

AFRREV IJAH

An International Journal of Arts and Humanities

Bahir Dar, Ethiopia

Vol. 3 (2), S/No 10, April, 2014:158-178

ISSN: 2225-8590 (Print) ISSN 2227-5452 (Online)

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ijah.v3i2.10>

**Between Convention and Realism: the Nigerian
People's Definition of Democracy**

Edosa, Enaruna, Ph.D.

Institute of Public Administration and Extension Services,

University of Benin, Ekehuan Campus,

Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria

Tel: +234 (0) 8023320793; +234 (0) 8073378328

E-mail: esedosa2020@yahoo.com

Abstract

This paper critically examines the meaning of democracy from a broad perspective and goes beyond the conventional conceptualizations to report what the Nigerian people mean by democracy. The paper is empirical. It draws some implications from the position of 'realism democracy' taken by Nigerians as well as offers some concluding observations.

Key words: Conventional Democracy, Realism Democracy, Self-government, Political Participation/Popular Participation, Representative Democracy, Due Process, Fundamental Human Rights, Constitutional Limitations, Social Pluralism, Political Tolerance, Nigerian People, Nigeria.

Introduction

Democracy has usually been defined in stereotypical terms or what we here call ‘conventional’ terms. But the definition of democracy has since gone beyond this rather limited form. It has since come to be seen in the form we refer to here as ‘realism democracy.’ Among Nigerians, this is how it has come to be viewed. This therefore means that the word democracy has grown in conceptual stature, beyond the conventional meaning it has often been imbued with, at least, from the angle of the average Nigerian.

There is no doubt that this ‘expanded’ meaning of democracy is worth understanding and studying. For one, its study and appreciation will necessarily enhance the scope of comparative analysis. Secondly, it will sensitize scholars and practitioners to look at democratization processes and prerequisites with keener interest and understanding. In other words, democratization processes and governance practices ought to be necessarily more citizen demand-centred.

This paper critically examines the meaning of democracy from a broad perspective and goes beyond the conventional conceptualizations to report what the Nigerian people mean by democracy. The approach here is to first critically review some of the existing definitions of democracy from a wide perspective and then proceed beyond the conventional conceptualizations to report what the Nigerian people mean by democracy. The paper is empirical. It draws some implications from the position of ‘realism democracy’ taken by Nigerians as well as offers some concluding observations and recommendations.

Conventional Definitions of Democracy

Democracy is a controversial word and has thus been differently conceptualised by many persons and scholars. But it simply means people’s government. Abraham Lincoln defined democracy as the “government of the people, by the people and for the people” (Burns, Cronin and Peltason, 1984; Ake 1992, p. 1). This has perhaps become the most popular definition of democracy today. However, in practice,

governance is hardly carried out by rulers for the benefit of the people especially in Africa, where rulers are mostly on their own and the people complain and lament endlessly. This act of insensitivity and misrule is really not democracy but only perpetrated in its name. According to Bolaji Akinyemi (2006), democracy is “a system where the government is dependent on the governed, both for becoming the government and for the continuing legitimacy of governance.”

McLean (1996, p.129) equally notes that, by democracy, the Greeks meant “rule by the people.” He argued that since the people are rarely unanimous, democracy as a descriptive term may be regarded as synonymous with “majority rule”. Similarly, democracy has been conceived of as “government of the whole, by the majority, generally through representatives elected by secret ballot of adults”. It has been argued that given the huge population today, everybody cannot be in government at the same time, thus, only elected representatives can rule, as members of the executive or the parliament (legislature) (Caritt, 1947, p.150 cited in Ogomudia, 2002, pp. 4-5).

Furthermore, democracy should be seen in terms of due process, devoid of arbitrariness and coercion in decision-making or enforcement of rules. As Brian Barry (1991: 25) contended:

I follow here those who insist that ‘democracy’ is to be understood in procedural terms. That is to say, I reject the notion that one should build into ‘democracy’ any constraints on the content of outcomes produced, such as substantive equality, respect for human rights, and concern for general welfare, personal liberty, or the rule of law. The only exceptions (and these are significant) are those required by democracy itself as a procedure. Thus, some degree of freedom of communication and organisation is a necessary condition of the formation (articulation) of expression, and aggregation of political preferences.

Besides, democracy embraces the following:

- (i) meaningful competition among individuals and organised groups (especially political parties) for all elective positions of government power at regular intervals and excluding the use of force.
- (ii) a high level of political participation in the selection of leaders and policies at least through regular and fair election.
- (iii) a level of civil and political liberties – freedom of expression, freedom to form and join organisation – sufficient to ensure the integrity of political participation and competition (Diamond, 1990, p. 7 cited in Babawale, 2002, pp. 2-3).

In summarizing his conceptual analysis of democracy, it has been stated that the mainstay of democracy relates to the following:

1. Sovereignty of the people
2. Government based on the consent of the governed.
3. Majority rule.
4. Minority rights.
5. Guarantee of basic human rights.
6. Free and fair elections.
7. Equality before the law.
8. Due process of law.
9. Constitutional limits on government.
10. Social, economic, and political pluralism.
11. Values of tolerance, pragmatism, and compromise

(<http://usinfo.state.gov/products/pubs/whatsdem/whatdm2.htm>
cited in Akinyemi, 2006)

As mentioned earlier, the term 'democracy' simply as Abraham Lincoln, a former American President, has eloquently and famously put it, is government of the people, by the people, and for the people (Burns, Peltason and Cronin, 1984; Ake, 1992, p. 1) - a definition derived, no doubt, from the fact that 'democracy' comes from two Greek words - 'demos', meaning the people and 'kratos', meaning power (Padfield, 1972, p.21) or 'Kratiss', meaning authority (Burns, Peltason and Cronin, 1984: 4) or 'kratein', meaning to rule (Holden, 1994, p.7). Democracy is therefore the power or right of all to rule or participate in governance. It is popular participation in the governmental process, with the implication of equality and freedom (Otubanjo, 1992, p. 22, Isekhure, 1992, p.3). It is 'mass action' or the involvement of all, that is, the generality of the populace in the political or decision-making process of government. D.D. Raphael has explained that:

The essential idea of democratic government is government by the people. Strictly speaking, government by all the people should mean unanimous decision. But this, of course, is impossible in political matters. Democracy in practice has to mean following the view of the majority. Perhaps Lincoln's addition of 'for the people' means, as in Rousseau's theory of the general will, that the decisive view, which for practical purposes must be that of the majority, should seek to serve the interests of all even though it does not have the agreement of all; otherwise there is the danger, so much feared by de Tocqueville and John Stuart Mill, that majority rule may become majority tyranny.

Pure democracy, a system in which all citizens may join in taking governmental decision, is rare. It is impracticable except in a very small polity. It was practised, more or less, in the city state of Athens over a relatively short period. Decisions were taken

by the Assembly, membership of which was open to all adult male citizens (but not to women or slaves or resident aliens). Even in Athens many matters of detail had to be left to appointed officers, but these were, for a time, selected by lot, thus preserving the idea that everybody was capable of doing the job and that there was 'no damned merit in it'. Important decisions were taken by the Assembly as a whole (Raphael, 1976, p.147).

Thus Appadorai (1975, p.187) has emphasised that:

By democracy we mean that form of government in which the ruling power of a state is legally vested not in any particular class or classes but in the members of a community as a whole.... Ancient democracy was direct, primary. When the Athenians called their constitution a democracy, 'they meant literally what the word itself expressed – that the people itself undertook the work of government'. Their Assembly, in which every citizen could take part, was the sovereign body in the state to decide national affairs, great and small. The opportunity for the citizen to take part in the executive and judicial administration of the state was considerable.

The direct Athenian democracy is what is commonly referred to as the 'ideal democracy'. However, Assisi Asobie (1997) contends that "Athenian democracy did not represent the ideal. After all, the citizens were not therefore allowed to participate as equals in politics. Nor did they enjoy liberty" (p. 3).

Nonetheless, James Madison, a political leader of the United States of America, captured this notion of the ideal democracy. He defined what he called "pure democracy" as "a society consisting of a small number of citizens who assemble and administer the government in person". He therefore argued that the system of government in the

United States of America could not be called a democracy since it involved "the delegation of the government ... to small number of citizens elected by the rest" (cited in Joseph, 1991, p.17).

Among modern Western political systems, it is perhaps that of Switzerland that is reputed as approximating most to the ideal. Switzerland is said to run a popular democracy in the following senses. First, in Switzerland, every adult male and female (i.e. from the age of 20 upward) participates actively in politics. And every man, but not woman, is a soldier from his 20th to his 60th year of age. Second, some cantons (i.e. states/regions) in Switzerland, practice direct democracy, in decision making by all adult males and (since 1971) females, too. Third, the Swiss national government operates under the principle of popular sovereignty. The Supreme legislative authority of the entire population is exercised continuously at the national level, by the Federal Assembly (i.e. the national council of 200 elected representatives and the Council of State of 44 representatives). But the Federal Assembly acts are subordinated to the final authority of the Swiss people in periodic referenda which occur two or three times a year on the average. Also, the Supreme executive authority at the Federal level, which is exercised by the Federal Council and assisted by the Federal Chancery, is subordinated to the Sovereignty of the people. The Federal Council submits and adapts itself to the wishes of the Federal Assembly or the National Referenda. And the Seven Federal Councillors operate as a collegial team under the chairmanship of the President who is also the Head of States and who holds office for only one year and gives way to another leader. Fourth, the commander in chief of the Swiss Federal Army is elected by the Swiss Federal Assembly (Kulby, 1966; Wuest and Witman, 1968; Elliott, 1973, cited in Asobie, 1997, p.3).

Nevertheless what obtains in Switzerland is not really popular democracy. After all, Switzerland is a Capitalist Society. It is a class society. The Swiss are divided by their relative position in the system of distribution of the ownership and control of the means of production, and by wealth, into a member of subtly graded classes.

And the class structure of the society is reflected in the multi-party system of the Swiss State. In the early 1960s, the largest parties were the Social Democratic Party; the Radical Democrats; the Catholic Conservative Party; and the Peasant Party. Others represented in the National Council were: the Independents; the Democratic and Protestant Party; the Liberal Democrats, and Popular Labour Party (the communists). Thus, there are parties that defend the interests of Capitalism (e.g. the Catholic Conservative Party). Others defend the interest of the Agrarian class (e.g. the peasant party). Others defend the interests of the working class (e.g. the popular labour party) (Asobie, 1997, p.4).

There is, however, yet another way in which democracy is conceptualised. To some, the essentials of democracy are periodic elections, representative government and fundamental civil liberties. This notion of democracy is referred to as liberal representative democracy. It is distinguishable from classical or popular democracy in several ways. The central principle of direct democracy is the belief that "the government and the governed are identical; that no distance exists between ruler and ruled; or more basically, that within the boundaries of the political community, ruler and ruled are identical: both are citizens". In the classical sense, the meaning of the term citizen is inseparable from the notion of continuous involvement in the public life of the community.

In contrast, the basic tenet of liberal representative democracy is the notion that "government and governed are separate and distinct". The people rule not through direct participation in governance, but "through representatives authorised to make policy decisions in the name of those who elected them." The political participation of the people is "limited to the periodic election of persons who act as representatives and to occasional transmission of instructions to them (Greenberg, 1983, pp. 25-29).

Classical democracy is founded on an abiding faith in the capacity of ordinary human beings to govern themselves wisely. The basic assumption is that: "everyone has deliberative and moral potential,

that given the proper political education and environment, ordinary people could be responsible and reflective", that, if given the opportunity, "they will grow and be able to generate progressively the knowledge and wisdom needed to guide collective action". On its part, liberal representative democracy is predicated on the premise that governance is a difficult and complex art requiring the greatest sophistication, intelligence, character and training (Greenberg, 1983, p. 28). Given the ignorance and lack of political skill, on the part of the majority of the citizens, a professional political class emerges which specialises in the art of governance. This is a group of people who make a living serving as the representative of the people, and who make politics a full-time occupation. This political class mediates between the government and the governed (Asobie, 1997, p.4).

Essentially, modern democracies use liberal-democratic governments. They are governments that are formed by political parties which secure majority votes from the electorate (eligible voters) after a free and fair competitive election.

From this liberal perspective, democracy has further been defined severally. Schumpeter sees it as the rule of the people to produce a government through a free and fair election (cited in Almond and Coleman, 1960, p.40). Sam Oyovbaire (1987, p.2), on his part, describes democracy "as a system which seeks to realize a generally recognised common good through collective initiation, discussion and decision of policy questions concerning public affairs and who delegate authority to agents to carry through the broad decisions reached by the people through majority vote". Nnamdi Azikiwe (1974), views democracy "as acts of government approved by elected representatives, for and or on behalf of the people" (p. 7). Furthermore, Dunleavy and O'Leary (1987) have asserted that:

Put more formally, liberal democracy is a system of representative government by majority rule in which some individual rights are nonetheless protected from interference by the state and cannot be restricted even

by an electoral majority. The extent to which those societies commonly recognized as liberal democracies have approximated to this model remains very controversial. Liberal democracy is not equivalent to use any system of majority rule. Conceivably a democracy can operate in an illiberal fashion, where minority freedoms are persistently denied not because they infringed upon the freedoms of others but because of majority 'tyranny' (pp. 5-6).

Liberal democracy is the key context in which we analyze the role of the state. Democracy is no doubt a controversial or even a confusing concept (see Dunleavy and O'Leary, 1987, p.4; Holden, 1994, pp. 4-7; Raphael, 1976).

In most democratic States, however, democracy has meant representative government. The ordinary citizen comes into the process only by casting a vote in favour of a representative or of the broad policy of a party. Decision on concrete issues is left to the body of elected representatives, the Legislature, or to a smaller group, the Government or 'Executive', acting with the consent of the Legislature. So what we have in practice is oligarchy, government by a few, but an oligarchy elected by the people as a whole and responsible to the people as a whole, responsible in the sense that it can be turned out at a next election and replaced by a different group of rulers. Vestiges of pure democratic procedure are found in some States where a popular referendum is held on certain basic issues, but generally speaking democracy in the modern world means representative government, the democratic element consisting in popular election and the possibility of dismissal (Raphael, 1976, pp.147-148).

Thus, democracy, popularly understood, denotes a system in which the eligible people in a polity participate actively not only in determining the kind of people that govern them, but also participate actively in shaping the policy out-put of the government. The determination of the composition of a government is done in free and fair elections. A political system which calls itself democratic must

have free and fair elections between competing political parties (Imuetinyan, 1999, p.1).

Democracy cannot be said to exist where the majority of the people in a political system are denied a say in the process of governance. To be sure, the philosophical basis of democracy can be traced to the Roman dictum that what touches all, must be discussed by all. Thus in the ancient Greek city states all free citizens gathered at the market square to discuss state affairs. Today, however, it is no longer possible to bring every citizen to the decision making arena. That task is now entrusted to a class of democratically elected politicians (Imuetinyan, 1999, pp.1-2).

Representation through the process of election is, therefore, modern states' solution to the problem of number. There are today in Nigeria houses of Legislature at state and federal levels as well as local government councils. These are democratic institutions where citizens can always vote in their representatives to exercise power on their behalf. There are also those elected into executive positions at the three levels of government (i.e. The President of the Federation, State Governors and Local Government Chairmen). Individuals elected into these offices are principally the representatives of the people although compared to the legislators, they have wider constituencies. For example, the Local Government Chairman and his Vice are elected directly by the people and their constituency is equal to the addition of all the constituencies of the members of the council (Imuetinyan, 1999, p. 2).

We have gone all this length to show that elected leaders are first and foremost representatives of the people. Thus in the performance of their functions such representatives must be guided by the views and aspirations of majority of the electors. In fact in a truly democratic setting it is the reconciliation and processing of these views into popular policy that should be the main function of those who hold political power in trust for the people. A situation in which politicians turn to the people only during elections, and rule according to their whims and caprices afterwards, is anti-democratic. There must be a

constant dialogue between elected leaders and the citizens at all times. Only then can people's views and aspirations be ascertained and taken into account in the policy-making process (Imuetinyan, 1999, pp. 2-3).

It is important to emphasise that when leaders take into account the views and aspirations of the people and act accordingly, that is when the political system is responsive. As a matter of fact, it is this principle of responsiveness that really defines a democracy. Following May (1978), Saward has asserted that: "A political system is democratic to the extent that, and only to the extent that, it involves realization of responsive rule." Thus, the participation of individuals in public affairs must result in the pursuit of their desires by the political authorities if the system is to be rightly referred to as democratic.

Individual full participation boils down to popular participation where the largest proportion of the citizenry is invited and expected to express their wishes on issues of governance. But we know that on every issue there are at least two, and possibly more, viewpoints. So whose view should carry the day? The most logical rule to apply is that the views of the majority should prevail. This is why majority rule has become the most popular procedure for popular participation in public policy. But in order not to deny the minority its right of self assertion, it is also a democratic imperative that while the majority would have its way, the minority must have its say. In a democracy, therefore, every opportunity must be given to the minority view to be freely expressed in order for them to win majority support for their views. In return, the minority must accept the majority decision once that decision has been freely arrived at (Imuetinyan, 1999, p. 4).

Another consequence of popular participation is the necessity for freedom of expression. For the individual to truly make his desires known about societal choice he must be free to express himself on those issues of the day. Without this freedom he cannot fully influence the course of events especially governmental policies. Indeed there is no way to ascertain the popular will if the individual citizen is not free to express his opinion. The availability of wide

ranging views of issues particularly through the media helps democracies to report conflicts of interest, provide vital information and indeed assist in the popular control of government by creating a well informed citizenry. In fact, freedom of speech and press involves the freedom to dissent, and also the freedom to form organisations and political parties as essential means of ensuring meaningful individual participation. The greatest tyrants therefore go after the elimination of freedom to dissent in order to create the culture of fear and silence on which tyranny feeds. Freedom therefore is a cornerstone of democracy (Imuetinyan, 1999, pp. 4-5).

As Robert Darl (1998) has emphasized,

... freedom of expression is required in order for citizens to participate effectively in political life. How can citizens make their views known and persuade their fellow citizens and representatives to adopt them unless they can express themselves freely about all matters bearing on the conduct of the government? And if they are to take the views of others into account, they must be able to hear what others have to say. Free expression means not just that you have a right to be heard. It also means that you have a right to hear what others have to say.

To acquire an enlightened understanding of possible government actions and policies also requires freedom of expression. To acquire civic competence, citizens need opportunities to express their own views; learn from one another; engage in discussion and deliberation; read, hear, and question experts, political candidates, and persons whose judgments they trust; and learn in other ways that depend on freedom of expression.

Finally, without freedom of expression citizens would soon lose their capacity to influence the agenda of

government decisions. Silent citizens may be perfect subjects for an authoritarian ruler; they would be a disaster for a democracy (p.96).

Thus, democracy promotes popular control of government. As has further been argued,

The distinctive features of democratic government, at least as we understand it in the western world, are intended to secure a maximum of liberty for citizens. Government with its rules and law restrict our freedom to do as we please. Democrats recognize the necessity of this, but they believe that, so far as possible, the rules should be self-imposed or at any rate should be in accordance with the will or consent of the citizens..., Liberty and equality are the distinctive aims of democracy (Raphael, 1976, pp.142-143).

In summary, Appadorai (1975) states that "democracy may be described as a system of government under which the people exercise the governing power either directly or through representatives periodically elected by themselves" (p.137). Of Abraham Lincoln's three terms, government of the people, really means government on behalf of the people, government by the people, really means representative government, and government for the people suggests that government should be carried on by persons of high principle (Harris, 1979, p.204). Of these three ideas, Harris believes that the third is perhaps the most valuable and meaningful. According to him, it suggests that those who are trusted with government are not politicians who seek to make themselves rich or powerful at the expense of those whom they are supposed to serve.

We may further summarize by saying that, in the world today, according to Sargent (cited in Oyediran, 1998), the basic elements of democracy can be said to consist of the following:

- a. Citizen involvement in political decision making;

- b. Some measures of equality among citizens;
- c. Some degree of liberty or freedom granted to or retained by citizens;
- d. A system of representation;
- e. Rule of law;
- f. An electoral system - majority rule; and
- g. Education [this may suggest political education or enlightenment to choose rationally] (p.38).

Also, the point should be made that the quality of democracy can be found in the quality of participation. That is, the extent the participation of the citizens counts in politics. It has been argued that,

It is the desire to maximize benefits that necessitates participation in politics. When participation is low and restricted, benefits are concentrated in a few hands, and the quality of benefit to the majority of the people is low. Active participation in politics limits the powers of those who form the government because the electoral vigilance of the people is the surest guarantee of a limited government. On the other hand, electoral apathy is an invitation to bad governance.... (In short) Democracy is participatory governance conducted within the political environment of basic freedoms (Ayoade, 1997, pp. 2 & 23).

Therefore, democracy is the power of the people to choose who rules them and to decide or influence how they are to be ruled. In other words, democracy is the power of the people to choose and direct their rulers. The people must have a say on who rules them and how they are to be ruled. They should be able to have a say on all state matters and any intended public policy. Democracy empowers the people to protect and promote their interests. In a democracy, the government

must serve the governed: it is government of the people. Government must therefore monitor and listen to public opinion.

As we end this section of this paper, let us be reminded that democracy represents a belief or conviction in man's ability to order his life by himself or his duly accredited delegate to decide his destiny, welfare, dignity and personal protection. It is man's absolute trust in himself and his potentials. It is a realization that men cannot be trusted with power; that men are easily power-hungry, corrupt and forgetful.

Finally, democracy represents the effective participation of people in their own affairs. It is majority rule and minority rights. It involves the due process of law and respect for fundamental human rights. Democracy epitomizes the dignity and regard for the individual; it seeks his/her consent in decision-making or governance and recognises and celebrates his/her ability to order his/her own life.

Nigerian People's Definition of Democracy

Beyond what we have above, there is a vast array of data on what Nigerians mean by democracy (see Edosa, 2012:356-358). Respectively, democracy means to the Nigerian people: good governance, free and fair election, employment or jobs, provision of security, good and affordable education, good roads, good and affordable hospitals with doctors, Food for the people, and good and affordable accommodation or housing. There is therefore no doubt that the Nigerian people want an accountable, responsive, transparent, sensitive and caring government; a government that addresses their basic needs and developmental concerns; a government that provides the now proverbial 'dividends of democracy.'

But all these are currently largely absent or unavailable in Nigeria. So, the Nigerian people's expectations are high. But what they get oftentimes are promises upon promises that are hardly ever met as well as bundles of disappointment. Consequently, the question is: How long will Nigerians have to wait for the 'mirage' called dividends of democracy? One thing however is almost sure: The

longer the wait for these mystical and elusive democratic dividends, the more people could begin to lose confidence in the democratic enterprise! The sad and painful memories of the excesses of past military regimes in the country may not linger forever!!

The long and short of what we are saying here is that the Nigerian people see democracy in developmental terms. To them, it is a survival thing; if you like call it 'bread and butter.' To these people democracy is an existential phenomenon. It is a survival thing. It is about providing the basic necessities of life for the people including security, stable electricity and social welfare.

It is no doubt fitting here to recall the comment of the highly engaging and polemical writer, Edwin Madunagu, on the widespread agitations of Nigerians for demilitarization during military rule. Madunagu (1992 cited in Babarinde and Ogunyemi, 1992) in his overview of the political transition in Africa observed that:

... people of this long-suffering continent are once more on the move for greater freedoms; they are challenging both the contents and forms of the social and political orders imposed on them; they are rejecting slogans and demanding concrete amelioration of their material conditions; they are re-negotiating the foundation of their nations; they are seeking and fighting for power (pp.115-116).

Political leaders should therefore make themselves relevant to the people by ensuring that governance is directed to meet their desires. This is a viable way democracy can have meaning for the people. A democracy that has no meaning for the generality of the people is obviously unsustainable. Democracy should accordingly go beyond the commonly mentioned or emphasized 'means' to achievement of desirable 'ends.' Nigerian political leaders should particularly take note of this.

Conclusion

This paper has tried to critically review the definitions of democracy from a wide spectrum. It has also tried to report that democracy has assumed a broader dimension among Nigerians who see it beyond majority rule, fundamental human rights, free and periodic elections, and other such conventional considerations, but in developmental and existential terms. It is this second aspect that this paper has referred to as the 'realism' definition of democracy.

The paper has also tried to point out that this 'realism' concept of democracy implies that political authorities should show more interest in what makes sense to the mass of the people. This means that the people cannot endlessly be fed with slogans and promises by their government, even if elected. In the particular case of Nigeria, the people desire to see and feel the much talked about dividends of democracy now!

References

- Ake C. (1992). *The Feasibility of Democracy in Africa*. Ibadan: CREDU.
- Akinyemi, A. B. (2006). "Consolidating Democracy in Nigeria," being text of a Public Lecture in honour of 65th birthday ceremony of Gen. Ibrahim Babangida on August 14, 2006 in Abuja and reproduced in *The Guardian*, Lagos, Monday and Wednesday, August 21 and 23.
- Appadorai, A. (1975). *The Substance of Politics* (11th ed.). Madras: Oxford.
- Ayoade, J.A.A. (1997). *Nigeria and the Squandering of Hope* (Inaugural Lecture), Ibadan: Vantage Publishers Ltd.
- Azikiwe, Nnamdi (1957). 'National Government.'
- Babawale, T. (2002). 'The Challenges of Democratic Government in Post-Military Nigeria.' Paper presented at the International Conference on "The Challenges of Democratic Consolidation

in Nigeria,” held at the Akenzua Cultural Centre, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria. August 2nd and 3rd.

- Babarinde, K. & Ogunyemi, B. (1992). ‘Institutional Framework for Democratic Transition in Africa: The Educational Imperative.’ In B. Caron, A. Gboyega, and E. Osaghae (Eds.). *Democratic Transition in Africa*. Ibadan: CREDU
- Barry, B. (1991). *Democracy and Power: Essays in Political Theory I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Burns, J. M., P., J.W. & Cronin, Thomas E. (1984). *Government by the People* (12th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall.
- Caritt, E.F. (1947). *Ethical and Political Thinking*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Darl, R.A. (1998). *On Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Diamond L. (1990). “Three Paradoxes of Democracy.” *Journal of Democracy*. Vol. 1. No. 3.
- Dunleavy, P. & Brendan, O’L. (1987). *Theories of the State: The Politics of Liberal Democracy*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Edosa, S. S. (2012). *Elite Values and Democratic Instability in Nigeria*. A Ph.D Thesis submitted to the Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Igbinedion University, Okada, Nigeria.
- Harris, P. B. (1979). *Foundations of Political Science*, London: Hutchinson & Co. Publishers Ltd.
- Holden, B. (1994). *Understanding Liberal Democracy* (2nd ed.). New York: Harvester.
- Imuetinyan, F. (1999). “Building Partnership between Elected Leaders and the Citizens in Local Government.” Paper presented at a Grassroots Based International Town Hall Meeting/Training

Workshop on ‘Democracy and Good Governance,’ organized by the United States Information Service (USIS) in collaboration with the Forum for Nigerian Women in Politics (FONWIP) at Eight (8) Centres across Edo State, Nigeria. 1st to 30th September.

- Isekure, N. (1992). *Democracy in Crisis: Edo State Election Tribunal in Perspective*. Benin City: Jodah Publications.
- Joseph, R. (1991). *Democracy and Prebendal Politics in Nigeria: The Rise and Fall of the Second Republic*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- Madunagu, E. (1972, February 27). “Transition in Africa: An Overview.” *The Guardian* (Lagos).
- May, J. D. (1978). “Defining democracy: a bid for coherence and consensus.” *Political Studies*. Vol. 26.
- McLean, I. (Ed.). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ogomudia, A.O. (Lt. Gen.) (2002). ‘Democracy Imperatives: Nigerian Army Perspective.’ Paper presented at the International Conference on “The Challenges of Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria,” held at the Akenzua Cultural Centre, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria.
- Otubanjo, F. (1992). “Divinity, Destiny and Democracy.” In Ayo Fasoro, Deji Haastrup and Femi Otubanjo (Eds.). *Understanding Democracy*. Ibadan: ADHERE.
- Oyediran, O. (1998). *Introduction to Political Science*. Ibadan: Oyediran Consults International.
- Oyovbaire, S.E. (1987). “The Context of Democracy in Nigeria.” In S. E. Oyovbaire (Ed.). *Democratic Experiment in Nigeria: Interpretative Essays*. Benin City: Omega Publishers Ltd

- Padfield, C. F. (1977). *British Constitution Made Easy*. London: W.H. Allen.
- Raphael, D. D. (1976). *Problems of Political Philosophy* (rev. ed.). London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Sargent, L. (1987). *Contemporary Political Ideologies* (7th ed.). Chicago, Illinois: The Dorsey Press.
- Saward, M. (1994). "Democratic Theory and Indices of Democratization." In David Beetham (Ed.). *Defining and Measuring Democracy*. London: Sage Modern Politics.