

DEMOCRATIZATION IN NIGERIA: NATION – BUILDING VERSUS STATE –BUILDING

Amaechi, Chidi M.

Department of History /International Studies,

University of Nigeria, Nsukka

E-mail: camaechi@yahoo.com

Abstract

Nigerians were highly excited by the inauguration in 1999 of the democratic regime, especially the termination of the protracted military stranglehold on the society, and the progressively widening political space. The freedom that followed opened the door to agitations and expectations. It is the position of this paper that much remains to be done because the transition or successful elections only mark the beginning of the democratization process and not the attainment of full-fledged democracy. It is only through a procedural identification of the problems of the nation and its people as well as the setting up of necessary institutions and framework by the state that the latter can be attained. In favour of the indispensability of history, the paper argues that the previous democratization efforts failed due mainly to ethnicity, bad leadership, corruption, poverty, unwholesome transplanting of foreign concepts of democracy without reference to local imperatives, and the inability of the state to rediscover the socio-political cum religious bases that sustained the traditional democracies of old. It avers therefore, that unless these problems are solved by the setting up of appropriate institutions and framework, with normative acceptance by different sections of the country, democracy cannot be attained in Nigeria.

Key Words: Democracy, Democratization, Nation-building, State-building.

Introduction

The enthusiasm with which Nigerians welcomed the institution of a democratic dispensation knew no bounds. It was not because Nigeria was a virgin soil, yet to drink from the fountains of democracy. Neither was it just a triumphant bliss that followed the escape from the persecutions of the global democratic revolution. The revolution encouraged the ostracization of authoritarian regimes and influenced external aid donors into continued tying aid flows to good governance. The euphoric situation resulted from the successful blocking of the military who had ruled the country for about 30 out of the 50 years of its existence since independence. Even so, the long period of military rule was not

as nightmarish as the authoritarian, repressive and corrupt nature of the military regimes. They eroded the remnants of past attempts at implanting a democratic culture and, invariably, efforts at nation building. The citizens became disgusted, impoverished and confused. The result was the emergence of ethnic champions and raw ethnic sentiments which even touched the very foundations of the state, and so pushed the hands of the clock to the starting point, as far as nation-building is concerned.

The inauguration of the democratic dispensation in May 1999 was, therefore, seen as messianic by majority of the citizens hence it opened the door to bottled-up emotions of repression, domination and marginalization as well as ethnic militias who, unfortunately, see democracy as a single dose panacea to their problems and desire for freedom, equity and justice. Even those that recognized the procedural nature of implantation of a democratic culture by alluding to the nascent stage of the democratic process still went too far to regard calls for sovereign national conference and secession by some ethnic groups and militias as being detrimental to both democracy and nation-building (Jagha, 1998:6). It is the objective of this paper to state that though freedom, accountability and justice are elements of democracy, it should not be forgotten, either, that the acquisition of a healthy culture of democracy is a continuing process and not a one-off thing. As observed by Aka (2002:225), Minter referred to the struggle for democracy in Nigeria as still unresolved, even after May 1999. This is not only because democracies are accepted as works in progress or journeys, as opposed to final destinations, but also because some democracies appear to be farther from their destinations than others, especially in view of some peculiar historical antecedents and traditional socio-cultural ways of life of the people. In other words, a transfer of power or successful election does not make a full democracy but the beginning of the democratization process

Again, while the fall-outs of democratization, especially freedom and demands for equity, accountability and justice tend to expose the problems inhibiting the task of nation-building, they pose greater challenges to state building. In other words, the task of surmounting the hurdles that normally beset the establishment of democracy remains the responsibility of the state and its government. By virtue of the social contract, this involves the adjustment of the existing or erection of new institutions and principles of state to meet the wishes of the citizens (state-building) thereby smoothing the course of democratization, which, in turn, leads to the sustenance of the state. The paper seeks to establish this important role of nation-building and state-building in the democratization process by perusing the concepts democracy, democratization and nation-building in Nigeria as well as the indispensability of state-building.

The Concepts and Applications of Democracy and Democratization Democracy It may be difficult to grasp the concept of democratization without prior clarification of the substance of democracy. From its introduction by the ancient Greeks, democracy implies the rule by the people, political equality under the law, and the possibility of an alternative government (Appadorai, 1974:138). As Macridis (1983:9) observed, liberty or individual freedom is indispensable in the practice of democracy. The Oxford English Dictionary defined it as "that form of government in which the sovereign resides in the people as a

whole, and is exercised directly by themö (as in the small Greek republics) or ðby officers elected by themö. It was the 19th American president, Abraham Lincoln that gave it a meaning that has continued to arouse hope and inspiration in the masses ó government of the people by the people and for the people. These definitions and explanations converge on governance through the will of the people in which all have equal rights, regardless of heredity, special rank or privilege.

As sweet as they sound, these definitions render the field wide open and portray the feeling that as long as something is done in the name of the people it could be termed democratic. The fact that a country has adopted democracy does not mean that political liberalization will be guaranteed. The masses (people) could still be oppressed by the system or excluded from the decision-making process. Unfortunately, the donor countries and organizations hardly look beyond structures and into local situations and peculiar imperatives. By virtue of its importance as an -acceptableø system of governance coupled with its fluid meaning, it became common for people to adopt or attach different meanings to it, all in a bid to accommodate certain local situations, and sometimes, to rationalize even atrocious policies. According to Scruton (1982:115), democracy refers to ðgovernment by the people as a whole rather than by any section, class or interest within itö. To Raymond (1978:155), it is a ðrule by the majority with respect and due consideration to the interests and rights of the minorityö and ðwhereby the rights of the individual person are respected and protected by the forces of government to whom they grant a mandate to ruleö. Without getting deeply involved in the dialectics of its various inscriptive attributes and meaning, and in support of adaptation, the success of democracy in any country rests on the morality of its citizens and the unwritten rules of honesty, accountability and integrity. These can hardly be attained without delving into the past of the people.

In some parts of Africa, and Nigeria in particular, the idea and practice of democracy existed before the colonial period and the two major features were accountability and direct representation. These were highly adhered to because leadership was exercised within readily recognizable political segments or communities, unlike now, and which made it easier for these features to be ðdefined less in terms of selection procedures and more in terms of affinity of the ruler to the ruled (Democracy in Nigeria, 2001:4). In addition, as has been observed,

Religion and mythical ancestry also played a pervasive role and were invoked to counter abuse of power by rulers í there were important checks on the exercise of power, reinforced by such social structures as councils of chiefs, age-grade associations, warrior, secret societies, and religious injunction. (Democracy in Nigeria, 2001:4).

Another important feature of traditional democracy was dialogue or discussion, which was an important mode of participation in public policy-making, especially, among the Igbo and the Tiv. Though the entire traditional setting cannot be easily reconstructed, the -peopleø still thirst for its richness of democratic values. It is in view of the need to adapt the new idea of democracy to the old values of the people that a writer described democracy as ðbasically a set of ideas and principles about freedom but also consists of a

set of practices and procedures modeled over time through a long and often tortuous history (Jagha, 1998:6). This description also aptly captures the procedural requirement in the establishment of democracy. It is not born over-night or transplanted but a continuing process, hence the word 'democratization'

Democratization

Democracy is suitable when cultivated and nurtured as opposed to transplanting. Democratization, therefore, refers to the process of political change, an on-going process and which signifies a transition away from dictatorial rule, as in the case of Nigeria. The transition from military to civilian rule and elections are good starting points but are not sufficient conditions for enduring democracy. The culture and institutions of democracy must be built and nurtured before it can produce fairness, equity, accountability, transparency, and ensure justice for all (Diamond, 1992:38 - 41). Invariably, good governance, fair and legitimate elections, justice, equity, accountability, transparency, responsible leadership, political education of the masses, efficient political institutions and respect for the rule of law are milestones on the road to 'full-fledged democracy' which cannot be attained 'miraculously' but through a gradual and steady process.

Democratization also involves adaptation to local exigencies, and not just the process of adoption. It is true that the principles or fundamentals of democracy are the same all over the world, its adoption, unfortunately, goes with certain intrinsic contradictions. The conditions that make democracy possible in one society may constitute a hindrance in another and so makes it imperative for each society to adopt necessary modifications in order to reflect the particular circumstances to which they apply to its people. For instance, the idea of 'rotational presidency' or 'zoning' in Nigeria are seen in some quarters as undemocratic since it does not give equal opportunities to all the citizens at the same time. However, in view of the multi-ethnic nature of the country rotational presidency and zoning guarantee a sense of belonging to the different ethnic nationalities, especially with regard to the issue of domination. It should always be borne in mind that perceptions of harmony, justice, equality, equity etc. sometimes differ among peoples, and like the concepts of peace, democracy can hardly be defined outside the system but based on the assertion of incompatible interests (Amaechi, 2004:3). As has also been observed, 'conflicts in democracies are not between right and wrong, but between different and differing interpretations of democratic right and social priorities' (Jagha, 1998:6). This remains a major hindrance among most African nations. Mostly affected are those that have been trying unsuccessfully to implant democracy entirely in the American and European conceptions. It also conforms with the view of Rantanakul (1989:48) that borrowing Western styles of democracy may look impressive in form, but in practice, it is unworkable and unsuitable to local circumstances.

This is exactly where history comes in. The background or past of a people, and more so for Nigeria, plays a very crucial role towards the attainment of democracy. The rationale lies in the fact that,

many developing nations are pluralistic communities in racial, national, ethnic and tribal terms. Many of them are lacking in shared values and symbols upon which the formation of consensus rests. Nigeria, for one, is a nation of different ethnic groups, languages, customs, cultures, values, hopes and aspirations from life (Dike, 2001:25).

Nigeria has experienced failed attempts at democracy. The present dispensation represents the country's fourth attempt at democratization. The earlier attempts failed mainly because of what Akude (1989:76) termed 'great diversities' among Nigerian peoples -- diversity in socio-cultural/ethnic life, diversity in religion, diversity of language, and diversity in levels of educational development. It is important to note, however, that these diversities, ordinarily, do not constitute problems but the use we have been making of them in the course of trying to project and protect ethnic interests. Perhaps, we should add poverty among the problems because though all other fundamental principles and institutions of democracy are essential in its functioning, they are meaningless to the lives of the people if they themselves are lacking the basic attributes of survival (Democracy in Nigeria, 2001: xviii). The thrust here is that the need for a proper understanding of the problems of democratization and the identification of possible solutions point to the indispensability of history because it guarantees the 'extraction from past experiences the lessons, warnings and inspirations which may serve as light to our feet, to illuminate our path' (Barraclough, 1957:221). As cited by Ifemeje (1988:111), Santayana warned, 'where experience is not retained – infancy is perpetual'.

Democratization and Nation-Building

Nation building is a very complex concept. Rustow (1960:369) asserted that the concept has both 'objective' and 'subjective' dimensions. The objective dimension involves such factors as the establishment of a territorial unit with a group of people and the setting up of governmental authority over, the territory. This perspective is common among Eurocentrists. Having successfully gone through the tortuous path of territorial and cultural unification, the Europeans tend to equate nation-building with the establishment of territorially defined political entities and government. This is indeed often regarded as 'state-building' and not nation-building proper. Even so, it refers only to the primary stage of state-building. The secondary stage involves the enactment and implementation of policies that could satisfy the interest of the group and sustain their unity. Again, if this perception of nation-building is accepted in its entirety, it becomes difficult to explain the situation in Africa, for instance, where there exist territorially defined political entities, which are yet to attain such 'supra-national' consciousness or unity (Emerson, 1962:93-4).

The subjective dimension of nation-building involves the creation of feelings and attitudes among a people and which could lead them towards national cohesion. This perspective is common among the Afrocentrists, as it tends to capture the situation in Africa and similar places. Africans were forcefully hammered into territorial units by the

colonialists without reference to ethnic feelings and affiliations (Jordan, 1985:15). Even the colonialists inadvertently concurred to this by their erroneous reference to the agitators for the independence of the African colonies as nationalists without nations (Emerson, 1962; Post, 1966:326; Hughes, 1981:130-31). The result is that many years after independence nationhood has remained a dream among most African countries. In other words, there is still need for the creation of feelings and attitudes through policies and actions that will act to galvanize the hitherto different nations into a larger one. Therefore, it is more acceptable here to refer to nation-building as,

the process of establishing among a group of people within a territory feelings of affinity, consciousness of a common destiny and participation in common cultural and political traditions that are also different from those of other people. (Morgenthau, 1952:73).

This equates nation-building with the creation of relevant psychological foundation necessary to bring about a strong feeling of nationalism. The achievement of this depends largely on the existing political culture. In all fairness, a democratic political culture favours consultation, discussion and free exchange of ideas. It also guarantees equality, equity and justice as well as provides a suitable environment for the creation and sustenance of this feeling of nationalism. This is hardly surprising because democracy creates a ready disposition on the part of the members of a state to subordinate their differences to the common good (Ndoh, 2003:155). Moreover, the feeling of being wanted is one of the strongest driving forces of action and allegiance towards nationhood. However, the road to the creation of this required feeling of nationalism in Nigeria has been tortuous due mainly to ethnicity and religion, which, as captured by Otite (1995:11), are the most devastating features of our contemporary Nigeria. In Nigeria, the British colonial masters achieved the first stage of state-building, or the objective dimension of nation-building, involving the founding of a territorial unit, geographically defined, for the country. Through a combination of military conquests and dubious treaties with harassed indigenous peoples, they subjugated and hammered different and often desperate ethnic national groups into one territorial unit. Worse still, they refused to take actions needed to weld these peoples into a community of people with a sense of common destiny. Instead, they actually adopted disintegrative administrative policies of 'divide and rule' which promoted the idea of separate development for each of the various ethno-linguistic groups. The Land and Native Rights Ordinance of 1910, for instance, limited the number of Southerners migrating to the North as well as established a segregated pattern of settlement among the various ethnic peoples living in the North. By so doing, they spread the myth and propaganda (Nnoli, 1980:112) that the ethnic groups were,

separated from one another by great distance, by difference of history and traditions and ethnological, racial, tribal, political and religious (Coleman, 1958:194).

The result was the heightening of tensions and antagonisms among the groups and at their departure in 1960, the British bequeathed to the motley of indigenous political leaders a shaky political amalgam called Nigeria. The situation is not surprising since the

motive of the colonizers was neither evangelization, or a philanthropic enterprise, nor desire to push back the frontiers of ignorance and tyranny, nor a project undertaken for greater glory of God, nor an attempt to extend the rule of law (Cesaire: 1955:10) but was spurred by greed. Rather than adopt a concerted effort towards nation-building, the indigenous political leaders that inherited power from the British, in their mindless struggle for power at the centre, fanned the embers of ethnicity by streamlining the distribution of resources and formation of political parties etc. towards ethnic gratifications. This exacerbated the forces of division and inter-ethnic struggle for dominance. With the dashing of the nationalist feelings and hopes nurtured at independence, citizens, recoiled their loyalties from the nation to their immediate ethnic groups which corresponds to Ekeh's (1980:23) concept of two publics – the civil public and the primordial public.

Ordinarily, the mere existence of different ethnic groups does not necessarily lead to ethnic acrimony. Positively, ethnicity harbours immense socio-economic welfare values, especially as mutual help associations. Therefore, the challenge of ethnicity lies in the ability to harness the similarities of the different groups for the sake of unity, manage their differences to ensure harmony, and streamline their internal structures and inter-relationship in favour of a democratic culture (Democracy in Nigeria, 2001:90). This was what Ramphal (Democracy in Nigeria, 2001: xviii) had in mind when he said that the solution may not be in the

submergence of the diversities, which are so central a feature of the Nigerian landscape – the more pertinent and realizable process is to visualize a bouquet of flowers. Each bloom is separate and precious in its distinctiveness but arranged in ways that enhance the others and render the whole an enriched oneness.

Again, for selfish interests, our political elite have ignored the similarities and overstretched the differences, hence the view that ethnic acrimonies have been engineered by wrong attitudes towards ethnicity than by ethnicity itself. Religion provided another basis for division. Nigeria remains a multi-religious state, with Islam and Christianity dominating. Ironically, all the religions preach peace. Therefore, the problem is not entirely with religion but with the politicization of religion coupled with the fact that adherence to the two major religions almost followed ethno-geographic lines. Each group strives to control the federal government by occupying all the important positions of authority and decision-making, apart from the subordination of the unity of the country to the interest of the region in control of political power at the centre. The result has been mutual suspicion, acrimony and disunity.

These unhealthy ethno-religious rivalries seem to have created a leeway for the permeation of the twin problems of poverty and corruption into every aspect of societal life in Nigeria. Worse still is the criminal neglect of the citizens by the leaders who are bent on satisfying their selfish interests first. Like a vicious circle, this has been reeling out series of social vices that continue to threaten the march to democracy and nationhood, especially by providing excuses for military interventions.

Out of the 50 years of the country's existence, since independence, military rule accounts for about 30 years. Due to their command structure, military rule tolerates no opposing views, tends towards dictatorship, and does not ensure accountability and equitable distribution of resources. Moreover, contrary to their usual avowed 'corrective' and 'no nonsense' stance, their mischievous and interminable transition programmes left trails of frustration and deterioration of civil-military relations. The situation almost led to the inability of the political system to live up to its primary functions which, according to Almond (1965:191), consists of five capabilities – the extractive, regulative, distributive, symbolic, and responsive – the fulfillment of which is necessary to ensure the system's adaptation, change and survival. In the case of the distributive capability or the authoritative distribution system, it disproportionately favoured the ethnic groups whose members dominated the political leadership to the disfavour of others, with the members of the latter groups feeling quite disenchanted and indeed wanting to opt out of the country. In recent times, this has been manifesting mostly in the form of ethnic militias, and pointing to the indispensability of adequate state-building efforts.

The Indispensability of State-Building

The state is an abstract entity and cannot be defined outside the institutions that sustain it. It is the 'overall network of institutional arrangements composed of the many diverse agencies which individually and collectively make public decisions' (Olaitan, 1998:138). However, the acceptability of the decision by the people depends on the capacity of the state to identify and attend to the constituent groups. Invariably, the state is required to underpin its organizational presence with a normative acceptance by the people in order to achieve the good of the totality of the people, which remains the end objective of state action. It follows, therefore, that the sustenance of the state largely depends on the state-building process. This refers to the 'conscious arrangement and design to create appropriate institutions and frame-work' for the existence of the state (Olaitan, 1998:139). In state-building, a distinction can be made between efforts designed to bring a new state into existence and efforts to consolidate the existence of the state. The latter involves the adoption of necessary changes to meet new circumstances, and so captures the progressive nature of the concept of state-building. The point here is that,

the functioning of the state institutions at a particular time cannot meet the demands of the state and its society continuously because of changing demands and situations such that the state has to continuously adjust and devise appropriate mechanisms and framework to meet such new demands (Olaitan, 1998:139)

From the foregoing, the inter-dependence of the concepts of democratization, nation-building and state-building can be deduced. Democratization exposes the state to the challenges of nation-building. The state can either 'build' or 'mar' the national aspiration. If it builds, the faith of the constituent groups in the system and the democratization process would be encouraged ad infinitum. In Nigeria, the problems of democratization and nation-building tend to reveal the failure of the state to put in place the suitable mechanisms in

order to live up to the social contract. The blame for this failure goes directly to the leadership because, as Mutharika (1994:62) observed, the success or failure of the institutions for development, which a nation can establish, depends upon how the leadership utilizes such institutions towards the overall development of the nation. As far as democratization and state-building are concerned, the colonial period was not a good schooling period. It was essentially autocratic and bequeathed extreme European liberal democratic institutions and values to Nigeria without proper reference to local imperatives. In view of the multi-ethnic nature of the country, the indigenous political leaders actually realized early enough the need for democracy and the federal system of government. They have gone further since independence to try such palliative measures as creation of states, the National Youth Service Corps scheme, creation of three-tiers of government, change from parliamentary to presidential system of government, Federal Character Principle, zoning of political positions, rotation of the presidency, creation of two-party system etc. Unfortunately, the problems of nation-building in the country are far from being solved. Some were imitated from the advanced democracies without reference to the peculiar history of the country, and the values governing them were not internalized first. Even those that conformed failed at the implementation stage because of being skewed towards sectional interests by the political office holders. Our peculiar experiences and circumstances demand that democracy be invented by utilizing traditional values that can imbue democracy with local relevance. This could be achieved without allowing the call to invent African democracy be a cover for repression, like the case of the Abacha regime and the bastardization of the notion of 'home-grown democracy' as Jagha (1998:11) observed.

As mentioned earlier, our traditional democracy was based more on direct participation along manageable political segments or units. This made it almost impossible to compromise such democratic qualities as good leadership, accountability and social justice, political socialization and the sanctity of human rights. It is true that the minute and segmented setting of the traditional democracy cannot be re-invented, we can re-discover and pursue vigorously the qualities that sustained it as well as the religious belief systems that guided and guarded it. The emphasis here is not necessarily a reversion to African traditional religion or the 'Nigerianization' of the existing world religions. However, the truth remains that the ability to retrieve what is necessary from the past amounts to rediscovering one's place in nature's network. Democratization, both in its procedural and local adaptation postures, requires good leadership, especially in emerging democracies. This is because the readiness of the people to respond spontaneously for national development largely depends on the quality and calibre of the leadership class. In this case, its commitment towards the emancipation of the poor and an unwavering dedication to lead the nation towards prosperity is quite essential.

Democratization and the Present Civilian Dispensation in Nigeria

At present, there are claims that we have attained 'full democracy' These emanated from the mere fact that the country has survived three presidential elections at a row since 1999. Therefore, expectations from and pressure on the government have been on the high side. Without discarding the progress so far, much still need to be done before the country

can get to the stage of relaxation. There are still vestiges of past mistakes, which, together with present challenges, need to be taken care of before we can start beating our chest. There are still problems associated with demand for creation of more states and local governments, generally acceptable revenue allocation formula, inadequate infrastructural facilities and rising level of corruption. These are apart from the near breakdown of the power, health and educational sectors. The situation has led to rise in ethnic agitations and conflicts which tend to expose the delicate character of the support of some sections of the country to official policies and actions. A closer look reveals that this situation is traceable to the wrong perception of democracy as a single-dose panacea to the nation's problems. The fact that the regimes of the present democratic dispensation rode to power on the massive support from all the sections of the country only provided an opportunity for the commencement of democratic consolidation and nation-building. It should not be a rationale for immediate gratification by the ethnic groups and militias. On the other hand, these seemingly anti-democratic feelings and agitations should not be swept under the carpet. They are the raw materials needed for democratic consolidation. As mentioned earlier, the ability of the government to provide solution to these agitations or put in place enabling policies and institutions takes the country closer to a healthier democratic culture.

Unfortunately, the heavily militarized nature of the Obasanjo regime, especially at the initial stage, revealed government's lack of understating of the democratic process. Conspicuously noticeable was the failure to adjust the leadership style of the regime to the tenets and exigencies of civil democratic rule. Democratic consolidation is preponderantly synonymous with dialogue and involves revolutionary minimization in the use of force, coercion and over bearing repression. These are antithetical to democracy. The handling of the ethnic militias, especially in the Niger Delta, and the frosty relationship between the executive and the legislature, especially during the first tenure of the regime, illustrated a tendency to command rather than conciliate or compromise. Moreover, the disregard for inputs from pro-democracy, human rights and other grass root groups tended to confirm the pessimistic prophecies of the possible influence of the president's military background on

his leadership style. It is not that the military is devilish but because by its nature, the military address the extreme and the extraordinary while democracy addresses the routine; the military values discipline and hierarchy, democracy values, freedom and equality; the military is oriented to law and order, democracy to diversity, contradiction and competition, the method of the military is violent aggression, that of democracy is persuasion, negotiation and consensus building (Jagha, 1998:11)

Calls for sovereign national conference and secession by some sections of the country, as means of achieving freedom, equality and justice should not always be seen as detrimental to democracy and nation building. Without advocating for violence or disintegration, it is obvious that the absence of freedom, accountability, transparency, equity, justice, dialogue etc. that these groups are seeking, point to the absence of democracy and endangers nation building. Therefore, calls for these qualities are supportive

of democracy. The logic here is that if we believe in democracy and its evolving nature ó democratization ó these demands can be said to have emanated from the finest thoughts of democracy and nationalism. It reveals the agitators as the real crusaders of democracy. To stop them amounts to denying the political system and the process of democratization an important input function ó public opinion ó needed for democratic consolidation. This would be akin to cutting-off the falcon from the falconer or blindfolding a painter.

Conclusion

Human wants are insatiable and this makes friction in human interactions inevitable. This is more so for multi-ethnic societies. However, democratization with its procedural bearing provides the enabling environment for the solving of national problems. Therefore, both nation building and democratization pose greater and even threatening responsibilities on the state. This is mostly in view of the fact that democracy cannot be attained without the establishment of the required democratic institutions and principles. In Nigeria, a delve into history reveals that previous democratization efforts were stalled by such factors as bad leadership, ethno-religious acrimony, corruption, poverty etc. Moreover, the unwholesome ~~transplanting~~ of European and American conceptions of democracy, without reference to local exigencies and historical imperative that sustained traditional democracies of old, has been an exercise in futility. Without disparaging past palliative measures, until the state provides appropriate institutions and framework and ensure the normative acceptance or internalization of the realities of the state, it will be difficult to attain democratic consolidation. This occurs when democracy is broadly and sincerely legitimate and so habitually practiced and observed that it becomes unlikely to derail.

References

- Aka, Philip C. (2002) "The Dividend on Democracy: Analyzing U.S Support for Nigerian Democratization." *Boston College Third World Law Journal* Volume 22, No.2 pp. 225- 280.
- Akude, Ike (1989) "Life and Politics in Nigeria" in Ikechukwu Akude (Ed.) *Issues in Social Studies in Nigeria*, Enugu: New Age Publishers, pp.68 ó 87.
- Almond, G.A. (1965), "A Developmental Approach to Political System" *World Politics*, Vol. XVII, NO. 2, pp. 191-200.
- Amaechi, Chidi .M. (2004) "Building Peace in Nigeria in this Era of Proliferation of Small Arms and Light Weapons" A Lead Paper Presented at the Civil Societies Roundtable Discussion Organized by the Centre for Development, Constitutionalism and Peace Advocacy (CD- COPA), At Pastoral Centre, Wetheral Road, Owerri, 28th ó 29th May, 2004.
- Appadorai, A. (1975) *The Substance of Politics* (11th Ed.) New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Barracough, Geoffrey (1957) *History in the Changing World*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Cesaire, Aime (1955) *Discourse on Colonialism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Coleman, J.S. (1958) *Nigeria: Background to Nationalism*. Nigeria and Sweden: Broburg and Wistrom.
- Democracy in Nigeria: Continuing Dialogue for Nation Building (2001). Sweden: International IDEA.
- Diamond, Larry (1992) "The Second Liberation" *African Report*, Nov. /Dec.
- Dike, Victor .E, (2001) *Democracy and Political Life in Nigeria*. Zaria: ABU Press Ltd.
- Eke, Peter P. (1980) *Colonialism and Social Structure*. An Inaugural Lecture, University of Ibadan.
- Emerson, Rupert (1962) *From Empire to Nation*, Cambridge, Mass: Beacon / Harvard University Press.
- Hughes, Arnold (1981) "The Nation State in Black Africa" in Leonard Tivey (Ed.) *The Nation State: The Formation of Modern Polities*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- Ifemeje, Christopher .C. (1988) *Introduction to History*. Obosi: Pacific Publishers.

- Jagha, Temple .O. (1998) 'Main Corrupts in African's Democratization' *AFRIGOV* (Newsletter of the African Centre Democratic Government), Vol.2 No.1, October ó December.
- Jordan, Robert S. (1985) *Government and Power in West Africa*. Benin City: Ethiope Publ. Corp.
- Macridis, Ray .C. (1983) *Contemporary Political Ideologies* (2nd Ed.) Boston; Toronto: Little Brown & Co.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. (1952) *Politics Among Nations*. New York: Alfred Knopff.
- Mutharika, Bingu Wa (1994) *One Africa, One Destiny: Towards Democracy, Good Governance and Development*. Harare: SAPES Trust.
- Ndoh, Cyril .A (2003) *An Introduction to Political Science*. Owerri: Concave Publishers.
- Nnoli, Okwudiba (1980) *Ethnic Politics in Nigeria*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Public. Co. Ltd.
- Olaitan, Wale .A. (1998) 'Rotational Presidency and State-Building In Nigeria' in Kunle Amuwo et al. (eds.) *Federalism and Political Restructuring in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Spectrum, pp. 137-146.
- Otite, Onigu (1995) 'Towards Salvaging a Ravaged Society' Postgraduate School Inter-Disciplinary Research Discourse, University of Ibadan, 18th July.
- Post, K.W.J. (1966) 'Nationalist Movements in West Africa' in Joseph C. Anene and Godfrey Brown (Eds.) *Africa in the Twentieth and Nineteenth Centuries*, Ibadan: University Press, pp. 326-337.
- Rantanakul, Pinit (1989) 'Modernization in their Society: Whose Values' in John Oxenham (Ed.) *Education and Values in Developing Nations*, New York: Paragon House, pp. 48 - 60
- Raymond, Walter .J. (1978) *Dictionary of Politics*. Brunswick Publishing Company.
- Rustow, Dankwart (1960) 'Politics of the Near East, South Western Asia and North Africa' in G.A. Almond and J. S. Coleman (Eds.) *Politics of Developing Areas*. N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, pp.369 -380.
- Scruton, Roger (1982) *A Dictionary of Political Thought*. Harper & Row Public Co.