

Maritime policy and economic development assignment

[Sociology](#)



This is in view of the growth-pole potentials of ports and ancillary industries. Although a comparison of Japan, a leading global power, and Nigeria, a vastly underachieving African country, might sound far-fetched, the effort is rewarding, as shown in this article, for its implications for public policy formulation and implementation. This paper attempts a comparison of the evolution and implementation of policies relating to the development of ports, the mercantile marine and port industries in both countries.

Focusing on the roles of the government and the private sector, it locates the discussion in a wider, global comparative context. The prospects and challenges of regional development through the agency of the maritime sector in both Nigeria and Japan are considered in the light of such concepts as 'maritime industrial development areas (MIDAS)' and 'developer ports'.

Pertinent lessons in comparative history and public policy analysis are highlighted in the paper, which has benefited from primary research in both countries. The paper also discusses the role of the state in the development of the maritime sector, the impact of globalization on the maritime sector, and the role of the private sector in the development of the maritime sector. The paper also discusses the role of the state in the development of the maritime sector, the impact of globalization on the maritime sector, and the role of the private sector in the development of the maritime sector.

The paper also discusses the role of the state in the development of the maritime sector, the impact of globalization on the maritime sector, and the role of the private sector in the development of the maritime sector. The paper also discusses the role of the state in the development of the maritime sector, the impact of globalization on the maritime sector, and the role of the private sector in the development of the maritime sector.

Studies, University of Lagos, Lagos, Nigeria. By Defaulting 160 27/09/2006, 13: 34 Lookup: Maritime Policy and Economic Development 161 formulation et De lubrication De politesse publishes.

Get article tenet De emmer en comparaison De l'?? evolution et De lubrication De politesse lie?? sees AU d?? placement portraiture, ANSI quo'?? la marine marched et auk industries portraiture De aces deuce pays. En SE basalt sure lee r?? lee du government et du structure privy??, cite contribution site lee d?? bat Dana UN context international et comparator plus large. Less perspectives et less d?? fish De d?? placement r?? signal par lintier?? direr du structure maritime, AU Nigeria et AU Japan, sons cousin?? r?? s ?? traverse aces concepts come correspondent auk B?? zones maritime De d?? placement industriesB?? et auk B?? ports De d?? placementB??.

Get article formula des leaps pertinent en matt?? re distorter comparative et danseuse De polities applique, et sets inspire?? De la recherch?? fundamental Dana aces deuce pays. Introduction It is now generally recognizes that the maritime sector could, if properly harnessed, This is in view of the growth-pole potentials of ports and ancillary industries (Hamper and Saw 1980). Although a comparison of Japan, a leading global power, and Nigeria, a well-endowed but vastly underachieving African country, might sound far-fetched, it has been accomplished with implications for public policy formulation ND implementation (Lookup Bibb, 2001 b).

This paper attempts a comparison of the evolution and implementation of policies relating to the development of ports, the mercantile marine, shipbuilding and port industries in both countries. 2 Focusing on the roles of <https://assignbuster.com/maritime-policy-and-economic-development-assignment/>

the government and the private sector, it locates the discussion in a wider, global comparative context. The prospects and challenges of regional development through the agency of the maritime sector in both Nigeria and Japan are considered in the light of such concepts as Maritime industrial development areas' (MIDAS), Export processing ones', and Developer ports'.

Pertinent lessons in comparative history and public policy analysis will be highlighted in the paper, which has benefited from primary research in both countries. Ports and Regional Development Seaports constitute the hub of the maritime sector of a nation's economy. For one thing, they are generally regarded as gateways between their hinterlands and elements. They thus serve as conduits in the exchange of merchandise between opposite ends of the intervening oceans.

Moreover, without them, shipping and shipbuilding cannot exist and it is the capacity of a port that determines the volume and regularity of its shipping. Hence, our 9. J. J. Pip 162 Africa zamia', NOSE. 11 & 12, 2003-2004 discussion will focus largely on ports. However, ports do not exist for their own sake or as mere conduits of trade, but are expected to exert a developmental impact especially on their hinterlands. To be sure, a port has several hinterlands stretching from the port itself to as far as transport links and competing outlets permit.

While the proximate hinterlands are likely to be captive to it, other areas may be contested by other ports depending on their differential access to transport facilities (Loup Bibb). That said, a critical issue that is germane to our discussion is the potential of ports as growth poles. Do ports really

generate development in their immediate or remote hinterlands? If so, what accounts for this or under what conditions can this be achieved? If such conditions are known, how can the developmental impact be optimized?

In any case, what criteria should be employed to measure the developmental impact of ports and how reliable are they? With regard to the measurement of the economic impact of ports, the Canada Ports Corporation once developed a computerized Economic Impact Model, which oppositely Measures the economic benefits of the freight handling activities of [Canadian] ports on the local, provincial and national economies [and provides] a realistic and defensible assessment of the economic contributions of the ports' (Testier 1991 : 183). This assertion was based on certain observable results.

Canadian ports were reported to have generated Jobs (direct and indirect), revenue, and personal income quantified in billions of dollars, which derived from port and related activities. However, critics have expressed doubts about the reliability and ropiest of such measurements. Some contend that Port impacts' studies of this kind were designed by port authorities to Justify or attract port investment. Others argue that it is misleading to attribute regional development to the ports, which are Only one element in a large number of producing and distributing systems' which generate economic changes in a given region (Goes 1990: 217).

It may also be noted that accurate quantification of the regional impact of ports is difficult to achieve in the face of the diffusion (that is, of origins and destinations) of port traffic beyond the arrow confines off region or nation

(ibid: 216). But may be extended to the whole question of the significance attached to ports in economic development. Orthodox historians would naturally be wary of any explanation that ascribes sole or unduly exaggerated importance to a single causal factor: the pitfall of monocausal explanation.

It is in this light that one should view the tendency to attribute developments generated in a region to either the geographical or transport factor. But as is indicated 163 below, the human factor appears to be overwhelmingly important in this age of technology. Whatever reservations that one may have about the reliability of the quantification of the social and economic impact of ports and their allied industries on the adjoining cities and regions, it is hardly debatable that port activities and shipping generate employment, and induce industrialization and overall economic growth.

The striking example of Maritime Industrial Developments Areas (MIDAS) in post-second World War Europe aptly illustrates the immense growth-pole potentials of ports. Even so, it must be conceded that there is a symbiotic relationship between the port itself, on the one hand, and the port-city and port-induced industries, on the other. Economic boom or depression in either a port's forelands or hinterlands immediately affects the port and the silting of the port or the loss of its comparative advantage to rival ports would be reflected in the fortunes of its hinterlands, particularly those that are dependent on it.

A related issue is the role of human agency in these developments. Without prejudice to the now discredited thesis of environmental or geographical

determinism, we may note that the development of the maritime sector and, indeed, of the wider economy, reflects the degree of the harnessing together of technological, political, economic, physical and other factors. However, what can hardly be controverted is that human agency can reverse or ameliorate the natural disadvantages of a port or initiate developments in its hinterland or foreground to the advantage or disadvantage of the port (Lippitt and Lippitt).

This is most clearly manifest in the formulation and implementation of policies which achieve port (re)development and foster shipping and industrial growth. Government is more suited to this sort of intervention because it has the capital that such large-scale works entail and it also has the capacity to absorb the impact of the long gestation of such low-return investments. It is capable of formulating policies reversing the in this study of Japan and Nigeria in the aftermath of the Second World War.

We begin by outlining the development of the Japanese maritime economy and policies. Maritime Policy and the Japanese Economy It goes without saying that maritime economies and societies are closely associated with the sea. In this connection, the length and nature of a nation's coastline, the magnitude of its mercantile marine and port-related industries, the level of placement of internal communications and the political and economic framework in which these developments take place determine to a large extent the growth and development of its maritime sector.

Japan, as an archipelago, is abundantly endowed with hundreds of seaport outlets of varying sizes and importance whereas Nigeria has only

one natural harbor at Lagos. In terms of population, the respective figures are both in excess of one hundred million though the absolute figures for Nigeria are rather imprecise. Though both countries each have populations in excess of one hundred million persons, Japan has a considerable edge in the level of its economic, social and political development. It is the second largest economy in the world with a well trained, highly motivated and skilled workforce.

While it has made giant strides in technological and scientific development, the reverse is the case with Nigeria. With the exception of a brief period of Allied Occupation after the Second World War, Japan has always been a sovereign nation with a rich and proud tradition. Conversely, the Nigerian nation state was formally established under British colonial rule which lasted from 1861 to 1960. A good starting point in our discussion is to elaborate on the geography of Japan in relation to its maritime economy. Japan consists of the four main islands of Hokkaido, Honshu, Shikoku and Kyushu aligned in a north-south axis.

There are also other islands, including the Okinawa chain, lying in the direction of China. These islands are deeply indented and, so, contain many natural harbors. The key ports include Yashmak, Osaka, Kobo, Nagoya, Tokyo, Sukiyaki, Sashimi and Dakar. Under the Port and Harbor Law of 1950, the ports were classified in accordance with their importance to the national economy. By 1960, the most important, known as Specially Designated Ports, were Osaka, Kobo, Nagoya, Tokyo, Smokiness, Hickory, Moms, Koura, Dakar, Sashimi, Sukiyaki and Yashmak.

The next group consisted of Major Hookah, Niagara, Distrust, Assai, Sago, Maori, Chief, Yokes, Kinkier, Hiroshima and Awakening on Honshu, Koch', Ammonia and Sanatoriums on Shook and Sashimi, Bebop, Haste and Nagasaki on the Shush islands respectively. There were also over thirty Ports of Refuge spread all over the islands (Lookup ICC, 1997). As is well known, the modern economic history of Japan, and the point of take-off for its rapid transformation into a global leader, was the Meijer Restoration, which took place in January 1868.

Guided by a patriotic leadership committed to catching up with the West, Japan underwent such social, political and economic transformation that it had become a leading regional power by the end of the century and a world power by 1914. The Meijer government pursued a policy of rapid industrialization and modernization encapsulated in the slogans Shannon Kooky (industrialization) and Focus Skyhook (Rich Nation, Strong Military'). Hand in hand with industrialization went the development of infrastructure with Western technical assistance.

A notable, though futile, effort to undertake major port engineering works was the Niobium port project, the failure of which was a spur to more successful efforts elsewhere (Massed 1981). All along, it was clearly understood that the national government had a leading role in harbor improvements and fleet development. With regard to the ports, which were categorized into first and second class, as well as local ports, official policy stipulated that it was the duty of the national government 'Onion line with the national interest [to] plan, improve and manage ports' (Mazurka 1983: 54).

Hence, the national government undertook the construction of breakwaters, seawalls and other protective facilities; anchorages and other facilities. It was also responsible for up to half the cost of land reclamation and other port projects. Ports which were accorded second-class rating were consigned to the local governments, which still received subsidies from the national government. Local ports were administered by public bodies and did not receive any financial assistance from the government.

Prior to the Second World War, Japanese ports policy had given prominence to government intervention and control, without totally eliminating private sector participation. From the end of the Second World War, the Port and Harbor Law of 1950, revised in June 1951 and April 1957, streamlined the roles of various actors in that sector of the economy. Beyond classifying the ports, the Law allocated responsibilities among the various stakeholders and set out goals and targets to achieve.

A striking feature of port policy was the overwhelming role of the setting and coordination of policies and services with overall national development. The effective implementation of these laws?? the Port and Harbor Law of 1950 and its amendments, and the Law for Emergency Measures for Port Improvement?? contributed largely to the rapid developments of the sass and after (Takeouts 1983: 33). The Port and Harbor Law of 1950 marked a turning point in Japanese port development and administration as it clearly defined the roles and responsibilities of port authorities in post-war Japan (Lookup 1997).

To be sure, the Law was based on the foundations of Japanese political economy, especially, the tradition of centralized planning, budgeting and tariff-setting, and the reality of Allied Occupation. With regard to the latter, the Law borrowed extensively from the practice in the United States. While port management bodies, including private sector operators, were involved in the day-to-day administration of the ports, the central government continued to play supervisory and interventionist roles in port administration and development.

The Ministry of Transport (now renamed the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport) exercised this responsibility on behalf of the central government by performing the following functions: (a) formulating national port development policies and necessary laws and regulations; (b) offering advice to port management bodies; (c) scrutinizing and coordinating port and harbor plans for the major ports; (d) setting technical standards for port planning, design and construction; (e) fostering technical innovation in ports; (f) financing construction works; (g) executing port construction; and (h) developing and maintaining channels out of port areas. Still, other ministries were involved in health, security, customs administration, environmental, financial, immigration and legal aspects of port administration in Japan. It is striking, however, that unlike in many other countries, including Nigeria, Japan does not have the equivalent of a National Ports Authority. The Ministry of Transport coordinates activities in this sector while each port is managed by its management body in line with the Port and Harbor Law.

Yet, there are areas of overlap of authority between municipal authorities and port management bodies. A between the city and the port. Here, the Port and Harbor Law encounters the City Planning Law; and the Ministries of Transport and Construction also have to share responsibilities. Inevitable disagreements are easily resolved through negotiation (Mazurka 1983). A cornerstone of port policy was the decision to make ports the linchpin of regional development. Related to this is the understanding that ports should not be run merely as commercial enterprises which have to make profits or, at least, balance their books. The regional developmental impact of port development projects was considered a sufficient return on port investment.

A third element of port development policy was the emphasis on research and engineering. Hence, the Port and Harbor Research Institute and the Ports and Harbors Bureau have invested in human capacity and innovative technology in the area of port engineering. In general, port policy was responsive to the spectacular development of the national economy in the sass. In particular, it had had to contend with the negative effects of the massive growth and concentration of population in the Pacific Industrial Zone. This required the rectification of regional disparities and the dispersal of the population and resources concentrated in 167 a few regional centers.

Consequently, the Law to Promote the Construction of New Industrial Cities was enacted in 1962 and fifteen such cities were developed across the country, though mainly along the coastline. An Act of 1964, which provided for the creation of Special Areas for Industrial Development, produced six Special Areas based on the earlier identified industrial bases. In all of this,

the ports served as the hub of development. At such locations, urban and regional development plans, containing infrastructure, city planning and industrial components, were implemented (Ports and Harbors in Japan, 2002: 65). Specifically, port and regional development has been pursued through 'Developer ports', created in depressed regions as a catalyst of industrial and urban development (Lookup 2004).

This was the case in Sashimi and Tamaki on the islands of Honshu and Hokkaido, respectively. At both places, much expense was incurred in developing artificial ports in economic backwaters. With the development of the ports, urban centers emerged with the migration and settlement of people, mainly workers, the provision of social and economic infrastructure, and the establishment of industries. Although port impact studies have generated their own economic impact on the adjoining communities. This may be gleaned from the increase in port traffic, the growth in industrial output and the rise in demand for commercial products by a burgeoning urban settlement.

Remarkable changes took place in Sashimi, a city (and region) that developed in the aftermath of the development of a 'Developer Port' in a hitherto backward area of Japan. The development of the port and the industrial projects had an immediate social and economic impact on Sashimi, the Barbaric Prefecture and wider areas of Japan as far field as the mega-cities of Tokyo and Osaka. There were dramatic changes in the absolute size of the population, and in the number and composition of the labor force. The population of Sashimi increased five-fold from 57, 000 in 1960 to 300, 000 in

1975, while the number of workers rose sharply from 28, 000 to 122, 000 within the same period. However, the proportion of workers engaged in primary, secondary and tertiary industries changed significantly.

In 1960, the bulk (20, 000) was engaged in primary industries while 3, 000 and 5, 000 respectively were employed in secondary and tertiary industries. In 1975, the trend had been reversed: the highest proportion (58, 000) was employed by secondary industry, followed closely by tertiary (52, 000) while primary industry employed only 12, 000 (Takeouts 1983: 38). These figures demonstrate the rapid transformation of what had been an agricultural area into one of industry and commerce. The erstwhile economic backwater had become a large industrial zone, with implications for population movements and standards of living. Arbitration necessitated the provision of public infrastructure such as roads, waterworks and sewerage.

In terms of the percentage of the population with access to potable water supply, Sashimi had exceeded the average for the Prefecture and almost equaled the national average by 1980. More remarkably, the transformation of Sashimi affected the larger cities, such as Tokyo and Osaka, from which people and industries drifted (Takeouts 1983: 40-41). The direct impact of the construction of the port on the maritime trade of the region was most remarkable. The number and tonnage of foreign shipping increased dramatically from zero in 1968 to 980 and 24, 302 respectively in 1975. The domestic traffic increased from 104 vessels with a tonnage of 24, 000 in 1965 to 7, 974 vessels and 7. 56 million tons respectively in 1975 (Satsuma 1977:

98). At Tamaki, no less dramatic changes followed the construction of a Developer Porto'.

As was the case at Sashimi, port development at Tamaki (West) number of employees increased dramatically. The number of factories rose from about 70 in 1951 to about 270 in 1975 while the labor force swelled from about 5, 000 to some 12, 000 within the same period. The volume of commercial sales tripled from about 50 billion yen in 1958 to 150 billion yen in 1972 and the number of stores treasured from about 500 in 1952 to well over 2, 000 by 1972. The statistics buttress the assertion that The location of industry (at Tamaki)... Enhanced by port construction, improved the industrial structure of the entire nation and increased its overall economic growth potentials' (Takeouts 1983: 44).

In general, ports policy was responsive to the changes in the local and global economies. Hence, during the period of accelerated economic development in the sass and the consequent shortage of port capacity, the government enacted the Law on Emergency Measures or Port Development and drew up the first Five-Year Port Development Plan in 1961. Both measures were coordinated with the overall national development Plano?? the Plan to Double the People's Income?? and resulted in a considerable expansion of port facilities (Ports and Harbors in Japan 2002: 65) As the examples of Sashimi and Tamaki show, the policy did achieve the goal of regional economic development.

Although the results were uneven, it has been claimed that the development plan had succeeded in Promoting new industrial zones in areas outside of

<https://assignbuster.com/maritime-policy-and-economic-development-assignment/>

existing placement zones Development has not only provided thousands of people in these areas with Jobs, but it has helped to revivalist the economies in these areas' (Ports and Harbors in Japan 2002: 66). A related development in maritime policy towards the ports was the coordination of port and city planning in the sass. This was characterized 169 as Thee Era of Port and City Co-Existences' (Takeouts 1983: 36). Closely connected with this was the injection of environmental considerations into port policy.

The declared aim was The creation of a pleasant port environment' (Mazurka 1983: 62). These programmer integrated such activities as waste disposal through landfills, creation of green zones and provision of environmental protection facilities along the coastal zones. The consequence was an improvement in the living environment in spite of the intensification of port, industrial and urban developments. By the early sass, maritime policy aimed at creating Spaceport's', which took Animals and plants into consideration as well as humans' Pan Times 18 March 1994: 2). In response to population explosion, the Japanese also intensified the process of Taking the cities