moral question considering its input to the development of the Nigerian nation.

Crude Oil Prospecting and Security Challenges in Rivers State

There is a link between crude oil prospecting and insecurity in Rivers State. Oil exploration activities have succeeded in dislocating the social structure and value system in the State. Social vices like prostitution, artisanal refining, cultism and kidnapping became the aftermath of ineffective family and religious institutions in the commodity. The oil workers used their wealth to oppress and intimidate the locals. Money and material acquisition has become the only language the youths understand. These jobless youths often take to crime and violence to realise their goals.

In analysing the problem of underdevelopment in the Niger Delta, Steve Azaiki posed the following questions: why has the Niger Delta remained underdeveloped for decades despite the fact that it contributes about 90% of the nation's wealth? The Niger Delta region is underdeveloped in all its ramifications, despite the fact that it is the bread basket of Nigeria. (Okaba, 2005) aptly described the economic dilemma of the region when he stated that;

The oil region in Nigeria seems to be stuck in time warp, with little real change since oil was discovered 45 years ago. Away from the main towns, there is no real development, no roads, no electricity, no running water and no telephone.

Underdevelopment is so severe; the youth of the region are the hardest hit by lack of development. This is why many of them have resorted to militancy in an effort to focus national and international attention to their plight. Despite all the claims by the oil companies to be involved in the development of the region, it is to the contrary. Pervasive underdevelopment made Okaba (2005) to note that:

The government and oil companies have profited by hundreds of billions of dollars since oil was discovered, yet most Nigerians living in the oil producing region are living in dire poverty.

Unemployment is very high among the people of the Niger Delta as the oil companies do not hire their employees from the region that produce the oil, but from non-oil producing regions of Nigeria. Also, the issues of underdevelopment and unemployment made members of the Akwa Ibom House of Assembly to launch a protest against Mobil Producing Company in May, 2001. Mobil is the largest oil company in that part of the Niger Delta with a major facility at Eket.

This study discovered that though Shell's oil exploration enhances the national development of the nation, its operations affects the local people and their environment negatively. The people have been driven away from their traditional economic activities to unstable and insecure jobs in shell locations. Thus, while the company made so much profit, the people of Ogoni still groan in poverty and lack. Therefore, the activity of SPDC in the region, instead of improving the general condition of the inhabitants of the region, has led to untold hardship, poverty, lack and penury.

The concept of insecurity would be best understood by first presenting the concept of security. In the view of Anyaebunam, (1999) security refers to: the situation that exists as a result of the establishment of measures for the protection of persons, information and property against hostile persons, influences and actions.

It is the existence of conditions within which people in a society can go about their normal daily activities without any threats to their lives or properties. It embraces all measures designed to protect and safeguard the citizenry and the resources of individuals, groups, businesses and the nation against sabotage or violent occurrence (Oloduro, 2012). According to Ikien (1991), it demands safety from chronic threats and protection from harmful disruption.

Security, however, can be described as stability and continuity of livelihood (stable and steady income), predictability of daily life (knowing what to expect), protection from crime (feeling safe), and freedom from psychological harm (safety or protection from emotional stress which results from the assurance or knowing that one is wanted, accepted, loved and protected in one's community or neighbourhood and by people around. It focuses on emotional and psychological sense of belonging to a social group which can offer one protection). This description structured the concept of security into four dimensions. However, these dimensions can be weaved together to give a composite definition of security as the protection against all forms of harm whether physical, economic or psychological. It is generally argued however that security is not the absence of threats or security issues, but the ability to rise to the challenges posed by these threats with expediency and expertise.

Insecurity on the other hand, is the antithesis of security. However, because of the very many ways in which insecurity affects human life and existence, the concept of insecurity has usually been ascribed different interpretations in association with the various ways which it affects individuals. Some of the common descriptors of insecurity include: want of safety; danger; hazard; uncertainty; want of confidence; doubtful; inadequately guarded or protected; lacking stability; troubled; lack of protection; and unsafe, to mention a few. All of these have been used by different people to define the concept of insecurity. These different descriptors, however, run into a common reference to a state of vulnerability to harm and loss of life, property or livelihood. Boele, (2001) defined insecurity as "the state of fear or anxiety stemming from a concrete or alleged lack of protection."

It refers to lack or inadequate freedom from danger. This definition reflects physical insecurity which is the most visible form of insecurity, and it feeds into many other forms of insecurity such as economic security and social security.

The devastating effects of insecurity on economic growth were recognised early enough in the literature. Most of these studies, however, examined the subject from a politico-socioeconomic perspective, only a few purely economic studies of the subject exist in the literature. UNDP (1994) defined human security with a view to understanding what insecurity entails. According to it, human security means, first, safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression. And second, it means protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life – whether in homes, in jobs or in communities.

The UNDP identified seven elements of human security:

- economic security;
- food security;
- health security;
- environmental security;
- personal security;
- community security; and
- political security.

Anything short of this definition and elements according to the report amounts to insecurity. According to Ojeifa, (1999) insecurity entails:

lack of protection from crime (being unsafe) and lack of freedom from psychological harm (unprotected from emotional stress resulting from paucity of assurance that an individual is accepted, has opportunity and choices to fulfill his or her own potentials including freedom from fear.

As Boele et al (2001) put it, those affected by insecurity are not only uncertain or unaware of what would happen but they are also not able to stop it or protect themselves when it happens. In respect of the factors

responsible for insecurity and conflicts, Collier (2006) stressed that countries which have a substantial share of their income (GDP) coming from the export of primary commodities are radically more at risk of conflict. The most dangerous level of primary commodity dependence is 26% of GDP. According to him, conflicts and insecurity is concentrated in countries with little education, fast population growth and economic decline. This was also the views expressed by (Duru. 1999).

The effect of insecurity on economic growth and development has been described to be negative. Oluduro (2012) analysed the effect of conflict and insecurity on development for twenty five countries between 1960–1995 and found that economic growth and development was almost always affected, agricultural sector was badly hit, exports were negative, production fell, there was a shift from international to domestic markets, imports went up dominated by military expenditure and essential consumption goods, usually leading to a shortage of foreign exchange for economic inputs., consumption per head fell, government revenue as a share of GDP mostly fell and foreign and private investments including government investment fell. This was further corroborated in SIPRI yearbook 2015, where they observed that threats to security can have socioeconomic roots, including contests over natural resources, spill-over effects of environmental degradation, economic and social inequalities, economic and political migration, natural disasters, among others.

The concept of insecurity is not alien to societies, as it has existed even in the primitive societies of the world. To be able to give an all-encompassing definition of insecurity, it is important we have a brief look at what security is. The social contract in which the people willingly surrender their right to the government who oversees the survival of all is necessitated by the need for security. According to Gbadegesin, (2008), with the end of the cold war, there have being attempt to shift conceptualization of security from a static centric perspective to a broader view that places premium on individuals, in which human security that embodies elements of national security, human rights and national development remain major barometer for explaining the concept. At the heart of this debate is an attempt to deepen and widen the concept of security from the level of the states to societies to individuals, and from military to non-military issues (Hyginus, 2003).

In the opinion of McGrew (1988), the security of a nation hangs on two important pillars which are (1) the maintenance and protection of the socio-economic order in the case of internal and external threat and (2) the promotion of a preferred international order, which minimizes the threat to core values and interests, as well as domestic order. Security is an all-encompassing condition which suggests that a territory must be secured by a network of armed forces; that the sovereignty of the state must be guaranteed by a democratic and patriotic government, which in turn must be protected by the military-police and the people themselves; that the people must not only be secured from external attacks but also from devastating consequences of internal upheavals such as unemployment, hunger, starvation, diseases, ignorance, homelessness, environmental degradation and pollution cum socio-economic injustices. McLennan and James, (2005) extended the view expressed above by saying that Nigeria's security should be based on a holistic view which sees the citizens as the primary beneficiaries of every security and developmental deliverable that the state can offer. In the view of Michael (2008), Nigeria's security will involve efforts to strengthen the capacity of the Federal Republic of Nigeria so it can advance its interests and objectives to contain internal and external aggression, control crime, eliminate corruption, enhance genuine development, progress and growth and improve the welfare and quality of life of every citizen.

The antithesis of security is insecurity, which can be seen as the absence of security as discussed above. The common description of insecurity is uncertainty, hazard, danger, want of safety, want of confidence, state of doubt, inadequately guarded and protected, lack of protection and being unsafe, instability and others. In the words of Egan (1999), the common descriptors outlined above point to a condition where there exists a vulnerability to harm, loss of life, property or livelihood. To them insecurity is state of not knowing, a lack

of control, and the inability to take defensive actions against forces that portend danger or harm to an individual or group, or that make them vulnerable.

Insecurity challenges can be traced to the early years of military rule when large quantities of arms were imported into the country for the use of the military during and after the Nigerian civil war, some of which got into the hand of the civilians. Soon after the civil war these arms were used by civilians and ex-military men for mischievous purposes such as armed robbery. There was also the army of unemployed youths some of whom lost their job during the civil war. The level of insecurity assumed dangerous dimensions in the prolonged years of military rule beginning from 1970 during which people procure arms and light weapons for personal defence. Some of these arms and light weapons got into the hands of unemployed youths who used them for deviant purpose. While some researchers attribute youth violence to peer group influence and other psychological factors associated with growing up, others emphasized the impact of political and economic factors such as ethnic agitation, political agitation, unemployment, Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) as triggers of violent reaction among the youths thereby fuelling insecurity in the state.

The key points from the above therefore are that:

1. insecurity especially in Rivers State could be regarded as a condition of anxiety or whatever that has the capacity to cause fear, impairment or injury in the lives of people. Such phenomenon is rooted in politics, economics, religion, ecology factors;
2. insecurity could be a business stratagem to avoid loss of human and material resources;
3. insecurity is something which can be felt by almost all and sundry in the state as it affects almost all facets of life; and,
4. the problem of insecurity has been extended from violent conflicts to non-violent conflicts with serious implications in the state.

Crude oil prospecting therefore has brought about security challenges in the state as it has necessitated various armed groups, cultism, etc., demanding for a share of the oil benefits. Failure of which had rendered the state insecure thereby leading to the offer of amnesty by the government as a means of managing the crisis.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is rather unfortunate that the fundamentally feudal character of the Nigerian State and systematic kleptomania has rendered the Oil proceeds from the Niger Delta a mixed blessing to the region and particularly Rivers State through not just the violation of the Niger Delta environment but also an increase in unemployment, crime and general insecurity in Rivers State. Oil exploitation activities have indeed devastated the environment and the fundamental bases for the development of the Niger Delta region. Corruption hugely funded by Oil has damaged the culture of hard work and in general the work ethics of many of the people in the State thereby increasing the spate of crime and violence especially among youths in the State. Insecurity in the state has manifested in increase in cult related violence and deaths, artisanal refining, kidnapping etc. unfortunately, governance has largely lost its focus as the key development institution in society now is mostly seen as an instrument for primitive accumulation by the privileged few.

Based on the foregoing, it is recommended that:

1. Multinational Oil Corporations (MNOCs) should attach priority to payment of compensation for damages that results from operations – without delay.
2. Development issues should not be politicized.

3. The government and MNOCs should contribute immensely towards the development of areas of oil exploration.
4. MNOCs should adopt an approach of peace, mutuality, harmony, commitment, and progress towards host communities' development agenda.
5. Laws favourable to oil-bearing communities/regions should be put in place to regulate; land tenureship, derivation, compensation, development plans, environmental hazards assessment.
6. Corporate governance should be approached with honesty and service to Niger Deltans.

REFERENCES

1. Aaron, K. K. (2006). Human rights violation and environmental degradation in the Niger-Delta. In E. Porter & B. Offord (eds), *Activating human rights*. Bame.
2. Aneji, O.A. (2000). *Oil of poverty in Niger Delta*. Aneji Publishers.
3. Anyaebunam, E. O. (1999). *Niger Delta: A case of regional contingency plan*. In A. Osuntokun (ed), *Environmental problems in the Niger Delta*. Lagos Friedrich Ebert Foundation
4. Azaiki, S. (2003). *Inequities in Nigerian politics*. Treasure Communications Resource Limited, Yenagoa.
5. Baghebo et al (2012). Environmental damages caused by the activities of multinational oil giants in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 5(1), 9-10.
6. Boele, R., Fabig, H. & Wheeler, D. (2001). Shell, Nigeria and the Ogoni. A study in unsustainable Development: The story of Shell, Nigeria and the Ogoni people-environment, economy, relationships: Conflict and prospects for resolution. *Sustainable Development*, 9, 74-86.
7. Crayford, S. (1996). *The Ogoni uprising: Oil, human rights and democratic alternative in Nigeria*. Africa Rights Monitor.
8. Duru, C. (1999). *Oil multinationals and the Niger Delta crisis*. African Scholars' Publishing Company.
9. Egan, J. (1999). *Troubled times in the Niger Delta*. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/programmes/crossjng/contments/32500.stm>.
10. Gbadegesin, A. (2008). *The impact of oil exploration and petroleum activities on the environment: Implications for peasant agriculture*. Macmillan Press.
11. Hyginus, B. O. (2003). *The Niger Delta environment: Its local geography*. Prelyn Publishers.
12. Ibaba, S. I. (2001). *Understanding the Niger Delta crisis*. Amethyst and Colleague Publishers.
13. Iken, A. A. (1991). *Impact of oil on a developing country: A case study of Nigeria*. Evans Brothers Publishers.
14. McLennan, J. & James, S. W. (2005). Deep water Africa reaches turning point. *Oil and Gas Journal*, 103(6), 102-114.
15. Michael, W. (ed) (2008). *Curse of the black gold: 50 years of oil in the Niger Delta*. Power House Books, Brooklyn, Newyork, pp. 36-61.
16. Ojeifa, I. E. (1999). *The Nigerian state and the environmental question*. In A. Osuntokun (ed), *Environmental problems of Niger Delta*. Friedrich Ebert Foundation.
17. Okaba, B. (2005). *Petroleum industry and the paradox of rural poverty in the Niger Delta*. Ethiope Publishing Company.
18. Okonta, I. & Douglas O. (2001). *Where vultures feast. 40 years of Shell exploration in Niger Delta*. Benin Nigeria Environmental Rights.
19. Okowa, J. W. (2005). *Oil, systemic corruption, abdulvistic capitalism and Nigerian development policy: A political economy*. Port Harcourt Paragraphics.
20. Oloduro, O. (2012). Oil exploration and human rights violation in Nigeria's oil producing communities. *Afrika Focus*, 25(2), 160-161.
21. Omofonmwan, et al (2009). Exploitation and conflict in the Niger Delta of Nigeria. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 26(1), 25-26.
22. Otoabasi, O. (2019). Oil exploration and crisis in the Niger Delta: The response of militia groups. *Journal of Sustainable Society*, 1(3), 78-79.

23. Pearson, S. R. (2017). Petroleum and the Nigerian economy. Stanford University Press Publishers.
24. Torulagha, P. S. (2007). The Niger Delta oil and Western strategic interests: The need for understanding. <http://unitedijawstates.com>.
25. UNDP (1994) Report.
26. UNEP, 2011.