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Abstract

The question of ethnicity has been one of the most topical subjects of study by social scientists. The controversies around this phenomenon seem to have been heated up by the high visibility of mobilized and politicized ethnic groups in most multi-ethnic states. Therefore, the extent to which ethnic nationalities are able to effectively manage the interplay of ethnic differences determines to what extent a multi-ethnic nation develops without crisis.

Historically Nigeria has come a long way from multi-ethnic entity with political differences and background to the amalgamation of 1914 till the present structure of thirty-six states. Ethnicity, no doubt has contributed immensely to ethnic conflicts in Nigeria because of long standing revulsion or resentments towards ethnic groups different from one's own or fear of domination which can as well lead ethnic groups to resort to violence as a means to protect and preserve the existing ethnic groups.

Significantly ethnicity in Nigeria, is a product inequality among the various ethnic groups orchestrated by a long period of colonialism; a period which witnessed the ascendancy of three major ethnic groups to the socio-political domination of other ethnic groups and a period when the three major ethnic groups were used as a pedestal for the distribution of socio-political goods, resulting in the inability of other ethnic groups to access these socio-political goods. This situation has continued to impact negatively on the forces of national integration and cohesion in ethnically divided Nigeria.

Considering the relationship between ethnicity and development; socio-political exclusion is not only ethically dangerous to development but also economically unproductive. It deprives groups and individuals of the opportunity for the necessary
development that can be beneficial to the society. Thus, it is important to develop an integrative socio-political frame-work that explicitly recognizes the participatory role of every ethnic group in governance. Hence, there is a need for the adoption of inclusive governance to manage ethnicity in Nigeria. Notwithstanding, ethnic conflict still persists and an attempt will be made in this study to identify the reasons.

Central to socio-political sustainability in Nigeria is a system that should recognize that differences are important to development and encompass notions of equality. Such a system should acknowledge the socio-political and economic power of every ethnic group and promote a system devoid of ethnocentric and exclusionary socio-political and economic policies.

**KEY WORDS:** Ethnicity, Development, Nationality, Primordialists, Instrumentalists, Citizenship, Underdevelopment, Ethnic Conflict, Ethnic culture, Civic culture.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 Introduction:

The International Day of Peace which was established by a United Nations resolution in 1982, and marked every year on September 21, is a global event whose activities are significant in highlighting the worldwide efforts toward conflict resolution and peace building. However this day is more relevant to the continent of Africa where most conflicts have taken place, with some running for decades, and seem to have defied every proffered solution. Therefore, from the perspective of socio-political and economic instability, Africa is seen as a drifting continent (Ong’ayo, 2008).

Today, various parts of Africa such as Somalia, Sudan, Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda, Uganda to mention a few, have experienced and some are still undergoing dangerous scenes of dysfunction and conflict, which have occurred between communities, ethnic groups and religious groups. Nigeria is no exception. A close observation has shown ethnicity as a mobilizing agent among the most important questions of this century, as conflict linked to ethnicity has led to significant loss of life and injuries in many countries, and become a major element of impoverishment, undermining human security and sustainable development.

Since independence in 1960, Nigeria has witnessed a period of unforeseen socio-political and economic instability as well as bloodshed. This is partly due to the petty-bourgeois origins of Nigerian nationalism and the politicization of ethnicity in the polity. Like the national formations on the Indian subcontinent, the political formation of Nigeria came into being alongside several contextual socio-economic and political factors; the fear of domination, economic exploitation, social and sometimes religious discrimination
(Rahim, 2007). These and others have not only set the tone for socio-economic and political underdevelopment, but have also set the various ethnic groups against each other.

1.1 Brief Historical Background of Nigeria

Nigeria is located in West Africa bordering on the Gulf of Guinea, and lies between the Benin Republic and Cameroon. The country has a total of 923,770 square km, 13,000 square km of which is covered by water. The boundaries of Nigeria extended for 4,047 km and countries with co-loving borders include; the Benin Republic (in the South West), Cameroon (in the South East), the Republic of Chad (in the North East) and Niger Republic (in the North West) (Ijeoma, 2010). The three major ethnic groups are Hausa-Fulani, Yoruba and Igbo. There are, however, other sizable ethnic groups which include Ijaw, Kanuri, Ibibio, Ogoni, Igbira, Jukun, Tiv etc. The major religious groups are Muslim, Christian and indigenous beliefs. The official language is English. This is as result of British colonisation that lasted for more than hundred years; whereas, the other languages associated with the three major ethnics groups are Yoruba, Hausa and Igbo. These socio-cultural differences have separated Nigerians from each other and constitute one of the main factors militating against national integration. However Nigerian leaders seem to be driven by the problems they create, even though Nigeria’s very diversity may indeed prove to be the guarantee of its stability and moderation if properly managed. Nigeria, like India, Canada, Malaysia, Ghana, today is one of the countries in Africa that owes its existence to the imperialistic activities of Britain. The pursuit of British economic ambition and expeditions through conquest crystallized in
the rather “artificial” creation called Nigeria in 1914, subjugating people from diverse culture, traditions and ethnic nationalities and organizing them to construct the Nigerian state.

The amalgamation in effect, produced two Nigeria with different social, political, economic and cultural backgrounds and development within the country. Some of the independent nation-states, kingdoms and communities that were thus combined included Kanem Bornu, the Sokoto caliphate, all in the present day Northern Nigeria; the city states of the Niger-Delta; the largely decentralized Igbo-speaking people of the South East; the old Benin Empire as well as the Yoruba Empire of Oyo, which had once been one of the most powerful states on the West African Coast. What the imperial government thought to be advantageous to them; today has come to be a major problem for the socio-political development of Nigeria. In other words, its artificial origin, coupled with other socio-political and economic factors, bequeathed it with a number of fundamental problems, which have turned to be the challenge of her socio-political and economic development.

With the adoption of Richard’s constitution in 1946, Nigeria was divided into three unequal regions (North, West and East). The Mid-Western Region was created in 1964. Political parties were thus, formed and maintained throughout the colonial era on regional and ethnic basis. Then, urban centres were formed, culminating the dispersal of people of the three major ethnic groups into different areas in the country, hence the question of exclusivism rocking the unity of the country today.

During the colonial era Nigerians only spoke with one voice perhaps to fight the common enemy “colonialism”, with each ethnic group having a different agenda which
surfaced after the flag of independence was raised in 1960. Competitive elections and Africanization of the bureaucracy began to make ethnicity increasingly important as the basis for political support and access to higher levels of state in Nigeria after independence. Nigeria today is beset with strings of socio-political problems which stem from the lop-sided nature of the political divisions in the country, the uneven socio-economic development and the type of federal system and the spirit in which it operates.

Post-independence Nigeria was turbulent and was marked by a succession of socio-political crises, as parties and ethnic groups violently struggled for political power and resources of the centre; embroiling the institutions of the state in a battle against each other. Due to the lack of tolerance among politicians (ethnic groups) and their unwillingness to abide by the rule of fair play in governance, political instability engulfed the newly independent state of Nigeria. Thus; the first phase of government under the leadership of the then Head of State, Nnamdi Azikiwe and Prime Minister, Tafawa Balewa was prematurely brought to an abrupt end in 1966 when the military assumed control through a coup widely regarded as ethnically motivated. The first military government headed by late General Aguiyi Ironsi who ethnically belongs to the Igbo ethnic group was soon brought to an end six months later through a coup by Northern officers. The second coup was seen as revenge resulting in the death of Aguiyi Ironsi and some southern officers.

Ethnicity therefore, assumed an added dimension and the forces that it generated plunged the country, first, into the secession of the East, and then, the bitter civil war of 1967-1970 that engulfed the country when Colonel Ojukwu tried to carve the State of

Nigeria, today, is made up of 36 states and 774 local governments’ areas (LGA) with Abuja as the federal capital, (See figure 1). For administrative expediency and the sharing of political office, the country is sub-divided into six geo-political zones namely; South West, South East, South South, North West, North East, and North Central. Today the country is beset with myriads of conflict stemming from the inability of the state to provide adequate socio-political and economic security for all ethnic groups. One of the themes that have dominated discussions about Nigeria today is whether the Country will survive as one indivisible political entity (Makinde 2012).

Figure 1: Map of Nigeria showing the 36 states of the federation.
Examples of conflicts in Nigeria in recent times include Yoruba/Hausa community clash in Shagamu, Ogun state; Eleme-Okrika in Rivers state; the intermittent clashes in Kano, Kano state; Chamba-Kuteb in Taraba state; Itsekiri-Ijaw/Urhobo in Delta state; Aguleri-Umuleri in Anambra state; Ijaw-Ilaje conflict in Ondo state; Hausa/Fulani-Sawaya in...
Bauchi state; Fulani-Irigwe and Yelwa-Shendam both in Plateau state; Hausa-Yoruba clashes in Mile 12 and Idi Araba in Lagos state; and Ife-Modakeke in Osun state Zango-Kataf in Kaduna state; Tiv-Jukuin in Wukari, Taraba state; Basa-Egbura in Nasarawa state; Ogoni-Adoni in Rivers state (Ubi, 2001; Imobighe,2003; Omotayo, 2005 in Abidemi 2007). These and other ethnic cleavages and overlapping affiliations of religion have undermined prospects for socio-political and economic development of Nigeria.

Compounding the problem of underdevelopment in a poor country like Nigeria is ethno nationalism, access to resources and allocation of power, which pose a great threat to peace, security and progress of the nation. The reality is that development cannot take place in a crisis ridden environment. One of the pillars of development is stability. The ethnic tensions that resulted in the civil war of 1967-1970 is a case in point. Negative use of ethnicity – preferring people from ones ethnic group over others in the distribution of socio-economic and political goods; making access to the state as essential for sectional opportunities and claims on resources. It is a strategy for group advancement and therefore focuses on securing control of government or gaining important representation through electoral office, cabinet appointments, the civil service, or public enterprise to the detriment of other group – no doubt negates socio-political and economic development. It becomes a powerful force that leads to socio-political instability that in turn defines the realization of a country’s resources. Once the state is controlled by one or more ethnic groups, upward social mobility becomes the preserve of such groups, who use the state machinery for group interests as opposed to national development concerns. To stop ethnic conflict, an attempt must be made to create an enabling environment which engenders peace and stability and guarantees the security
of the people and the optimal utilization of both human and natural resources leading to improvement, enhancement, elevation, progress of the citizen, to mention a few.

When Nigeria's socio-political and economic failure is examined, it becomes evident that ethnic conflict is central to its current developmental syndrome. It seems to thrive in uncompromising and confrontational social and political environments. The endless images of this are irreconcilable differences and struggles between groups over access to socio-political and economic power and the opportunities that go with them. It is a negative force that is utterly destructive to civil society and consensus building. It negates socio-political development, undermines a country's economic stability and flouts the rule of law. Glickman (1995) however links ethnicity to political processes. He points out that despite the persistent ethnic conflicts in the politics of African states – including Nigeria – significant liberalization and democratization leading to socio-political development is possible. In other words it can be a required ingredient for the realisation of socio-political and economic integration if it is properly appropriated.

The problem of ethnicity as it emerged under the auspices of colonialism ensured that Nigerians had no control over the central power and often were kept divided into administrative districts. The colonization of Nigeria ensured that people of diverse culture were brought together to form one country. Most of these were not properly integrated into their new states. The implication of this is that the Nigeria state was unable to create an overlapping national interest which would have disregarded parochial and group interests even after many years of independence, hence the instrumentality of colonialism to ethnic conflict in Nigeria.
In Nigeria, the colonialists provided the urban setting which constitutes the cradle of contemporary ethnicity. The British colonialist, while pretending to carry out a mission of uniting the warring ethnic groups consciously and systematically separated the various Nigerian people thereby creating an atmosphere of social-political and economic conflict. According to the International Foundation for Election Systems (IFES) on behalf of United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in 2000 found that ethnicity is the strongest type of identity among urban Nigerians. Almost half of all Nigerians (48.2%) choose to tag themselves with an ethnic identity. In other words ethnic conflict is more pronounced in the urban areas.

At the heart of ethnic conflict in Nigeria according to Nigeria Strategic Conflict Assessment (NSCA) lie political corruption and the lack of good governance. The politicians are many times indirectly involved in virtually all the conflicts. They stimulate ethnic consciousness, the aim of which has been to mobilize ethnic grievances in order to achieve their ethnic group objectives. Scholars have argued that some of the communal conflicts in some parts of the country are proxy wars engineered and executed by the political class to divide and rule the people. They allocate opportunities in employment, education and other life chances to individuals from their tribes or regions. Such policies undermine the political, economic and administrative authority that manages the country’s affairs at all levels comprising the mechanisms, processes and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interest, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate differences. Therefore the decline in social, political and economic growth of Nigeria in the last decade despite its enormous
human and natural resources can be traced to political actions often dominated by ethnic interests, hence the incessant conflict that has engulfed the country.

In a multi-ethnic society such as Nigeria, ethnicity should be seen as an additional variable in socio-political and economic development over and above those normally present in more homogeneous societies. The role of ethnicity in development can be negative or positive; it can be a problem or a potentially rewarding challenge (Chien, 1982). Malaysia is an example of a multi-ethnic community that uses its ethnic composition to advance its socio-political development by creating a unique pattern in which the strengths of the Malay and non-Malay community have been beneficially utilized. In a way, one might express the attitude of the leaders from the various ethnic communities as sharing a country on the basis of an enforced integration imposed by the British colonial government as the umpire. Since there is no practical and humane possibility of dissolving the union, the only practical way is to make the best out of it (Chien, 1982). This type of federation may serve as a consensus model to be emulated by Nigeria.

The consolidation and survival of Nigeria’s union thus depends on the ability of the centre to manage the pressures that come from the socio-political and economic demands of every ethnic group. A major contributory factor to ethnic conflicts is the undemocratic nature of governance. This is because most political leaders in Nigeria have employed the divide-and-rule method of governance and created more ethno-religious divisions than the colonialists ever did. Before the country’s democratic government was inaugurated in 1999, ethnic conflicts were not so pronounced, although feelings were expressed. Thus, the survival of the Nigerian federation hinges on
proportional control so that the federal government can control and contain ethnic tension by regulating the power mechanisms.

In response to mis-governance there has been an array of ethnic mobilizations such as Oodua People’s Congress (OPC), Movement for the Actualization of the Sovereign State of Biafra (MASSOB), Arewa People’s Congress (APC), Ijaw Youth Movement (IYM), and Movement for the Emancipation of Niger Delta (MEND), among others, which have evolved in the North, West, East and South of the country; to protest against socio-political and economic marginalization. The prevailing ethnic situation in Nigeria seems to show that the country is yet to be a united one because of inter-ethnic distrust and destructive rivalry which must be carefully addressed when there is still a chance to salvage the fragile unity of the country. Prevailing illusions notwithstanding, Nigeria can only be held together by negotiated consensus not force. Despite the fragmentation of the country into thirty-six states and 774 local government area (LGA) by successive governments to ease ethnic tension and promote development; inter-ethnic rivalry still persists.

Democratization seems to have reenergised long suppressed feelings among the hundreds of ethnic nationalities in the country. Some are pushing for greater participation in the running of the affairs of the Nigeria state, and in state creation, while others are clamouring for greater autonomy. To date the response from the federal government has been the use of violence to suppress the intensity of ethnic conflict in the country.

While conflict is part of every human community, its nature and management severally determine its effects on the society (Okunola, 1998). Ethnic conflicts are a means of
identifying the imperfections in a plural society, and of suggesting remedies to remove or solve the problem of inequality, discrimination, internal colonialism, and the misuse of majoritarian democracy and national government powers (Otite, cited in Osinubi and Osinubi, 2006). In order to preserve or establish progressive development, the root causes of ethnic conflict need to be addressed.

Ethnic conflict management whether by local elites or governments should be seen as a continuing process with no end point or final resolution (Lake and Rotchild 1996). It is also an imperfect process that, no matter how well managed will still leave some potential for violence in virtually all multi-ethnic polities. Effective ethnic group management seeks to reassure every ethnic group be it major or minor of their socio-political, economic and cultural security. In essence, there are possible ways of managing ethnic conflict such as democratization, power sharing, free and fair electoral processes, proportional representation or zoning systems can produce a congenial atmosphere for the interdependence of groups, and political participation and prevent ethnic groups from being locked out of government (Glickman, 1995). This means that regional autonomy, confidence building measures, promoting the rights of every ethnic group reduce the socio-economic and political factor that produces violence.

By and large, the impact of ethnic conflicts on socio-political and economic development in the polity has been negative. Apart from the loss of lives and property, investible resources are often diverted to security issues and conflict management. Yet, its psychological impact through depression is agonizingly too traumatic. The most worrisome element is the gradual re-militarization of the state and society, as opposed to the desired goal of de-militarization in the name maintaining peace in trouble spots.
across the country. Cosmetic solutions, such as the creation of local government councils will only lead to the emergence of majority minorities and more agitation for socio-political and economic rights; which means that sustainable development will remain a pipe-dream if the root causes of ethnic conflict are not given adequate attention by all who envisage the re-awakening of Nigeria.

1.2 Problem Statement

Inequalities (socio-economic) among the various ethnic groups as orchestrated by a long period of colonial administration (1860-1960) have made Nigeria a cynosure of ethnic conflicts. The central issue is that the social formation of Nigeria which is basically ethnically heterogeneous and by implication a multi-cultural society may result in a high potentiality for lack of cordiality, mutual suspicion and fear and in addition a high tendency towards violent confrontation for various socio-political reasons.

Ethnic conflict has arisen out of this context of mutual fear and suspicion over distribution of socio-political and economic goods and lack of cordiality. Thus the inability of every ethnic group to access socio-political and economic goods continues to impact negatively on the force of national integration and cohesion. It is a product of the long history of unequal access to power, resources and opportunities among the different ethnic groups in the country. Thus the demands of such a challenge are exacting.

Significantly, this context has led to open confrontation and conflict because the stressful condition of the body polity raised questions that challenge the very basis on which the political community – modern Nigeria – is organized. This prompts the
question, ‘is ethnicity in Nigeria an invention of the people or of colonialism?’ What raises this question is the fact that the various ethnic groups that constitute the pre-Nigeria state once co-existed socially and economically, hence the question of whether ethnicity is a social construct or a natural order?

Contemporary ethnic communities and identities in Nigeria are not likely to dwindle even with the inevitability of civilization, but rather represent critical aspects of Nigeria’s experience of modernity itself. Ethnic conflict in Nigeria is therefore the outcome of a continuous and continuing process of social construction emanating from the encounters of different ethnic groups with each other as well as the deliberate mobilization and manipulations of ethnicity by the political class. Of importance here is the problem of socio-political exclusivism of ethnic groups and individuals in Nigeria. As a result ethnicity has become a bane to the socio-political development of the country. Ethnic pluralism no doubt is and will remain a fundamental characteristic of modern Nigeria that must be recognized and incorporated within any project of nation-building. Thus, this informs us that Nigeria’s many ethnic fingers can be transformed into a formidable fist for socio-political development.

This study proceeds from the view that without consideration for equality and the acknowledgement of the inclusion of every individual and ethnic group big or small in governance, ethnic conflict in Nigeria will be exacerbated, ignoring every effort to make every Nigerian see himself or herself as a Nigerian and not as a Yoruba, Hausa or Igbo.

1.3 Objective of The Study
The aim of this study is therefore to examine the nexus between ethnic conflict and development in Nigeria; as ethnic conflict has led to significant loss of life and become a major element in impoverishment, undermining human security and sustainable development. Bearing this in mind, it must be stated that most of the ethnic conflicts in the country have different root causes and different political, social and economic contexts. Thus, in order to examine the extent to which ethnicity has impacted on the socio-political and economic development of the country and how policy approach has managed to address the problem posed by ethnic conflict to Nigeria’s unity, the objective of this study will be carried out in relation to the question posed by this study.

(1) What are the causes of ethnic conflict in Nigeria and how has it impacted on Nigeria’s unity?

(2) The corollary question to the above is, what are the measures put in place to manage or reduce the negative impact of ethnicity in Nigeria?

(3) To achieve the above, what strategies can be employed by the Nigerian government to defuse the flame of ethnic crisis?

Socio-political and economic development can be achieved where ethnic equality is promoted via the instrument of equal citizenship. Therefore, this study proceeds from the view that, without adequate consideration of respect for the equality of every ethnic group through the instrument of good governance, the desired unity that breeds socio-political and economic development will remain elusive. This is because where one ethnic group is considered to be more important than others it will be difficult to put out the flames of ethnicity.
1.4 Significance of The Study

A number of studies have been carried out on ethnicity in Nigeria. This study has identified a knowledge gap which concerns the nexus between ethnic conflict and development in Nigeria. This, one can say, emanates from the fact that one of the major forces of developmental dilemmas facing the country today is the historical legacy of ethnicity bequeathed to the country by the colonial administration. This has impacted on national integration in the country as will be seen in this study. In order to examine this knowledge gap the study aims to introduce a fresh idea into the study of ethnicity in Nigeria linking it with socio-political and economic development of the country.

A further compelling reason to develop this knowledge gap is because most studies dwell on issues such as religious conflict, ethnic and minority problems. Therefore, there is need to consider the inadequacies of those studies. Significantly, ethnic conflicts are not only inevitable; they are also sometimes desirable to reveal different needs and interests among the various ethnic groups as well as reveal their cohesion. The challenge is for those involved in societal development to mobilize the strengths of every ethnic group in the country as the resource-input in the search for the realization of the socio-political and economic goals of development which are meaningful and appropriate.

Thus the contribution of this study is to identify the nexus between ethnic conflict and socio-political development in Nigeria based on the idea that ethnicity is not itself dangerous but its manipulative tendencies in relation to Nigeria’s political instability have; made it a major problem in Nigeria. An investigation of this kind that looks at
ethnic conflict and socio-political development in Nigeria has not been done; hence its choice for this study.

1.5 Research Method

Research is an academic activity that involves defining and redefining problems, formulations of hypothesis or suggested solutions; collecting organising and evaluating data; making deductions and reaching conclusions; and at last carefully testing the conclusions to determine whether they fit the formulating hypothesis (New Age, 2011). Research has also been described as a method or process of gathering information as well as a means of answering unanswered questions or creating that which does not currently exist (Goddard and Melville 2001). In other words research is the original contribution of knowledge to the existing stock making for its advancement. It is also the pursuit of truth with the help of study, observation, comparison and experiment. The term research should therefore be seen as a systematic method consisting of enunciating the problem, formulating a hypothesis, collecting the fact or data, analysing the facts and reading certain conclusions in the form of solutions towards the research problem. (New Age, 2011)

Methodology on the other hand has been described as a documented, respectable and tested set of methods practices and rules used to collect and analyse information (Gartner, 2011). While method refers to the techniques and procedures in the process of data collection which are to be used for inferences, interpretations, as well as explanations in research; ranging from asking questions, reading and interpretation of documents to observation of controlled and uncontrolled situations. We can therefore
say that methodology is the point at which method, facts and epistemology (epistemology here means the presuppositions about the nature of knowledge of science that informs social inquiry) coalesce in an overt way and the process of directly investigating specific instances within the social world. It describes and analyses all these, throwing light on their limitations and resources. It clarifies their presumptions and consequences relating to their potentialities to the social world at the frontiers of knowledge. It aims to explain the process of scientific inquiry (Cohen et al. 1989). What follows therefore is the detail description of the methodology used in this study.

The study adopts the historical approach, defined as a systemic and objective location, evaluation and synthesis of evidence in order to establish facts and draw conclusion about past events. It is seen as an act of reconstruction undertaken in the spirit of critical enquiry in order to achieve a significant representation of a previous age (Cohen et al. 1989). This study has adopted the historical approach on the basis that ethnic conflict in Nigeria can best be understood within the frame work – secondary data analysis – of a historically constituted context. It is the view of this study that through the reconstruction of the past, the present socio-political instability in Nigeria as orchestrated by the colonial engineering of Nigeria can be understood. This method is in contrast to the qualitative method which focuses on in-depth understanding of specific human behaviours and perhaps the reasons behind such behaviour and the quantitative method which focuses on systematically empirical investigation of social phenomena via statistical techniques.

There are four methods that researchers use to collect historical data; these are archival data, secondary sources, running records, and recollections. The archival or primary
sources are typically the resources that historical researchers rely most heavily on. Archival data include official documents and other items that would be found in archives. Secondary sources are the works of other historians/researchers who have written history. Running records are on-going series of statistical or other sorts of data such as census data. Recollection data include data such as autobiographies, memoirs or diaries. The historical method therefore is a necessary technique without which no account of the present may be properly understood. This method has the capacity of “challenging dominant assumptions because of the past through which the present and the future can be reconstructed” (Jupp, 2006:135)

Researchers that use historical method often explore the past in order to gain a better understanding of events and motivations which precede the current state of affairs (The reason why this study has chosen historical method). This helps them in identifying a pattern of behaviour of which the present merely represents a point in a continuum of development. Scholars have argued that in historical research, the researcher carefully and systematically investigates and analyse documents and other sources of fact about a given problem or event in the past. Significantly, this is done to determine how such historical facts influence current practices, to reconstruct and predict future trends, or probably suggest ways in which current practices could be modified in the light of history. Therefore this approach seeks to understand the process, the background and the reason for which ethnic conflict has continued to be a force to be reckoned with in Nigeria’s socio-political and economic system to date.

Historical research is however not without its own problem; such as that the data can be biased and influenced by persons writing them. Historical method no doubt is broad.
Tracking how ethnic conflict started and how it has affected Nigeria’s socio-political development could therefore be taxing. Studies that involve the socio-political and economic system of Nigeria before and after independence can be difficult. It is therefore the responsibility of a researcher adopting the historical method to bring out the key issues and analyse them in order to arrive at a benefitting conclusion. Historical research is, therefore, very important and necessary for this kind of study, because it provides insight into some salient ethnically based issues e.g. state creation, and how it affects socio-political and economic development in Nigeria. This cannot be gained by any other research technique.

Ethnic conflict in Nigeria is a complex phenomenon which does not require a regression approach, as this type of approach cannot examine in-depth issues as regards ethnicity in Nigeria. What this suggests is that laboratory schemes like experimental design whereby experiments will be formulated to test hypotheses derived from theory or prior research, is not suitable for such a study since the social world does not operate in an organised order; hence the choice of historical approach as the ideal method for this study. The historical approach explains how the history of Nigeria evolved in response to the colonial state’s needs and demands. Attention is also given to how the colonial needs affected different ethnic groups in the Nigeria state and how ethnic conflict has been managed in post-colonial Nigeria.

This study does not depend on qualitative or quantitative designs that usually rely on survey data. Rather, it relies on information based on the historical formation of Nigeria, crucial data sources such as archival materials and other documents related to ethnic conflict in the country. Secondary data sources such as books, articles and other
publications relevant to the study will also be used. What this means is that historical research seeks out information from a larger array of sources making it more exhaustive in gathering data (Powell, 1997). The study takes advantage of the fact that the historical approach helps us to understand the present, thereby contributing to contemporary public and social policy debates on ethnic conflict and its attendant effects on the socio-political and economic development of Nigeria. However, qualitative variables will be used in the collection of data and quantitative variables will also be employed where necessary because data or evidence should not be examined from a singular point of view.

1.6 Data Collection Method

Data are facts, figures and other relevant materials past or present, serving as bases for study and analysis. As identified by Hox and Boeije (2005), data may be used for the description of contemporary and historical attributes, comparative research or replication of the original research, reanalysis – asking new question – of the original data not addressed, research design and methodological advancement and teaching and learning.

Data collection therefore is the process of gathering and measuring information on variables of interest, in an established systematic fashion that enables one to answer stated research questions, test hypothesis, and evaluate outcomes (Whitney et al. 1988). Data collection is common to all fields of study including physical and social sciences, humanities etc. Although methods vary by discipline, the emphasis on ensuring accuracy and honest collection remains the same. Data collection for research
can be in the form of surveys, observations, interviews as well as historical analysis which involves the study of documents.

The data collection method used in any research has its advantages and disadvantages (Welman et al. 2005). One of the advantages is the fact that it will broaden the researcher’s knowledge of the research topic and, at the same time, help the researcher to contribute his/her quota to the existing knowledge in the research area. According to Brynard and Hanekom (1997) one of the disadvantages of data collection in research work is the amount of time it consumes. What must have informed this assertion was that, without adequate and appropriate data, to understand and as well add to the existing knowledge in the research field becomes problematic; more so as one may not be able to add to the already existing knowledge. Thus access to the research material becomes more difficult the more time has passed. The data collection method can be both qualitative and quantitative in nature. It should be noted that data collection of a past event is dependents on existing transcriptions and their interpretation to discover the pattern used and this is based on the intuition of the researcher.

There are two kinds of data collection method, the primary data collection method and the secondary data collection method. The primary method refers to the systemic empirical investigation of social phenomena where the researcher directly collects data that have not been previously collected. Primary data are first-hand information collected through various methods such as observation, interviewing individuals, questionnaires, case-studies, diaries, photographs etc. Significantly, and on every occasion that primary data are collected, new data are added to the “existing store of knowledge” (Hox and Boeije, 2005: 593). The material created by other researchers is
made available for reuse by the general research community; it is then called secondary data.

The secondary collection method contains data that have been collected and compiled for another purpose. This consists of published and unpublished records. The secondary data collection method may be done by collecting information from a diverse source of documents or electronically stored information. The Nigeria census is an example of a common secondary data source.

These methods provide information about the human side of an issue—the often contradictory behaviours, beliefs, opinions, emotions and relationship of individuals. It is also effective in identifying intangible factors such as norms, socio-economic and political status, ethnicity and religion whose role as a research issue may not be readily apparent. Therefore the study will adopt a historical method of research focusing on the issue of ethnic conflict and socio-political development in Nigeria. One reason necessitating this choice of method is the fact that the study describes and therefore understands ethnic conflict as it affects socio-political development of Nigeria.

1.7 Sources of Data

The data base of this study will be derived from sources containing information on ethnicity, ethnic conflict, human security and development in Nigeria. The sources of data will include literature-archival/historical and contemporary documents comprising published and unpublished books, commentaries in journals on political and non-political actors, periodicals as well as autobiographies. Mass media publications such as Newspapers and Magazines will be use as well as government research reports on
ethnic conflict in Nigeria and the reports of other independent research institutions, both local and international. Data will also be sourced from Human Rights Organizations’ libraries, government agencies e.g. National Population Commission as well as resources from the internet.

1.8 Data Management and Analysis
The organisation and analysis of the data collected starts with their sorting into themes and sub themes, informing the structural arrangement of the findings. This is however done in an attempt to avoid the challenges involved in the interpretation of the findings and to reach a good conclusion. The establishment of the cogency and reliability of the findings in relation the objective of the study will follow to check if there will be need for additional information.

1.9 Expected Findings
The research is intended to highlight the link between ethnic conflict and socio-political development in Nigeria. It will also attempt to provide a frame work in which ethnic conflict can be used to identify the development needs of the people. In the main, policy options will be provided by the study on how ethnic conflict can best be resolved. This, the researcher believes, will reduce and contain ethnic conflict in the country.

1.10 Delimitations of the Study
Ethnic conflict has become one of the more serious challenges of our time, particularly to development, which perhaps explains why ethnicity is seen as a reigning concept in
African studies. However, some of the studies have failed to provide empirical evidence to substantiate their claims. The present study intends to contribute along this identified gap. Limitations of this study are envisaged concerning (i) availability of literature, (ii) inability of the researcher to travel to the country to interview some of the major political players, (iii) the possibility that some of the publications to be consulted may be biased in their presentations. However, an attempt will be made to reduce these effects on the outcome of this work. This will be done by consulting a wide range of materials (v) most importantly time and finance.

However, with regard to ethical standards, the research will use documents for which permission has been granted and authors of written cited materials will be acknowledged. The study has also taken into consideration the ethical code of the University of Fort Hare.

1.11 Chapter Outline:

Chapter 1: This chapter discusses the introduction to the study.

Chapter 2: A review of relevant literatures analysing discussions, debates on ethnic conflict and development in Nigeria.

Chapter 3: This chapter analyses and discusses ethnicity and its relations to political development in Nigeria.

Chapter 4: This chapter will be devoted to discussions on the persistence of ethnic conflict in post-independence Nigeria.

Chapter 5: This chapter will look at uncivil politics and underdevelopment in Nigeria.

Chapter 6: In the concluding chapter, an attempt will be made to conceptualize possible
ways of preventing ethnic conflict and suggest ways of progressive and effective management of ethnicity in Nigeria.
CHAPTER TWO

Approaches and Methods of Understanding Ethnic Conflicts

2.0 Introduction

This chapter is, basically, a review or perspectives of scholars on ethnicity; some of which seeks to give readers and learners a frame work for understanding the concept of ethnicity, ethnic group and ethnic conflicts. To fully understand their views some of their work in relation to this study will be reviewed in this chapter. This chapter begins with a discussion of views of scholars on ethnicity, ethnic group and ethnic conflict. This is followed by an analysis of ethnicity and development, good governance and development as well as human rights, democracy and development.

Ethnic conflict in Nigeria’s political society can be linked to the quest for the elusive socio-economic and political goods by the various ethnic groups within the polity. There are three basic factors that have contributed to the problem of ethnic conflict in the Nigerian political system, namely, the struggle for power and for resources of the state by a defined dominant class, the nature of the Nigeria state as a specific modality of class domination immersed in the struggle among contending social forces and the problem of ethnicity (Idowu, 1999).

Thus getting an in-depth conceptualization of ethnic conflict in Nigeria requires an understanding of the traditional model of governance that is the backdrop against which any attempt at development must be viewed. Ethnicity cannot be totally eliminated if development is to take place. This, in effect, means that ethnic conflicts are also sometimes positive and sometimes desirable to reveal different socio-political and economic needs and interest as well as test group cohesion among ethnic groups that
constitute the Nigerian polity. The reason why ethnic conflict management can be seen as a continuous process is that, no matter the effectiveness of the management strategies employed, particularly in multi-ethnic state, it still leaves potential for violence. Put differently ethnicity shapes peoples orientation and socio-political identity and explains what will be collectively defined as acceptable.

The fundamental sociological problems in discussing ethnic conflict are the problems of situating conflict, describing and analysing its structure, articulating its modes and themes, and of showing how various kinds of conflict may be related (Idowu 1999). On a general level of analysis, conflict occurs where there is an interaction between at least two individuals or groups whose ultimate objectives (political, social or economic) differ, Nicholson (cited in Idowu, 1999). Ethnic conflict is described as a struggle over values and claims to socio-political status, power and scarce resources in which the objectives of the opposing parties are to gain the desired socio-political values. In other words conflict can be a state, situation, event or process which involves a distinct category of social behaviour. This category of social behaviour is evident in the clash of two incompatible yet valued objectives (access to socio-political and economic goods) in other words it is a process of interaction or striving.

Central to the incidence of and occurrence of ethnic conflict in Nigeria is struggle over access to socio-political and economic resources. In explaining ethnic conflict in Nigeria, one cannot exclude the politics, struggles and the consistent consumerist pattern of the major ethnic groups in the acquisition of socio-political and economic goods as a causal factor in the conflictual and unstable nature of political interaction and attitude in Nigeria.
This irreconcilable struggle for power triggers conflict. The result is the state of socio-political and economic underdevelopment of the country.

The fact that ethnicity has been linked with all socio-political vices associated with the Nigerian body polity has made the subject a dominant theme in the study of Nigeria socio-political development. To some extent, no work is deemed scholarly that does not consider the prominence or relevance of ethnicity in its analysis. The result of such interest in ethnicity, which is proportional to the high level of ethnic consciousness in the Nigerian society, is the legion of literature on ethnicity, making a critique a huge task (Lewis 2002)

2.1 Ethnicity Defined

The inability of every ethnic group to have access to socio-political goods has continued to impact negatively on the forces of national integration and cohesion in ethnically divided states both in Asia, Latin America and in sub-Saharan Africa. But there remains the question of why multi-ethnic states have not been able to mobilize the goods in ethnic differentiation for developmental purposes and why ethnicity is easily mobilized and manipulated in such political systems. Ethnicity has been one of the most popular subjects of study by social scientists. The debate on ethnicity seems to have been fuelled by the high visibility of mobilized and politicized ethnic groups in most multi-ethnic states of Africa and Asia.

Its popularity has made it an “unwieldy concept” (Green, 2006: 1) hence the reason for several connotations given to the subject, thus making it one of the most researched phenomena by scholars in political science, sociology, anthropology etc. Ethnicity for
example is considered a social construct (King, 2002) Barth cited in Hale, 2004; Seo, 2008). Van Evra (cited in Hale, 2004) states that ethnic groups are formed and once formed they tend to strongly endure. Hence the question is whether ethnicity is a natural order of things or a social construct. Analysts have put their argument into two opposing perspectives primordialism and instrumentalism – to be discussed later – the result of which are arrays of literature on the subject. Thus, the conceptualization of ethnicity is a complex one.

To fully understand this concept there is need to consider the concept of the ethnic group. Cohen (cited in Salawu et al. 2011) sees the ethnic group as an informal interest group whose members are distinct from the members of other ethnic groups within the larger society because they share kingship, religious and linguistics ties. Yinger, on the other hand defines the ethnic group as a segment of a larger society whose members are thought, by themselves and/or others, to have a common origin and to share important segments of a common origin and culture and who in addition participate in shared activities in which the common origin and culture are significant ingredients (cited in Lee et al. 2002).

In a shift from the above Hale (2004) sees the ethnic group as a set of people who perceive that they have things (social, political and economy) in common and that their similarities are captured by a label; the ethnic group name, as in Zulu and Xhosa in South Africa, Marmas and Chakmas in Bangladesh, Nahuas and Chortis in Honduras or Tuareg and Mozabite in Algeria. Hale’s (2004) perception of the ethnic group goes beyond the socio-biological relatives of kingship, language, culture and ancestry. It captures the socio-political identity of the group. It is for this reason Calhoun (1993:231)
sees it as a “bounded set of individuals, not necessarily characterized by any internal pattern of relationship much less one of kinship or descent”, hence the construction of ethnic groups as nationalities (King, 2002).

Ethnic groups depend on the maintenance of boundaries; however the socio-cultural features that describe the boundary may change. What remain unchanged are the differences between the members of the ethnic group and those considered outsiders (non-members of the group). Vanhanen (2004) perceives the ethnic group as an extended kin group. Their members tend to support each other in conflict situations, explaining why many types of interest conflicts tend to become canalized along ethnic cleavages in multi-ethnic states.

Notwithstanding this, the above definitions give us an insight into some important variables of the ethnic group, having a shared culture/language and the recognition as belonging to the same socio-political group. Thus ethnic group can also assert and maintain its socio-political and economic identity. Therefore, an ethnic group consists of those groups that share a common language and ancestry and are equally regarded as so by other ethnic group. Each ethnic group has its own constituted features which do not change and are consistently distributed within this group. Hence, the Yoruba of the West in Nigeria, the Zulus in South Africa, the Marathi in India and the Krahn in Liberia can all be classified as ethnic groups that share a common language/culture and ancestry and they are regarded as so by other ethnic groups. In a nutshell, an ethnic group can be defined on the basis of their distinct differences that the members of the group and other ethnic groups see as significant to their identity.
In a multi-ethnic state it is assumed that there will be clearly defined ethnic groups with “generally incompatible values” (Fearon and Laitin, 2000:849). These ethnic groups are constructed and poised to defend and maintain their boundaries to raise their self-esteem against those considered to be out of the group for whatever significant reason. The in-group is often considered ethnic and often has its motivation rooted in achieving their socio-political and economic goals. “Ethnicity thus serves to structure such actions, by providing people with social radar that they use to efficiently identify or impose social possibilities and potential constraints in a world of immense uncertainty and complexity” (Hale, 2004:482).

The term ethnicity indicates that groups and identities have different mutual contacts. The implication of this is that groups do not live in isolation. What brings about ethnic conflict is the nature of their socio-political and economic interactions. Ethnic feelings are the interaction of various ethnic groups. Ethnicity is considered a phenomenon that mediates between diverse human relations and between different values and norms expressed and utilized differently at both the individual and collective levels and can influence the life processes of ethnic groups either positively or negatively, (Seo, 2008). Perhaps, this is the reason why ethnicity has been considered an aspect of the social relationship between agents – social, political and economic – who see themselves as being culturally distinctive from members of other groups with whom they have a minimum of regular interaction. This informs us about why ethnicity has been described as a frame within which certain socio-political disputes are conducted. Participation in such disputes can at the end of the day reproduce ethnic understanding and cooperation. For example, ethnicity can be mobilized in pursuit of perceived ethnic
interests such as a demand for justice, equity in the distribution of socio-economic and political goods and equal representation in governance.

By implication ethnicity does not constitute any threat to the socio-political and economic development of a state. It is the negative employment of ethnicity – negative attitudes towards those regarded as outsiders – that constitute the threat to political development. Hence the positive aspects of ethnicity often become insignificant in multi-ethnic states. The interaction of ethnic groups may either negatively or positively affect the socio-political and economic positions of other groups. In essence, ethnicity becomes problematic when the various ethnic groups turn the table against each other in an attempt to have access to political power, thus degenerating it from a form of political support into a basis for political conflict.

With a view to explaining the phenomenon of ethnicity, one question that readily comes to mind here is why ethnic groups have maintained their identity and why ethnicity has become the basis for mobilization and manipulation particularly in multi-ethnic states. One reason that can be given is that ethnic groups have continued to grow stronger because of their socio-political and economic needs and the demand for such has given room for ethnic mobilization and manipulation by the political elites. Ethnicity according to Egwu (2007) is thus, an abstraction of the ethnic group because it has no independent existence of its own, being always driven by the political class interest or the quest for power. Hence, ethnicity is seen as a significant obstacle to development policies in a multi-ethnic state (Thorne, 2007). It emerges as a result of the on-going socio-political contestation.
Seo (2008) maintains that ethnic manifestations should be understood in the context of individual and collective socio-political experiences in a given society. In essence, the high visibility of ethnicity is a direct result of cultural and socio-economic conditions in existence over generations. By exploring the presence, extent and context of a group’s behaviour one can predict or have an insight into what an ethnic group is up to. The prediction by scholars that ethnicity and ethnic attachments will lose their significance in the process of industrialization and civilization (Seo, 2008) seems to have lost its position. This is because there has not been a shift from ethnic attachment. What this means is that ethnic groups today are affirming themselves more and more which has made ethnicity more significant because of the instrumental use of the phenomenon by the political class. The political class refers to a relatively small group of people that is aware and active in politics and from whom the national leadership is drawn. However this class in multi-ethnic states has, in a sense, cultivated alliances whose primary interest is their socio-political gains through the manipulation of ethnicity. Thus ethnicity can be seen as a process by which an appeal is made to the socio-political and economic differences in the ethnic groups through which the groups are manipulated. It is a psychological process that the political elites manipulate for their own political interests, making the people ethnically conscious.

From the above, ethnicity can be viewed as social organization. King (2002) posits that ethnic identity may be narrowed or broadened in boundary terms and in relation to the specific socio-political and economic needs of the group; hence the assertion that ethnicity refers both to aspect of gain and loss in interaction (Ericksen, 1993). What this implies is that ethnicity has both a political and organizational aspect, making it a
significant phenomenon in societies where it is politically mobilized and manipulated. Calhoun (1993) comment that ethnic conflicts have been described as the product of manipulation or at least a recurrent innovation. It is a creation of political elites who draw upon, distort and sometimes fabricate materials from the cultures of the group they represent in order to protect their well-being or existence or to gain political and economic advantage for their groups as well as for themselves. Ethnic mobilization is made possible as a result of groups’ competition for scarce socio-political and economic resources engendered by the process of modernization.

Ethnicity has also been defined as a social construct. The meaning of this is that ethnic conflict is considered a by-product of uneven access to socio-economic resources orchestrated by the reorganization of the hitherto autonomous pre-colonial societies into artificial state structure, hence the explanation of ethnicity in relation to “external stimuli” (King, 2002:356). The result of this is the spate of political instability in these post-colonial states. This instability is made possible as a result of shifts in ethnicity after independence. In essence the ethnic groups which had, prior to colonialism, maintained a cordial relationship, develop a new identity in which ethnicity was central and national interest secondary.

In a shift from the above school of thought, Duran (cited in Seo, 2008) observes that in modern society ethnicity may be regarded as a rational group response to socio-political pressure and a basis for concerted group action. This is clearly and significantly demonstrated in contemporary African states. What one can deduce from this assertion is that ethnicity is a function of the structure of the socio-political and economic situation of the society. Thus ethnicity can best be understood as a deliberate strategic choice by
groups and individuals as a means of obtaining socio-political and economic status or rights. This points to the fact that ethnicity may not be regarded as acquired by belonging to a particular ethnic group which shares the same origin but should be seen as a means of expression in specific socio-political and economic spheres. Ethnicity is a tactic which groups or individual believe can propel and earn them their desired socio-political status, hence its political utilization.

One new dimension that has been added to the phenomenon is the interpretation that ethnicity can be a “chameleon strategy” (Pieterse, 1993:8). What this means is that the minds of members of a particular ethnic group operate in such a way that they can choose to be members of their ethnic group when they want to or members of the larger community (the state) when they feel it is politically or economically profitable. This explains why ethnicity has been classified by Green (2006) as a mid-level identity, representing a group, perhaps small enough to mobilize and manipulate but also large enough to lead to strong political development if otherwise mobilized and manipulated positively. Ethnic conflict thus is the product of competition for political and economic resources.

From the above conceptualization of ethnicity one can conclude that ethnicity is more or less a “mediating reference point” (Seo, 2008:351) through which ethnic groups in multi-ethnic states with diverse human relations and values promote their group interests. However, the extent of the utilization of ethnicity may be different between individuals and groups in the expression and utility of ethnicity; because of variation and the perception of their socio-political and economic positions. For example in South Africa, Kenya, Honduras, Jamaica, India etc. where there are diverse ethnic groups, ethnicity
may serve as a common mediating reference point which may likely affect their socio-political and economic relations as well as development.

The implication of the above is that each ethnic group may tend to emphasize their ethnic identity and utilize it more effectively for their own socio-political and economic interests. However this mediating reference point may eventually become a tool in the hand of different ethnic/political leaders who capitalize on these socio-biological bonds and utilize it for their own political and material advantage. Individuals always act in a manner that maximizes their socio-political and economic benefits. They can decide to act in the interest of their group or otherwise depending on what benefits them most. This explains the relevance of national cohesion in a multi-ethnic society to prevent ethnic conflicts, creating a relationship between ethnicity and nationality.

2.1.1 Nationality and Ethnicity

In the discussion of ethnicity, the subjects’ ethnicity and nationality rarely connect. This is because ethnicity belongs to the framework of multiculturalism while nationality relates to constitutional politics (McCronne, 2002); hence, the fundamental question of whether nationality and ethnicity are the same. According to The South African Concise Oxford dictionary 2002 edition, nationality refers to the status of belonging to a particular nation or an ethnic group forming a part of one or more political nations. It is a collection of people sharing national identity, usually based on ethnic and cultural ties. The instrumentalist approach to constructing a nation is the pragmatic and situational aspect of large communities. Nationality is the aspect of identity that derives from one’s membership of a nation. It is a socio-political ideology that asserts collective and
solidary goals in a political community. Nationality, one can say here, is psychological and therefore supplies the well-spring for sentiments such as patriotism and self-sacrifice.

According to Kedourie, “humanity is naturally divided into nations, that nations are known by certain characteristics which can be ascertained, and that the only legitimate type of government is a national self-government” (cited in Calhoun, 1993:213). To understand the concept of nationality it will be better to briefly look at the concept of nation. A nation is a self-identified cultural group that regards itself as distinctive from others in some fundamental and significant way (Encyclopedial.com, 2008). Members of a nation see themselves as having a common history that binds them to one another and to a given territory.

In the words of Bacova (1998), the primordialists believe that the nation is primarily the ethno-nation; a community which unites individuals through the same blood and common fate. This sense of mutual attachment feels natural even if the objective bases of the group are invented. It should, however, be stressed that there is no particular attribute that a group must have in order to qualify as a nation but essentially, language, history and ethnicity are the three common bases of national identity.

The subjectivity of the origin of national identity notwithstanding, they possess a significant status that shapes how individuals see and regard themselves and are treated by others. One fact that needs to be stated here is that some of Nigerian states for example Delta state where there are Delta Igbo and Delta Urhobo or Kogi state where there are Ibira, Igala and Yoruba are, to some extent, ethnically divided and most of these states include sub-groups that could evolve from sub-group state into
nationalities. However this is not to say that they are constantly conflictual; as much has been done in the federation to contain ethno-linguistic diversity tension by reorganizing the states to reflect language, culture and religious diversity, though, such reorganization has still left minorities within the state boundaries. Socio-political relations are therefore influenced all over the world based on the fact that nationality has become a universal component of identity. The way that state boundaries were historically constructed particularly in Africa has made nationality a politically salient issue and the possibility of violence is thus heightened; which explains why there are instances of conflict that plague multi-ethnic states.

Scholars have come to agree that nationality and ethnicity are different but difficult to dissociate one from another. It is equally difficult to explain nationality as the continuation of ethnicity or a reflection of common history, culture or language. In essence, nationality should not be seen as the continuation of ethnicity. Significantly, nationality and ethnicity has been made so important because of modernization in terms of socio-cultural changes, especially nation building and integration of different ethnic groups. Ethnicity is diffused to give way for common national citizenship. Nationality tends to promote a wider range of integration of all ethnic nationalities in a nation-state regardless of their ethnic group. This however does not take away the fact that a nation has a founding moment which can be located in the primordial times which explains why ethnic nationalities believe much in their identity. Ethnicity can thus be regarded as the basis for nationality; a social reproduction of basic classificatory differences between categories of people and to aspects of gain and loss in socio-political interaction.
(Eriksen, 1991). What then are the differences between nationality and ethnicity? Are the two the same?

Ethnicity from our discussion so far is associated with a plural society. The term plural society usually designates colonially created states with culturally heterogeneous populations. Typical plural societies include Indonesia, South Africa, Mexico, India, Jamaica, Nigeria etc. The groups that make up the plural society, though duty-bound to participate in a uniform political system are distinctive in other matters and ethnically tend to be articulated as group competition. Thus nationality is positively inclusive, whereas ethnicity is exclusive. One needs to state here that it is still possible for nationality to be exclusive to some extent. For example, a member of ethnic group X may be preferred above a member of ethnic group Y in the sharing of political office but the fact still remains that individuals from X and Y ethnic groups still see themselves as belonging to the same nation. What varies here is not the degree of inclusiveness or exclusiveness but the bases of inclusion and exclusion (Zenker, 2011). On the other hand, ethnicity is negatively exclusive. For example a member of XY ethnic group residing in AB ethnic group may not be allowed to participate in the political processes in the person’s host ethnic group or vice versa. That is, the in-group on the basis of ethnicity excludes the out-group from political processes. The argument here is that nationality serves as a bridge between the gap of ethnicity in a plural society with reference to the people and not to a particular ethnic group.

One significant and noticeable difference between nationality and ethnicity is in the area of propagation and its submission to public discussion and scrutiny of ideas. The ideology behind the notion of nationality is constantly repeated and promoted but
primordial loyalties and affiliations exist and function without any form of subjection of intention and socio-political ideas to public scrutiny.

From the above one can say that nationality confers status of the self by defining an individual as belonging to a higher, meaning-bearing collectivity, which in turn inspires loyalty and pride in one's national identity. Thus, the significant mark of nationality and by definition is its emphasis on political loyalty to the state which is preferred above ethnic loyalty. Nationality however has been adjudged to be an essentialist characteristic. You either have it or you do not; and status of minority nationalities within states is often one of vulnerability and marginalization (Encyclopedial.com, 2008). Each nation implicitly provides a rationale for the exclusion of those who are not full members of the national community.

Ethnicity, if sufficiently powered, can provide individuals with most of their status, and their entire cultural identity can be couched in an ethnic idiom. More so, nationality creates the thought of patriotism. On the other hand, ethnicity creates a thought of ethnicism promoted by the political elites in order to gain political power. People can share the same nationality but different ethnic groups. For example, the Zulu and the Xhosa in South Africa are distinctive different in terms of their ethnic group but they still belong to the same nationality. It is the modern state that defines nationality; the pre-existing ethnic relations are therefore revised to encourage national cohesion rooted in socio-political power relations and not ethnic solidarities.

Nationality places demands on the fact that there should be relative internal homogeneity rather than a continuity of ethnic variations. Therefore a triumph over ethnicity and hence, links every individual directly to the centre. Ethnicity on the other
hand invokes ethnic identity which is constituted and maintained in a social process that involves diverse intentions; ethnicity is divisive while nationality attempts to suppress the divisive elements of ethnicity. One can therefore conclude that the difference between nationality and ethnicity as they have been explained here for scholarly convenience is their relationship to the state.

2.1.2 Ethnicity through the Eyes of the Primordialists and Instrumentalists.

In the social sciences, there is a large body of literature related to ethnic groups, ethnicity and ethnic conflict. Most of these studies fall into two major forms of ethnic identity – the primordialist and the instrumentalist. We shall explore these theories in relation to ethnicity and place them in the context of socio-political development.

**Primordialism**

This is a view of the essentialist that ethnic groups can be taken as givens in social existence (Pieterse, 1993, Young, 1986). That is, ethnicity is seen as immediate contiguity and kin connections but also as being born into a particular community, culture, language and sharing the same social practices. Perhaps this is the reason why Fearon and Laitin (2000) see ethnic identity from the point of descent rules of group membership and content typically composed of cultural attributes, such as religion, language, customs and shared historical myths. The community is believed to be individuals united through common ancestry or fate. Smaje (cited Seo, 2008) believes primordialism regards ethnicity as a principle of social structuring, powerful and immutable characteristics of the human condition evincing meanings which transcend
the immediate social context. In essence, the behaviour of an ethnic group as expressed can be understood as an end in itself, a result of a prior affective arousal or emotional need (Seo, 2008). Primordialism appeals to emotional and instinctive constraints as ultimate distinctive explanations for group mobilization. However it’s been argued that ethnic groups are rational interest groups lacking primordial significance and those ethnic groups assert and maintain their identity because of socio-political and economic reasons rather than psychological primordial attachment, hence the categorization of ethnicity as an element of socio-political and economic action. The ethnic group can be mobilized for political action by individuals who see ethnicity as an important instrument in accomplishing their socio-political goals. Ethnic groups are therefore “purposeful groups; their common purpose is that they are arbitrarily created and sustained for pragmatic utility” (Seo, 2008: 347).

One question that rightly comes to mind here is why people still follow ethnic leaders whose interest seems to serve the interests of the elites and not the masses. Horowitz (1985) postulates that ethnic groups can be regarded as supra families. The essence of ethnicity is its promotion of unity and solidarity which undeniably overcomes the primordial community. It is this unity and solidarity that has made the people support their leader. For example the saying by the Yoruba (an ethnic group in South Western Nigeria) that, “omo wa ni e je o see” – he is our son we must support him – is a primordialistic statement; showing that it does not matter what the person does, as long as he/she is part of us, we will support him; resulting in the activation of solidarity when the group (community) is being deprived of its socio-political goods. One feature of
ethnicity that is been invoked here is the emotional aspect which the primordialist considered as given and undeniable.

This explains the argument that modern society is far more than a politically regulated, contractual and impersonal association of individuals and groups. Rather it is held together by an affinity of personal attachment and moral obligation to the group. The level of this attachment/commitment to the group may however be different. That is, it may be “high in some and it may be moderate or low in some” (Seo, 2008:336). Young (1986) asserts that primordialism seeks to identify and define the cultural psychological dimensions of ethnicity. Primordialism calls for emotional attachment and ethnic solidarity from members of the ethnic group and invariably provides for a basis for their ethnic consciousness. The ideal of primordialism is characterized by absolute loyalty and solidarity to one’s ethnic group and its goals. However, this differs from individual to individual and from one community to another and from one period to another.

The above however justifies the fact that primordial sentiments cannot be ruled out in national political development. For example primordial attachment has been found to be one of the preferred bases for fragmentation of hitherto autonomous political units in the independent states of Nepal, Sri Lanka and Nigeria when they were reorganized into their present political units. This brings to our notice that primordial attachment plays a significant role in socio-political and economic development of ethnically divided states by virtue of some unaccountable absolute import attributed to primordial ties; which in other words means that people have the ability to construct and deconstruct the social political and economic realities around them; hence, the comfort and sense of belonging that stems from ethnic group identity.
Primordial identity here is made up of what one is born with or acquired and considered significantly different from all other identities which are considered secondary. What this portends is that, since culture is more or less a human formation and can be learnt it may not be a significant factor when considering ethnicity as a social relation. Rather it can be orchestrated to that level if and when it is activated by the socio-political interests of the group.

However, primordialism has been criticized on the basis that primordialist “have neglected people’s creative abilities or efforts for the establishment of a better world” (Seo, 2008:339-340). This has made primordialism to be regarded as significant only in times of conflict and not so significant at other times. Primordialism can be useful in explaining the emotional basis of ethnicity and the tenacity of ethnic solidarity, and how ethnic affiliation can be instrumental to individual group identification.

One significant criticism of primordialism is the fact that it makes ethnic group/individuals passive and captive to primordial sentiments, it makes them emotionally caged, so they are unable to respond proactively to socio-political challenges confronting them either internal or external. Primordialists appeal to emotional and instinctive constraints as ultimate explanations for national mobilization (Conversie, 2006). This explains why individuals as well as groups dogmatically follow their ethnic leaders even when the actions and inactions of such leaders are meant to boost their socio-political status at the expense of group’s socio-political and economic growth.

Ballard (cited in Seo, 2008) postulates that a good deal of ethnic conflicts are not about culture; rather, they are about access to material resources as well as political and economic inequalities among ethnic groups. Therefore, one can conclude here that the
primordialists do not take cognizance of the importance of social structure hence, their insensitivity in eradicating socio-political and economic inequalities. Notwithstanding this, scholars have come to agree that primordialism is a significant phenomenon in explaining the emotional basis of ethnicity and the importance of ethnic solidarity; and how ethnic sentiments can actually become a very persuasive and significant element of group as well as individual identity.

**Instrumentalism**

Unlike primordialism, instrumentalism sees ethnicity as a dependable variable, controlled according to its strategic utility for achieving more secular goods (Conversie, 2006). It hinges on the affiliations of individuals to the community which are economically and politically beneficial to them. That is to say they are based on rational awareness and not closeness as in the case of primordialism, but the need for socio-political and economic protection or common interest. Young (1986) opines that the instrumentalist perspective saw ethnicity as a vehicle for socio-political and economic competition, hence as political contingent, situational and circumstantial. Keyes, (cited in Young 1986) posits that ethnicity is salient only in so far as it serves to orient people in pursuit of other interest vis-à-vis other people who are seen as holding contractive ethnic identities. A contractive ethnic identity is shaped by the unequal distribution of political power and resources; where political and economic powers have been constructed around the dominant ethnic groups. Considering this, one can state that the ultimate objective of ethnicity to the instrumentalists is driven by the interest of the groups which may be political or economic.
The instrumentalist approach attributes that ethnicity is circumstantially construct in a given society. If this is the case, it means that ethnicity is highly susceptible to manipulation; or better regarded as a social phenomenon constructed for mobilization. Balch (2008) believes that ethnicity is constructed by particular groups of people driven by competition for socio-political and economic objectives. In essence, it is a socio-political and economic construct meant for specific interest. It is an adjustable political instrument to serve a particular objective and a more “convenient basis for mobilization” (Seo, 2008:345).

The instrumentalist approach is regarded as a rational reaction to the demands of a situational or to the social pressure within the community or from another community Boca (1996). According to King (2002) ethnicity is a social construct. Thus ethnicity can undergo changes which explain why ethnic communities may not be static. They change from time to time, and are defined and structured to meet their community socio-political and economic interests, hence the description of ethnicity as a strategic instrument of a particular community for enforcing its goals and interests (Bacova, 1998). To the instrumentalist, the construction of ethnicity is for a purpose (social, political and economic).

According to Conversie (2006), radical instrumentalists believe that the nation does not correspond to any objective reality. They see sharp differences between political elites and their followers; where the latter are easily manipulated by the political elites. They are seen as ambitious social engineers who in an attempt to gain political control of the state stir up the emotions of the masses. Hale (2004), in his contribution posits that, without an underlying psychological theory, instrumentalists explain the political
phenomenon as manipulation by the elite. This begs the question of why such manipulation succeeds. In essence, the psychological understanding of the people plays an important role in ethnicity. This, in other words, means that ethnic manipulation is a variable of the psychological understanding of the people. What this suggests is that the instrumentalists singled out the “manufacturers” (Conversie, 2006:17) of nations among those groups that have most to gain from it.

Explaining instrumentalism from the point of modernization theory, the instrumentalists believe that as long as people continue to interact as a result of modernization, ethnicity may likely fade away. Perhaps this is what informs King (2002) to see the ethnic group as a social organization. Thus through the process of modernization ethnicity is manipulated by the political elites, hence the process of ethnic politics. This is corroborated by Horowitz (1985) that ethnicity is multidimensional and therefore manipulatable. Ethnic conflict thus is the product of competition for political and economic resources. The dynamics of ethnicity as they affect political development is perhaps due to the socio-political and economic differentiation in multi-ethnic states. That a community is seen as a means of achieving individual or group socio-political goals by the instrumentalist, means that the state is a modern organization, an invention, it is artificial, there is no blood relation and the fact that the state needs the support of its members makes it an invention, hence its susceptibility to manipulation.

Though the theory of instrumentalism emphasizes the group/individual struggle for economic and political value, the instrumentalist has been criticized for his narrow definition of ethnic interest as emphasizing socio-political and economic values. The
assumption therefore is that ethnic groups, in as much as they are still internally stratified, will still struggle over their socio-political status within such communities.

The instrumentalist has also been criticized for neglecting people’s struggle over what Seo (2008:348) refers to as “ideal interest”. Apart from socio-political and economic interest, people still struggle over the maintenance of their cultures and identities, their socio-political and economic differences notwithstanding. What this suggests is that there are ethnic manifestations that are primarily cultural and sometimes religious. For example, the conflict between the Zulus and the Ndebele in South Africa as well as among ethnic groups in Bangladesh has centred on the recognition of their socio-cultural status. Thus, the explanation of ethnicity centred on politics and the economy is perceived to have underrated the psychological and emotional power of ethnic bindings. The instrumentalist has also failed to recognize or believe that the leaders in the mobilized groups may also be interested in preserving and maintaining their cultural heritage instead of trading it for socio-political and economic gain. This explains why a particular ethnic group may decide to support a leader they believe will support, preserve and promote their cultural heritage. For example black South Africans will always support a party/leader that will promote and preserve the culture of black South Africans.

One salient point that needs to be pointed out here is that the instrumentalist theory has not explained why ethnicity has become more of a basis for mobilization than any other phenomenon. Perhaps it is a result of the dynamism of ethnicity where people in every ethnic group can be seen as social actors with multiple kinds of social identity, (for example religion and social status). Without any point of contradiction this can coincide
with the demands of every group, which has made the theory significantly more important for explaining socio-political struggles between ethnic groups.

One basic and significant difference between instrumentalism and primordialism is the basis of individual or group attachment to their community. To the instrumentalist it is on account of what, how and when the attachment to their community/ethnic group is beneficial to them or brings them practical advantages which may be political, social or economic. In a nutshell, individuals understand their closeness to their community/ethnic group as an instrument for achieving their goals. Whereas to the primordialist, even though there may be elements of gain or loss in their relationship to their community, the fact is, they are psychologically and emotionally attached to their community. As explained earlier, the political and economic benefits may be perpetually beneficial to the political class. The primordialists still believe so much in their sociobiological attachment to their community. Therefore both primordial and instrumental approaches are examples of an unnecessary polarization of inherently complimentary aspects of human life (Bacova, 1998).

2.1.3 Towards a Theory of Social and Ethnic Development

In the foregoing discussion we alluded to the contribution of strengths and weaknesses of the primordial and instrumental to the notion of ethnic development. It is apparent that both theories failed to provide any direction towards inclusive development. However this inclusive development cannot be discussed solitarily without first looking at political and economic institutions through which the notion of inclusive development is
explained. In the process a soft theory based on empirical evidence and good practices around the world is developed.

Institutions are seen as durable systems of established social rules and conventions that structure repeated human interaction through which a society (state) undertakes certain functions which may be political, economic or social (Hoggson, 2001, North, 1989). In essence, an institution is a regulatory agent that specifies and motivates how groups and individuals in a society (state) perform certain or specific socio-political and economic functions. In a multi-ethnic state, institutions no doubt would have a profound influence (negative or positive) on the pattern of socio-political and economic performance. Political and economic institutions are two variables that significantly rely on each other, giving us an insight into the fact that economic development may best be promoted by political institutions and vice versa.

Diamond (2012) observes that while economic institutions are critical for determining the prosperity of a state, it is the politics and political institutions that determine what economic institution a country has. By political institution we mean an organization which creates, enforces and applies laws that mediate/manage conflict, make policies on the economy and the social (regulatory and welfare agencies) system. Examples of political institutions include political parties, the courts etc. The term may also refer to the recognized rules and principles within which the above organizations operate including such concepts as the right to vote and to be voted for (Diamond, 2012).

Political institutions affect economic institutions by providing the political framework that creates rules that either facilitate or militate against the growth of the economic institutions. Thus, inclusive political institutions will lead to progressive economic
institutions. Political inclusivity is essential to the growth and well-being of the state, particularly multi-ethnic states.

On the other hand, economic institutions can be viewed as those institutions that perform economic functions in relation to establishing and protecting the economic rights of groups and individuals and as well permit cooperation in a state. Inclusive economic institutions are those that allow and encourage the participation of groups and individuals in economic activities and allow individuals to make the choices they wish, observes Diamond (2012). Inclusive economic institutions arise from political institutions that share political power, particularly in a multi-ethnic state instead of allowing power to be vested in individuals. In other words, political power rests on the broad participation of citizens in the decision making process. This would deprive the political class of their exclusive control of socio-political and economic power. Significantly, economic growth can be promoted by political institutions, the reason why Flachaire et al. (2011) assert that political institutions are a deep cause of development.

The above shows that good and workable political and economic institutions are unequivocally needed for the sustainability of a political system. In the words of Diamond (2012), ‘good institutions’ refers to laws and practices that serve as a motivational factor for citizens (groups and individuals) to work hard, and become economically productive, and thereby enrich themselves as well as the state. Hence, good economic and political institutions will likely increase the possibility of resolving re-distributional conflicts in a state.

A close observation of the above submission shows that for political and economic institutions to function in a multi-ethnic state there has to be an inclusive development
that will serve as an antidote to social exclusion, ethnic inequality and the hegemonic dominance of the political class. Inclusive development refers to the perception that every individual and group in a state (multi-ethnic) has equal socio-political and economic rights to be part of the society which invariably enhances governance and promotes effective institutions, sound socio-economic policies, and respect for values of every ethnic group. It is imperative for multi-ethnic states to involve every ethnic group in decision making process for political sustainability as well as effective ethnic development.

The empirical evidence from around the world and particularly Latin America indicates that inclusive development is obtainable in multi-ethnic states. Essentially, for groups to gain prominence, strength, as well as influence on national policies, Vega (2004) identified three important legal and constitutional developments that need to take place. First is a constitutional reform that will recognize their society as multi-ethnic and multicultural, thus recognizing the rights of every ethnic group. The second and third legal documents relate to and call for diversity by defending the rights of every individual as well as group to participate in governance. For example, in an attempt to curb the attempt at excluding culturally/ethnically defined groups, the Colombian constitution of 1991, chapter 1 Article 13 states that “the state will promote the conditions necessary in order that equality may be real and effective, and will adopt measures in favour of groups which are discriminated against or marginalized” (Colombia 1991 constitution). The constitution recognizes ethnic and cultural diversity as a fundamental principle of the state through which exclusive socio-political policies can be diffused; knowing fully well that socio-political exclusion of groups may lead to the inability of the groups
affected to access socio-political and economic goods. The result of which will be conflict.

The inclusionary policies in the Latin American states of Bolivia, Ecuador, Colombia, Honduras, Paraguay, Mexico etc. seek to address the shared features of exclusion by breaking the intergenerational transmission of disadvantage; thus, giving them better access to opportunity in governance. One means through which this was achieved was through constitutional laws that recognize the multi-cultural diversities of the people and legal recognition of autonomous territories. Thus exclusiveness was put under check; and, as well, enhances groups’ consciousness of developmental opportunities and socio-political and economic integration.

Buvinic (2004) explains that the common understanding of the features of exclusion which include those shared across excluded groups, and a comprehensive way of thinking about social policy and anti-exclusionism interventions will boost effective policy interaction, and by establishing a national civil and social rights framework, socio-political and economic discrimination and the causes of exclusion would be curtailed. Therefore there is a need for the adoption of inclusionary socio-political policies.

This approach to development no doubt requires the shifting of socio-political and economic project targets from individuals to groups and the disaggregation of the unit of analysis that defines the interaction between individuals and groups, opines Bunivic (2004). This approach, one can say, also requires a comprehensive socio-political and economic intervention to defuse the multiple aspect of exclusion, such as discriminatory social practices, attitudes and beliefs. The argument here is that some states has been able to stem social exclusion through the promotion of solidarity, social cohesion and a
socio-political culture that accepts diversity by expanding and strengthening the leadership capacities of the excluded groups.

Ethnicity no doubt is a consequence of the mobilization and politicization of ethnic group identity (Egwu, 2007). The prospects of a multi-ethnic nation’s development is engendered by a relationship between its ethnic groups devoid of friction over the allocation of socio-economic resources; and the creation of an enabling environment for socio-political and economically productive activity. Hence the development of a country is brought by about by the people. The socio-political system must encourage the development of every group which relies upon itself for its own development and which knows the advantage of cooperation (Nyerere, 1967). In essence, an atmosphere of peace and political stability is uncompromisingly inevitable for development in a multi-ethnic state. When there are no socio-political distractions such as oppressive conditions, exclusion and inequality among the ethnic groups; what occurs is all-round development.

No doubt ethnic conflict is a significant feature of inter-ethnic competition for socio-political and economic resources in a multi-ethnic state but the question is why this conflict? Obviously there is an indication that there is socio-political and economic exclusion of individuals and groups, which is seen as the bane of development and a reflection of socio-cultural (ethnic) structural imbalance in the society, as well as the inability of the political class to mediate between differing ethnic groups. Ethnicity, no doubt, is more pronounced in competitive situations where available socio-political and economic resources are scarce in relation to the interests which grow around them, argued Nnoli (cited in Egwu, 2007). Considering the elements of ethnicity which include
exclusiveness, significantly manifested in inter-group competition for socio-political and economic resources and the consciousness of being primordially one in relation to other, some ethnic groups unarguably will be in a disadvantaged position.

Given the plight of the disadvantaged position of some individuals and groups particularly the minorities in a multi-ethnic state, ethnicity is likely to be given a priority. However, it can be stemmed with the inclusion of every ethnic group in governance. This system will breed good governance where the socio-political and economic resources are distributed fairly among ethnic groups and where the rewards system will no longer be in the favour of only those who are in control of the state but also those who produce the resources. Good governance, here, is a universally accepted socio-political instrument that every nation can use to stem the challenges of political instability.

For real development to take place in a multi-ethnic political system there is need to create an atmosphere of peace and stability which will boost confidence and faith in every individual and group in the government, resulting in the adoption and implementation of inclusive socio-political system, as has been done in some Latin America states. What this means is that the political mobilization of ethnicity is a threat to national cohesion and the emergence of corporate identity in a multi-ethnic state.

Therefore, an inclusive socio-political and developmental system is required. Social inclusion can be viewed from the inclusion of the views of every group in the national economic and political debate and decision making as well as political representation of every group. Bolivia and Ecuador are examples of countries where political responsibilities are bestowed on every group. Central to the issue of social
inclusion Vega (2004) observes that the system requires a mentality within government which should materialize in more inclusive policies (social, political and economic) and also a greater consciousness within excluded groups regarding their responsibilities and duties. Thus, inclusive policies/governance calls for the groups’ involvement to correct imbalances in access to political and economic goods in a multi-ethnic state.

Inclusiveness must be seen as an instrument of conflict management in a multi-ethnic state. Socio-political inclusion is a universally accepted solution to inequality and to discontent over exclusive socio-political policies in a multi-ethnic state. It is an attempt by government to respond to the view that existing socio-political inequalities cannot handle the demands to stem ethnicity in a multi-ethnic state.

The concept of socio-political and economic inclusion and exclusion emphasize how the benefits of development and political participation are inequitably or equitably distributed in a multi-ethnic state. Socio-political exclusion can be viewed as the inability of an individual or group to participate in the basic political, economic and social functioning of the country in which he/she lives. It is the denial of equal access to socio-political and economic opportunities imposed by certain groups (political class) in the society on others (Buvinic, 2004). Geddes (cited in Kaldur et al. 2012) defines it as isolated from the mainstream of political life and from decisions about one’s own life taken by others. Socio-political exclusion impacts negatively on culturally/ethnically defined groups while inclusiveness promotes socio-political integration. Inclusive socio-political policies give room for productive political resources. They create an enabling environment for every ethnic group to participate in governance; it is also a positive development towards recognizing the socio-political rights of every ethnic group. The end product of this is
development and stability. Thus, stability and sustainability of the political system in a multi-ethnic state, requires input from every ethnic group. The recognition of every ethnic group via their input to the political system will bring about healthy socio-political integration and a healthy political system.

Ethnicity can be harmonious and cooperative. Often it is the unacknowledged dimension of ethnicity that produces the key to its management (Osaghae, 2007). It is important to state here that the recognition of the position of each ethnic group in a multi-ethnic state is very significant. This is because the knowledge based on the position of one ethnic group is unfinished, therefore the only and the best way to know and acknowledge the position of others is through an inclusive system which brings out the truth about the stand of every ethnic group in a multi-ethnic state.

The notion of ethnicity has long been used to indicate various axes of ethnic differentiation that eventually contribute to socio-political and economic inequality in multi-ethnic states. What this translates to is a political project that involves the search for a cohesive system of every ethnic group leading to national integration and understanding. This will eventually produce positive results and an inevitable socio-political transformation. Individuals and groups that are excluded from the mainstream of national life appear as victims of poor socio-political and economic policies.

Considering the relationship between socio-political and economic development which are dependable variables, political stability is a catalyst to the sustainability of other variables. Because ethnicity can be abused, through the ages ethnic elites have been using ethnic symbolism to attain and retain political power. No doubt, the challenges of ethnicity are unprecedented, considering its negative effect on groups that have long
been excluded or marginalized. This raises the question of what the psychological needs of the people are that constitute each ethnic group, in an attempt to ensure the prevalence of national cohesion over ethnic affiliation. Without mincing words, the socio-political and economic inclusion of every group in governance which will eventually translate to the socio-political and economic development of each group seems to be the answer.

Ethnicity no doubt is a complex socio-political phenomenon, therefore socio-political and economic exclusion is not only ethically dangerous to development but also economically unproductive. It deprives groups and individuals of the opportunity of necessary development that can benefit the society. Therefore it is necessary to develop an integrative socio-political framework that will explicitly recognize the participatory role of every ethnic group; a system that is not ethnocentric and exclusionary; a system that recognizes that differences are important to development and that will encompass notions of equality, and acknowledgement of differential socio-political and economic power of every ethnic group. Hence, socio-political inclusion should be seen as central to political stability and socio-economic sustainability.

2.1.4 Ethnicity and Ethnic Consciousness

Ethnic consciousness can be viewed as the basis for group pride and unity, through which groups seek to unify their members around group specific socio-cultural attributes and through which specific socio-political goods and self-respect is attained within and from those groups in the dominant population. It can as well be seen as an ideological construct carefully crafted by the political class to give them access to political power. It
thus sets against each other people whose values are in conflict, who want different things, and who do not understand each other. It is the result of socio-economic and political competition between ethnically differentiated groups. Nnoli (1978) posited that the malaise of ethnicity had infected all facets of communication. In the process of socialization, ethnicity has increased and become internalized. Consequently, the ethnic factor assumed a self-fulfilling and sustaining dynamic of its own which daily reinforced the individuals’ internalized ethnic sentiments.

However a conflict based on the consciousness of one’s group’s socio-political position in the polity is considered to be ethnic when it involves organized political movement, mass unrest, separatists’ action, and civil wars with opposing lines drawn along ethnic boundaries. It is usually a conflict between minority groups and dominant (majority) groups, where the majority controls access to the power and resources of the state and the minorities, often without going into open confrontation with the dominant groups, question the state structure as a whole and act violently when the society and the state are unable to suggest any mechanisms for regulating and resolving these socio-political and economic contradictions (Stavenhagen 1991). Sometimes as in the case of Nigeria conflict occurs among the majority ethnic groups over the allocation of socio-political and economic goods.

Various theoretical approaches to the study of ethnic conflict have been articulated. The sociological approach argues that ethnic conflict is catalysed by the usurpation by one ethnic group of certain privileged social niches and also effects of social discrimination based on ethnic characteristics. For example, the control of the state is considered to be the greatest price in ethnically plural societies. This explains why political positions such
as presidency, governorship, legislative posts are keenly contested by the various ethnic groups. In political science theory, a powerful dynamic in the explanation of ethnic conflict is the roles played by the intellectuals and politicians in mobilizing ethnic consciousness and inter-ethnic strife. This approach is very relevant to ethnic conflicts in Nigeria.

Ethnicity cannot be conjured out of thin air. It must be built on real cultural experience. Before ethnicity becomes the basis for political mobilization and action, it must be a work of intellectual construction, an imagining or invention of a common history, language and culture, typically expressed in oral or written text combining and reworking both old and new elements (Berman, 1998). The ethnic problem in Nigeria was partly man-made and partly tailored by nature itself. Man-made problems relate mainly to the fusion of the various ethnic groups hitherto independent of each other by the colonialists perhaps for administrative purposes and for economic exploitation, while problems created by nature concerned its geography and ethnic composition. Consequently, ethnicity when mobilized and manipulated can be the root cause of internal problems connected with disrespect for human rights and social justice. If appropriated properly, on the other hand, it could be the ingredient required for the realization of the ideal society, political integration, participation and common good. It could thus be said that the nature of ethnicity in Nigeria and elsewhere in Africa is instrumental rather than primordial.

Hobsbawn (1995) argued that a good deal of the politics of collaboration took place within the limits set by the colonial theory of monarchy. The colonial government manipulated African monarchical system of government and the whole process of
traditional inventiveness to serve a good deal of practical purposes. As the principal clients of the colonial government, the chiefs became the most powerful patrons in local societies and became the central focus of the development of client patronage networks around political institutions and positions of authority. In fact the structures and practices of the state, the expectation of African cultures and institutions encouraged Africans to think ethnically; leading to contests over property rights and access to resources, largely on ethnic terms. In a nutshell, colonialism energized ethnicity (socially, economically and politically) in an attempt to gain control over political activities in the country.

Fundamentally, ethnicity is a political and social phenomenon associated with interaction among members of different ethnic groups. It is a type of informal interest grouping which is called into being as a result of the intensive struggle between groups over the allocation of resources and positions within the state. Nigeria, as it is known today, can be regarded as a colonial creation. The major problem the country has been facing since independence is the result of the deep cleavages which exist between the diverse elements (people) who make up the country; often marked by strong regional loyalties that compete with much desired loyalty to the nation. In other words, ethnic conflict is basically a product of competition for scarce socio-political and economic resources among the various ethnic groups in multi-ethnic societies embedded in patron-client networks – a socio-cultural norm that regulates the obligations and expectations of patrons and their clients. Because of the ethnic formation of Nigeria, a patronage network operates within its ethnic context. Thus the moral economy of the patronage network is circumscribed by the norms of the ethnic group.
In the words of Osaghae (1994), Nigeria is a country with a large number of ethnic groups. The inequalities among them pertain to size, resource endowment, education and access to state power and resources. Highly developed and fractionalized indigenous bourgeoisie, make the ethnic situation, perhaps, the most complicated in Africa. In other words, ethnicity thrives in Nigeria because of the multiple and conflicting versions of culture and customs, as well as divergent interest of the various ethnic groups. Significantly, this has made it possible for the political class to easily manipulate and mobilize group consciousness; a situation which has been the bane of national integration and socio-political development of the country.

2.2 Ethnicity and Development

Presently ethnicity and several other socio-political and economic problems have been a force to reckon with in the country and in many African states, many of which have reshaped people’s lives and the manner in which institutions have responded to people’s needs. One can say here that ethnicity is the bane of socio-political and economic development in Nigeria which is a reflection of the development strategies that are related to the colonial blue prints adopted by the Nigeria nationalist leaders after independence. When the term development is considered, it is important to realise that all conceptions of development necessarily reflect a particular set of socio and political values. Development, one would believe, can be conceived within an ideological frame work. Development is seen as synonymous with socio-economic and political growth of a country.
Development is a dialectical phenomenon in which the individual and society interact with their physical, biological and human environment transforming them for their own betterment and that of humanity at large and being transformed in the process. Development connotes training in the art of using local resources and creative human energy in problem solving rather than an imitation path to the good life that some societies have achieved (Nnoli, 1995). This means that development is all about positive societal organisation for the benefit of all.

Lawal (2007) sees development as the process by which a type of social change is introduced into a system in order to produce better production methods and improve social arrangement. It involves a structural transformation of the economy, society, polity and culture of a country. Development is the improvement of any society and the living standards of its peoples through the organised tapping and utilization of the resources, human and material, available in the society. Development is rights based and could be integrated into a dividend or to deliverable of the democratic process. Ideally, development should be a process that raises the material and living conditions of the people. For development to take place, therefore, other kinds of improvement in health, education, social welfare and security must be in place. Development also means improved access to life chances and opportunities such as employment and social security. Development is impeded when these are blocked, due to the fact that people may be from one ethnic group or the other.

Claude Ake (2000) posits that development should be a lived experience instead of a received one; people become the agents of development as well as its means and its ends. In other words if those responsible for deciding what development is and what
values it is to maximise, they must also have ultimate control of public policy. People must not only participate in the conventional sense, they must have the responsibility of deciding how to proceed with social transformation and every other major common concern. People must become the means of development if people are the end of development, then their interest and well-being is the measure of all things, the supreme law of development. However the level and rate of development of any particular society is influenced by so many variables such as the system of government, leadership, ethnic interests and sometimes religion.

The concept of development has been seen as one of the most ambiguous terms in social discourse and it continues to generate debate among various scholars. Development in human society is not a one-sided process but rather a multi-sided issue. In general terms, however, development has been viewed from political, economic and social dimensions. In this context, political development focuses on political stability and the institutionalisation of political goals and the means for achieving them. It is also associated with growth and vitality in associational life and civil society. Social development focuses on social interactions as well as integration of the people and the means of ensuring sustainability of the co-existence of the people. While economic development is associated with more education, assertiveness and a push for participation, it tempers the time of politics and creates cross-cutting interests and multiple affiliations which facilitate democratic consensus-building and socio-political stability.

Salawu (2010) sees development as a process of improving the quality of all human lives; creating conditions conducive to the growth of people’s self-esteem through the
establishment of social, political and economic systems and institutions. The struggle over these often leads to ethnic conflict. In conceptualization, development can be seen as a multi-dimensional process involving major changes in social structures, popular attitudes, and national institutions as well as the acceleration of economic growth, the reduction of inequality and the eradication of absolute poverty. Todaro (1989) identified three core values of development; these include the ability to provide as many people as possible with their basic needs or the ability to acquire adequate food, shelter, health care and protection. It also entails the perception of individuals or groups of self-worth and esteem as respected members of society; and freedom in the sense that individuals and society at large have an expanded range of choices, not only with respect to material necessities for self-reproduction but also in their ability to have a say in, if not to determine, the method and process by which values are allocated in the society.

Rodney (1972) conceives that development whether economic, political or social implies both an increase in output and changes in the technical and institutional arrangement by which it is produced. In essence, development is a multi-dimensional concept and in spite of the various conceptions, development is basically about the process of changes which lie around the spheres of societal life. Development policies are primarily given the task of contributing to reducing the structural causes of conflict by improving the socio-economic and political situations of the country as well as developing mechanisms for managing ethnic conflict.

Armatya Sen offered more illuminating thoughts on this concept. He sees development as capability expansion and synonymous with freedom (Sen, 1999). As capability expansion, development requires adequate empowerment of the state and the society
such that they can adequately distil their complimentary responsibilities. It requires an enhanced state capacity as well as institutional and governmental stability. It is only within such a framework that individual members of the society can find fulfilment in terms of the basic necessities of life. As freedom, development demands great latitude of autonomy for the political community and its constituent parts, as well as for the individual members of such communities. In that case, the level of popular participation, measured in terms of the quality and quantity of participation is highly decisive.

Dudley Seer (1969) argues that development does not mean only capital accumulation and economic growth but also the condition in which there is reduction in and elimination of poverty, inequality and unemployment in a country, and there is no development when its benefits are meant for the progress of a small group of people. Development is the process of bringing about fundamental and sustainable changes in the society. It encompasses growth, embraces such aspect of the quality of life as social justice, equality of opportunity for all citizens, equitable distribution of income and the democratization of the development process. Therefore development is all about the capacity of members of the society to actualize and manipulate the forces of nature by participating actively in the socio-political engineering of their lives and destiny.

Scholars have argued that as good as development is, it cannot take place in a turbulent environment. Stability is one of the pillars of development, and once fuelled, ethnic tension can and does result in destruction. It forces productive human beings to channel their energies into ethnic clashes instead of using them to develop their community/country. If we agree with the above statement, then it suggests that the difference in the level of socio-political and economic development of the various ethnic
units in Nigeria may be or is responsible for ethnic conflicts. It is true that deep-seated feeling of aversion often exist between groups at different levels of development which co-exist in the same society due to uneven socio-economic opportunities. Perhaps one can say that ethnic conflict and development are variables where ethnic conflict is seen as a means to an end though destabilizing. This is because the demand for socio-economic and political rights of the citizens challenges the established power structures that have prevented each ethnic group as well individuals from reaching their developmental goals.

From the above, it is clear that there is a link between ethnic conflict and development. In other words, there is a direct effect of the devices of ethnic conflict on development. If for example, development is conceived to include the capacity of a government or system to manage resources efficiently to improve the well-being of the citizens, then ethnic conflict can be regarded as one of the challenges to development. In Nigeria therefore, the system lacks the capacity to manage its resources effectively and efficiently to improve the quality of life of the people because ethnic conflict has become a significant cause of concern since it undermines economic progress and impedes policy changes for the required development.

In a departure from this, ethnic conflict impacts on poverty through a range of welfare effects; direct effects, indirect effects and instrumental effects. The direct effects include household breakdown through killings, injuries and physical and mental disability; effects on assets and cycles of displacement and poverty. Indirect effects include the effects on local institutions, social networks and community relations, political institutions and governance as well as macro-economic effects. Instrumental effects
include disruption of coping strategies as a result of its destructive nature (Justino 2009). In justifying her claim, Justino (2009) maintained that poverty can be a basis for mobilization through grievance, and can also be the basis for becoming a supporter or even a participant because of the provision of shelter, food resources, or information and also through reducing the danger of denunciation. Factors such as selective incentives, socio-emotional incentives, coercion and fear and cost of non-participation may force someone to participate in conflict. The creation of a climate that is conducive to poverty reduction, promotion of peace and social cohesion reduces conflict and opens the door to development.

The assumption therefore is that ethnic conflict flourishes in an environment devoid of socio-economic and political security. As the state disengages from critical, basic social provisioning, only the continuances and clients of those who control state power actually continue to have access to state resources through patronage. Patronage relates to mutual dependence and reciprocity, instrumental to political mobilisation and resource distribution along ethnic and patronage lines. Thus, under these conditions, groups have tended to rely on identity-based politics to struggle for access to the state and the resources that it controls, in order to protest exclusion and oppression, as well as to demand basic rights and socio-political and economic provisioning.

The sovereignty of a state is responsibility the essence of which requires that states provide the appropriate standard of political goods and services which are those intangible and hard to quantify claims that citizens once made on sovereigns and now make on states. They encompass expectations, conceivably obligations that enable citizens to participate freely, openly, and fully in politics and political processes. Others
include security, health, and education, economic opportunity, law and order and fundamental human rights, the absence of which makes ethnicity thrive and the state/government lose its legitimacy, hence the need for good governance.

2.3 Good Governance and Development
One of the major problems confronting most African states today is governance. Like many developing countries, socio-economic and political development is a problem of good governance. The Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary defines governance as the activity of governing a country. Streeteen (n.d) sees governance as the sum of the many ways in which individuals and institutions, public and private, manage their common affairs. It is a continuing process through which conflicting or diverse interest may be taken. One can also interpret it in relation to civil society, in that civil society is particularly important for good governance. Civil society here refers to the wide range of group of people for example non-governmental organizations or community groups that have a presence in public life, expressing the interests and values of their members or others, based on ethical, cultural, political, religious, scientific considerations. Although civil society can be distinguished from the state, it nevertheless contains a range of institutions that are thought of as public in the wider sense that they are open institutions, operating in public, to which the public has access. “Some view governance as the act of governing, others draw a corollary between it and the democratization process, the process of empowering the civil society actors and institution, and some others view it in a more nuanced form as the problematic relationship between the state and civil society” (Balogun, 1998:3).
Governance has also been defined as the total ability to organize, synthesize and direct the various actions of the working parts of the government machinery in order for such a government to perform meaningfully, creditably and acceptably (Eregha, 2007). Thus governance involves both the governing class and the governed people and good governance must of necessity be democratic, entail recognition, popular support and participation by the people, accountable and ensure basic freedom. Akpotor (cited in Eregha, 2007) submitted that governance covers all aspects of the relations (complex or simple) that exist between a government and a people. The extent to which the people’s affairs are managed depends on the class of people in power. Thus governance could be good or bad.

From these definitions given by scholars, governance is better conceived as who gets what, when and how and perhaps how much. Conceptually, governance is different from politics but as a human phenomenon, governance is exercised within a given socio-economic and political context and belongs to a broader department of politics. Politics is the art or science of influencing people on a civic or individual level, when there are more than two people involved. Politics is seen in every social activity and in every corner of human existence. The believed is that politics takes place at every level of social interaction; it can be found within families and amongst small groups of friends just as much as amongst nations and on the global stage. When it comes to the allocation of values, politics is authoritative but governance has to do with the process and mechanisms of allocating these values without jeopardising the principles of equality, justice and fairness. Hence, governance is the process employed by the state to attain a range of desired socio-political goals (Ogundiya, 2010).
The relationship between governance and development has raised the international policy agenda. There is widespread agreement that governance matters intrinsically and for improvement in economic and social outcomes. Good governance is perhaps the single most important factor in eradicating poverty and promoting socio-political and economic development. But what exactly is “good governance”? When, why, and how do governance issues make a difference to the way countries develop? Thinking about how best to govern is not a new issue. It was central to Aristotle’s thinking about how best to facilitate people’s ability to lead flourishing lives in Ancient Greece (Ogundiya, 2010). There is now substantial literature on governance. Virtually everyone agrees on some key points. First, that governance refers to process – how things are done. Second, that a discussion of governance requires more than a focus on government. It also relates to the nature of relations between state and society. Governance refers to the nature of rules that regulate the public realm – the space where state and economic and political actors interact to make decisions.

Therefore good governance; when defined in terms of this work means fair and equitable allocation of resources for the achievement of the end or purposes of the state, which is the promotion of the common good (socio-political and economic rights of the citizens). Good governance provides opportunities for popular participation in decisions that affect the life of the people, access to power and transparency as well as accountability of those in power. Thus socio-political stability is a product of good governance.

Eyinla (cited in Omotola 2007) sees good governance as accountability, security of human rights and civil liberties, devolution of powers and respect for local autonomy.
Good governance is closely linked to the extent to which a government is perceived and accepted as legitimate, committed to improving public welfare and responsive to the needs of its citizens, competent to assure law and order and deliver public services, able to create an enabling policy environment for productive activities and equitable in its conduct. Good governance according to the World Bank is synonymous with "sound development management" it encompasses a broad sphere of public sector management; accountability, legal framework development (reforms) in information and technology, the legitimacy of government, the competence of government to formulate appropriate policies, make timely decisions, implement them effectively and deliver services (Potter 2000).

Therefore, a system of good governance would consist of a set of rules and institutions, a legal framework for development and a system of public administration which is open, transparent, efficient and accountable. The meaning of good governance includes all of the above, but goes one major step further in insisting that good governance also involve democratic politics. It is precisely for this reason that development cannot simply be managed into motion by some idealized system of good governance, evacuated from the world of politics. Scholars have suggested that neither democracy nor good governance are independent variables. They are dependent ones, and whatever their relationship with economic growth and development may be, both are the product of particular kinds of politics and can be found in states which promote and protect them.

Governance also includes institutional and structural arrangements, decision making, policy formulation and implementation and the nature and style of leadership within a political system. Hence, governance is about problem identification and solving. It is
also about the socio-economic and political development of the state. Therefore, governance means the manner in which power is exercised in the management and distribution of a country’s socio-political and economic resources. How these are distributed makes governance either good or bad. If the resources of the state are distributed to promote inequality, personal or ethnic group ambitions, the essence of governance and that of the state is defeated. If, on the other hand, it promotes socio-political and economic development then the result is good governance.

The concept of good governance seems to be a problematic one. But, the fact is, it remains a useful concept for obvious reasons. This is because good governance is a universally accepted socio-political instrument that could help overcome the challenges of political instability, particularly in multi-ethnic states. “The concept could be used to invite judgement about how the country concerned is governed. It enables the raising of evaluative question about proper procedures, transparency, responsiveness, the quality and process of decision making, and other such matters” (Doornbos, 2001: 94).

Therefore if socio-political development/stability must be achieved; the society must aim for growth that cannot be easily reversed through the political process of imperfect – bad – governance.

Conceptually, good governance is measured by the level of its performance; that is its ability to effectively deliver the most crucial socio-political goods-beginning with security-to citizens of nation-states. The hierarchy of political goods begins with the supply of security, especially human security within which citizens are able to resolve and manage disputes without recourse to arms or other forms of coercion. It can also be measured through the provision of political and civil freedom, that is, participation of
citizens freely, openly, and fully in politics and the political process. This encompasses the right to compete for political office, tolerance of dissent and difference; as well as fundamental human rights, a fiscal and institutional context within which citizens can prosper, support for civil society, a method of regulating the sharing of the environmental commons etc. This eventually creates an environment that is conducive to socio-economic and political development. Together, the management, supply and delivery of these goods constitute governance, and the extent to which nation states do or do not perform well.

Madhav (2007) believes good governance has much to do with the ethical grounding of governance and must be evaluated with reference to specific norms and objectives as may be laid down. It looks at the functioning of the given segment of the society from the point of view of its acknowledged stakeholders, beneficiaries and customers. It must have firm moorings in certain morals, standards, values and principles. One fact that should be noted is that the question of dealing with governance, though related to democracy is culture specific and system bound. This depends, to some extent, on the historical experiences of a nation, its culture, and the aspirations of its people and the stated socio-economic and political objectives of the state, including individual and group preferences, current issues, the expectations of the governed, type of political system as well as the ideological and the religious disposition of the state. Hence, governance is defined as the totality of the exercise of authority in the management of a country’s affairs, comprising of the complex mechanisms, processes, and institution through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights and mediate their differences (UNDP, n.d). To describe governance as good or bad, an
understanding of the essence of the state which are not embedded in the constitution but also a function of the religious ideas and nature of problem confronting the state is required. The essence of the state to earlier thinkers such as Aristotle, Plato, and Rousseau is to promote the common good of the citizens notwithstanding their ethnic group.

From the above, governance is seen as catch-all concept, but many failed to make distinctions that are important for assessing the relationship between governance and development. The point here is that there are multiple and complex relationships between governance and development which can be clustered around two elements; instrumental and constitutive issues.

Governance matters instrumentally for socio-economic and political development as well as performance. Better governance is positively associated with improved investment and growth rates. Government effectiveness, an efficient bureaucracy and the rule of law are associated with better economic performance. Development is all about positive societal organisation for the benefit of all. When corruption acts like a debilitative virus, it is bound to negate development and even democracy. Scholars have come to agree that corruption can be categorised into the productive and the unproductive, where the latter is associated with Nigeria and the former with America.

The failure of governance in Nigeria is a function of the nature and character of the Nigerian political elite.; The problem of development is both a symptom and consequences of bad governance.

On the other hand, some governance issues are seen as constitutive of development. As outlined by Amartya Sen (1990) poverty is not just a matter of being economically
deprived. It is defined and sustained by a sense of helplessness and lack of self-respect on the part of the poor. Of all the ills that kill the poor, none is as lethal as bad government. On paper at least, there is also overwhelming international agreement about the intrinsic value of democracy, human rights and good governance. There is no reason for any country, no matter how poor, to abuse its citizens, deny them equal protection of the law or leave them victims of corruption, mismanagement or economic irrationality (UN Millennium Project in ODI Briefing paper 2006).

It is important, however, to realise that governance as a norm cannot make sense unless it is predicated on the presupposition that the experience and knowledge of bad governance is possible and real. On this basis the norm of good governance is the political ethic that will probably challenge and possibly replace the reality of bad governance. The argument here is that good governance is pivotal to successful and sustainable development. The presumption is that for enduring developmental progress, the basic tenets of good governance must be well institutionalized. The point, however is that neither good governance nor development can take place in an atmosphere of chaos and anarchy.

Good governance is seen by Madhav (2007) as a concept applicable to all sections of the society and public accountability and transparency are as relevant for the one as for the other. It is when all these and various other sections of society conduct their affairs in a socially responsible manner that the objective of achieving the larger good of the largest number of people in society can be achieved. Good governance can also be seen as a commitment and the capability to effectively address the allocation and management of resources to respond to collective problems (socio-economic and
political problems). In view of these assertions one can say that where there is accountability, transparency and effective management, the views and the positions of every ethnic group, big or small, will be considered.

The Nigeria vision 2010 document (Nigeria World Document, 1997) sees good governance as accountability in all its ramifications. My own understanding of this is that good governance calls for rule of law, which guarantees socio-economic and political rights of the citizen. If not well managed through an effective way of releasing and tapping the energies of the people, and channelling them to productive endeavours, ethnicity and ethnic conflict will serve as major retardants of political progress and economic management. With such sound management of human resources, the goal of development is considered assured.

Most scholars dwell very much on good governance but tend to forget that the failure of governance means that those in government have not properly managed the economy, and other socio-political institutions. What gives room for mismanagement and misallocation of resources is the patron-client network within government; instrumental to an environment hostile to socio-political and economic development. In a situation like this, argued Obadan (cited in Ogundiya, 2010), the authority of governments over their people tends to be progressively eroded; which invariably reduces compliance with decisions and regulations. Governments in turn respond through populist measures or, as in some authoritarian governments, resort to coercion. In this way, the socio – economic and political rights of citizens are affected and the demand for this leads to conflicts which affect development negatively.
The lack of good governance is evident in the inability of a state to achieve its socio-economic and political goals at a particular time. Bad governance negates a nation's socio-economic and political development. Governance can only be termed good if the socio-economic and political needs of the people are met; but, when such government cannot meet the needs of its people, it becomes bad governance, the symptoms of which are incessant crisis (which may be political or religious), ethnic conflict engendered by social, economic and political instabilities and frustration and insecurity among the people. The evolution of good governance would provide a basis for good conflict management conversely; good governance cannot evolve if the conflicting parties (groups) do not resolve their differences.

Good governance can be said to be almost everything. Once the state gets it right (politically) nothing else matters. This means that any state devoid of good governance tends to exhibit an increase in criminal violence, the provision of limited quantities of essential political goods, flawed socio-economic and political institutions, corruption flourishes, the state; driven by ethnic hostility victimizes its own citizens who are regarded as political enemies or hostile. The resultant effect of this is turning to ethnic identities that, naturally, are on hand to protect their members. However, when democratic values and the fundamental human rights of the citizens as entrenched in the constitution and its manifestation visible within the polity, there is a tendency to achieve societal goals. In other words where citizens and ethnic groups accept their fundamental obligation to work for the common good and benefit of the country, with regard to political, social and economic equality, the promotion of a common bond
occurs that disregards disunity and promotes national integration regardless of ethnic affiliation.

### 2.4 Human Rights, Democracy and Development

The United Nations Organisation proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 by as a common standard through which every individual and every organ of society should strive to promote respect for the rights and freedoms of people among member states. Recognising this fact, a variety of approaches aimed at dealing with the menace of ethnic conflicts through the constructive solving of problems was deemed non-negotiable. The conflict in question may involve inter-group disputes, warring nations or even internal quarrels. The fact is that Nigeria federation is fraught with inequalities reflected from the limited opportunities available to the people from the perspective of socio-economic and political rights. Therefore it is pertinent to say that there could be development along with the institutionalization of democracy and fundamental human rights.

Article 2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Right 1948, adopted by the UN General Assembly resolution 217 A (111), states that “Everyone is entitled to all rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration without distinction of any kind, such as race, sex, language, religion, political, national or social origin, property, birth or other status” shows that the article did not specifically mention every ethnic group, but made mention of race, colour, religion and language which all relate to the ethnic group. Ethnic groups, from this perspective, can be defined as a community which unites individuals through a common ancestry, race and language. Therefore every individual that belongs to such a
community, major or minor is deemed equal and should not be denied their socio-political rights. Every ethnic group and its leaders compete with each other for better socio-political and economic positioning in every political system. Every ethnic group wants to maximize its power or at least try not to fall behind of other ethnic groups. This explains why it becomes necessary for the state to protect the socio-political and economic rights of every individual and ethnic group.

The concept of human rights, democracy and development will remain paramount in the affairs of all nations which cherish development and good governance. At present, there is virtually no facet of diplomatic interactions between one sovereign nation and the other which is not founded on the internationally accepted principles of human rights, democracy and development (Idowu, 2008). He argued further that where the government of a state is founded on the principles of obedience to law, democratic process and respect for human rights, there is every possibility that the state’s legal order will be good and just. It will be a state where leaders will have respect for citizens’ fundamental rights and basic freedoms. This quality will obviously place the citizens, who constitute the human resources of the nation on a pedestal to love their nation and struggle to contribute to its socio-political and economic development.

The concepts are often used as universal goals for national development. These terms are also used by theorist to represent conditions or means of collective action, rather than values or ends in themselves. These terms will look ambiguous unless the question of whether each of these an end in itself or a means to an end is posed. In answer, human rights and democracy are considered to be a means while development signifies an end, to wit, the realization of any value outcome. In his analysis (Idowu,
2008) noted that the terms human rights, democracy and development are popular and relevant in the social political affairs and process of development of every nation. This contention is based on the most distinctive element in democracy; citizens’ fundamental rights must be guaranteed and protected before they can be in a position to render their human resources for the effective democratization and overall development of their nation. In other words rights are primarily fundamental to the emancipation of an enduring democracy and national developmental growth.

Conceptually, the term development is a conscious acceleration of socio-political and economic development, security of human rights and civil liberties through effective, consistent, progressive and enduring policies of government. Human rights are those liberties, immunities and benefits which by accepting contemporary values, all human beings should be able to claim as a citizen in societies in which they live. For better understanding, Marshal (1992) defined citizenship as the body of rights and duties and the status, which goes with full membership of a community or a society. Marshal conceives that the modern concept of citizenship consists of three basic elements: civil, political and social. The civil elements comprise of the rights necessary to individual freedom (freedom of speech, religion, right to justice, right to own property, right to freedom of movement etc.). The political element consists of the right to political participation in the exercise of political power and the social elements relate to cultural rights. In a nut shell a full member of a given society deserves all three types of rights.

Marshall’s citizenship theory perhaps is the founding work on modern citizenship theory and has influenced other modern citizenship theorists. On this premise, one can sum up Marshall’s notion of citizenship as a body of human rights conceived as the rights to
which all human being are entitled including the right to liberty, freedom of speech and equality. Theoretically, fundamental human rights provide a form of universalised citizenship.

Democracy is described as a system of governance in which, through elections, and persistent checks, the people utilize their political power to choose those who occupy the various political roles or positions. Democracy, if adequately understood, is a theory that sets some basic principles according to which a good government, in whatever form must be run. Effective democratic governance relies on public participation, transparency, and accountability. Democracy not only prescribes how political offices (power) should be acquired but also what to do with it or how it could be exercised. For ideological and structural reasons, democracy as a political system produces development. “The better the quality of democracy, the greater is likely to be the quality of development” (Bhagwati, 2002: 153). Democracy can be viewed both as an ideology and a structure. The ideology is that of the process of governance by consent; the structure consist of institutions by which that ideology is implemented. The two (ideology and structure) therefore contribute to the quality of socio-political development (Bhagwati, 2002). Development is not just a process of improving the quality of all human lives, protection of the environment and relief of extreme poverty. It is having the political system that permits and provides the environment for the effective participation of all (ethnic) groups in governance. The inclusion of every group matters significantly to the quality of socio-political development.

The democratic tradition, which is imperative for development, cannot blossom in the context of conflict which prevents citizens from exercising their rights over certain
matters that are crucial to the overall development of the nation. In other words the evolution of the democratic institution of government based on a common political ideology can bring about solid socio-economic, political, cultural, educational and even technological development. But if we look at it the other way round, perhaps one can say that, in this context, it seems democratic governance is yet to take its root firmly in Nigeria because rather than engendering development and good governance, it has led to an increase in general political instability, ethnic conflicts, ethno-religious conflicts and general economic and political decay.

Human rights and democracy are part of the meaning of progress and well-being and are important contributors to development and well-being in other areas. Socio-economic and political development are tools for better and more accountable governance. For all its imperfections democracy remains one of the hopes for securing human dignity and rights which engendered development. This vision of democracy is normatively grounded in universal human rights standards, and recognises the interdependence of human rights instruments and the rights they defend.

The features of democracy as enunciated by Dahl (cited in Salvaris, 2009) include effective participation, equality in voting, informed electorate, citizen control of the agenda, inclusion, fundamental human rights, free and fair elections, freedom of expression, independent sources of information and freedom of information. Holistic democracy recognises the importance of strong institutions and practices of governance accountable to the people with due respect for cultural and societal values and traditions. Improving on protection for human rights, empowering marginalized ethnic groups to become partners in the restructuring and development programme of the
society definitely will help to consolidate the principle of democracy and what it stands to achieve. Through the spirit of and mechanism of human rights and democracy socio-economic and political rights of all can be guaranteed.

2.5 Conclusion:
There have been different explanations to ethnicity in Nigeria, two of which are the primordial school and the instrumental. This chapter began with its operational measures through a theoretical understanding of what ethnicity is. A thorough analysis of ethnicity suggests that ethnicity in Nigeria can be conceived as a product of deliberate division of ethnic groups using the instrument of administration; hence, the need to search for the elusive socio-political stability through the instrument of good governance, human rights and democracy. This is to say that the deconstruction and reconstruction of ethnicity among different ethnic groups is the catalyst to political instability in Nigeria. The promotion of citizens’ fundamental freedoms paves the way for peace that is mostly needed for the survival of a democratic government, while development remains an essential attributes of a sovereign nation in which citizens are given the opportunity to pursue their safety and happiness.

The consideration of the relationship between human rights, democracy and development however shows that each of the three terms is identifiable with certain fields of study; human rights is more related to law, democracy is more of political science while development is more technological. The three discipline are likely to overlap, in their daily application because these terms are popular and of much relevance in the political affairs and process of governance of every nation. Idowu
(2008) opined that the protection and promotion of fundamental rights should come before democracy and development; based on the fact that citizens are the most distinctive elements in democracy and their fundamental rights must be guaranteed and protected before they can be in a position to render their human resources for effective democratization and overall development of their nation. That is promotion of human right is fundamental to the establishment of an enduring democracy and national growth (socio-political and economic development).
CHAPTER THREE

Ethnicity and Political Development in Nigeria: A Historical Backdrop on Ethnic Conflict

3.0 Introduction

This chapter is based on ethnicity and political development in Nigeria, where the background to ethnic conflict in Nigeria will be discussed. The artificial creation of Nigeria by the colonial government and the attendant ethnic conflicts that have been the order of the day in Nigeria over the allocation of socio-political and economic resources demonstrate that the country shares a common background of the colonial legacy with the rest of Africa in relation to ethnic conflicts which have contributed to the underdevelopment of the country. This chapter presents a discussion of the background of ethnic conflict in Nigeria. It is a fact of history that Nigeria was forged in the course of colonial occupation.

Ethnicity in Nigeria as it is today is propelled and provoked by the politicization and mobilization of ethnicity. Scholars of ethnic conflicts in Nigeria agree that ethnics in Nigeria are divided into ethnic majorities and ethnic minorities. The majorities are dominated by the Hausa-Fulani in the North, the Yoruba in the West and the Igbo in the East. Among these major ethnic groups are minorities such as the Ijaw, Kanuri, Igbira, Ibibio, Nupe, Edo, and the Tiv etc. Apart from these ethnic divisions, religion is another phenomenon that has polarized the country into two camps apart from political division of North and South. The North is predominantly Muslim while the South is predominantly Christian. In essence, ethnic conflict in Nigeria cuts across all facets of Nigeria’s socio-political life, hence the discussion on the dual mandate and indirect rule.
3.1 The Dual Mandate

One feature of the past which is well known to scholars of ethnic conflict in Nigeria is the principle of “Dual Mandate” expounded by Lord Lugard. The British colonial administration in Nigeria was based on the Lugardian principle of the dual mandate. What this means is that, on one hand, the British colonial government would confer the benefits of Western civilization on the Africans leading them to have better ways of life and higher standards of living. This Lugard believed could be achieved by spreading Christianity and ending barbarism.

While doing this, on the other hand, the resources of Africa would be developed for the benefit of the world at large but most especially for the benefit of the colonial power undertaking the work. The reason for this was the realization that there were vast profits to be made through the exporting of resources such as rubber and through the taxation of the natives as well as importers and exporters. In addition, those resources and inexpensive native labour – slavery having been abolished – would provide a very important fuel for the industrial revolution in resource depleted Britain as well as monies for public works projects.

In January 1900, the protectorate of Northern Nigeria was designated and Lugard was appointed High Commissioner. The colonial office in the same year also assumed responsibility from the foreign office for the Oil Rivers Protectorate, which had been renamed the Niger Coast Protectorate. In 1906 this was amalgamated with Lagos to form the colony and Protectorate of Southern Nigeria (Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1960).
As can be seen from the above, the British Protectorate had been declared over Northern and Southern Nigeria in 1900, but the fact is that much effort was required to bring these large areas under control. Some punitive measures were taken in order to bring in the people who had no conception of law and authority as understood by the Europeans. For example it took several years to bring the Emirs in the North under control because of the enormous power they wielded. This was made possible because of the highly centralized system of traditional government that placed the Emir particularly that of Sokoto above other subordinate units within the Emirate. This was dealt with by Lugard by declaring every person free and equal but with the recognition of the institution of governance in the Emirate. Many of the principles of Lord Lugard in respect of colonial administration were adopted and it became the mainstay of British colonial administration in Nigeria and elsewhere.

The administrative measures which Lugard introduced were the means by which he believed that his proposed idea could become a reality under the circumstances which prevailed in the territories to be developed (Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1960). Thus, Lugard decided that British rule could be effectively exercised indirectly, through the medium of existing native authorities with British political officers acting as advisers to them. To eliminate savagery in the administration of justice, the British government adopted the principle of indirect rule.

3.2 Indirect Rule
As stated earlier the ideological underpinning, as well as the practical application of the principle of indirect rule in Nigeria is usually traced back to Lugard. In this system, much of the day-to-day government of localities was left in the hands of traditional rulers – who in principle gained prestige and stability, albeit at the cost of a loss of autonomy – allowing a limited number of European colonial administrators to effectively oversee the government of large numbers of people spread over extensive areas of the country.

Indirect rule came to be predicated on a form of decentralization that was more than territorial, more than just a search for institutional forms of control anchored in a historical and cultural legitimacy (Mamdani, 1996: 76-77). The success of this system however depended on fairly centralised hierarchical political units. For example, in the North, there was a system of administration already developed, with some conception of subjection to authority. Within this system there existed a mechanism for the collection of taxes which could be continued and developed to provide much needed sources of revenue. This is how the system in the North succeeded. However, there was variable success in the West. This is because the prevailing political system in the West at that time did not permit excessive use of power due to the implementation of a system that put a check on the King and his chiefs as was the case with the Emirs in the North. In the East, it was a total failure because of the absence of a traditional political system anchored on traditional rulers. The attempt to impose British appointed chiefs on the people was vehemently resisted. From the political point of view, the stated aims of British rule in Nigeria were the maintenance of law and order and the gradual development of native administration.
In the Lugardian scheme, indirect rule was a single and coherent edifice resting on three pillars; a native court, a native administration and a native treasury. Under this system the native chiefs govern their people, not as independent but dependent rulers. Orders of government are not conveyed to the natives through them, but emanate from them in accordance, where necessary, with instructions received through the colonial government (Mamdani, 1996). In essence he considered that natives would act as some sort of middle managers in colonial governance; which would invariably lead to avoidance of revolt, because the people would be more receptive to someone who looked like them, spoke their languages and shared their customs.

However, there were other reasons for which this principle was adopted. Chiefly among these reasons were the shortage of personnel and the cost of administration. Others were the existence of a socio-political system that aided its success particularly in the North, its success in India, the belief in gradual change if necessary and maintaining the status quo as far as possible, the large size of the territory, language etc. The years between 1900 and 1914 witnessed the consolidation of colonial rule in Nigeria.

The British colonialists established over Nigeria a common authority (a centralized form of government). They did not rule the country as a single nation. In 1900, separate protectorates were proclaimed for the North and South; with the Native Authority System established to administer the North indirectly. After the 1914 amalgamation, the country was still being administered as two separate entities. In other words, the colonialists used the Machiavellian policy of divide and rule to administer Nigeria. For example in the South, Western Education was significantly promoted with English as the official language of administration, whereas in the North the colonial administration
was conducted through the Hausa language invariably preserving Northern social structure and institutions but preventing Western influence.

The division of Nigeria into three unequal regions for administrative purposes gave credence to the manifestation of ethnic politics in Nigeria. This is because the domination of each region by the principal ethnic groups led to the formation of three powerful ethnically based political parties (Northern People Congress, Action Group and National Council of Nigerian Citizens), which in turn, reinforced the popular philosophy of the three-player ethnic game (Salawu, 2010).

The separate administration of North and South not only hindered the development of a common national identity, but also generated a deep developmental gap in terms of social, political and economic integration. In addition, when nationalism began, it took the form of separate ethnic nationalism. The resultant effect of this is lack of national cohesion till date; and the fact that the colonial government failed to develop socio-political and institutions that could integrate Nigeria.

Figure 2: Diagrammatical explanation of colonial administration in Nigeria
Lack of socio-political and economic integration

In 1953, for example, when the motion for political independence in 1956 was moved, the North opposed it perhaps for fear of domination. The result was the struggle for control of the centre by each ethnic group till today; even after fifty one years of independence. The federal constitution adopted in 1954 was considered the solution to the problem of national integration. But the 1946 division of the country into three unequal sizes had already laid the foundation for ethnic conflict, resulting in the socio-economic and political problems encountered by the system. Ethno-politics has been a significant feature of the politics of Nigerian federation.

A critical look at the political structure of Nigeria shows that the Northern region is twice the size of the West and the East combined. One unfortunate phenomenon in Nigerian political system is that the “big three” are not willing to concede political rights to the minorities constitutionally. This has always led to conflicts of interests among the major and the minority groups. Ethnic conflict has become a household phenomenon in Nigeria not because of the nature of the socio-political differences of the ethnics wedged together by the colonialists but because of the inability of these ethnic groups to see and explore the socio-economic benefits in the diversity of Nigeria, coupled with the struggle to have perpetual control of the socio-economic and political affairs of the country by each ethnic group.

The hegemonic formation of each major ethnic group which took place between 1946 and 1952 lead to the evolution of ethnically based political parties, as stated earlier, with
the Action Group which grew up from a pan Yoruba cultural group; Egbe Omo Oduduwa dominating the West, the Northern People’s Congress equally evolved from a Hausa-Fulani cultural group; Jamiyya Islamiya Arewa, dominating Northern politics and the National Council of Nigeria Citizens from nationalistic parties, cultural associations and labour movements; dominating Eastern politics. Though there were other smaller political parties, the fact is, the electoral system of that time, when the winner took all gave political strength to the major political parties.

One fear that is rife among the Yoruba of the West and the Igbo of the East is the fear of domination as a result of the structural and fiscal imbalance of the country, which they believe will always give the North an electoral advantage over the South. This fear has led to the centralization of socio-economic and political power by the dominant ethnic groups to their own advantage and to the detriment of the minorities, which eventually pushed the government to federalize the party system in the country.

The national government led by Tafawa Balewa from 1960-1966, was terminated on the 15th of January 1966 in a coup led by late Colonel Chukwuemeka Nzeogwu, and by the time late General Aguiyi Ironsi came into power, the federal system had been abolished and a unitary system introduced. The Hausa-Fulani of the Northern region rejected this system, believing that it was a ploy to edge them out of the political system. This was followed by a coup adjudged to have been ethnically motivated. This coup brought Gowon; who later divided the country into twelve states, to power and thus systematically transfer political power to the North using their numerical advantage. In addition to the civil war of 1967-1970, Nigeria has been faced with numerous socio-economic and political conflicts, which have been a threat to unity in the country.
With the increase in ethnic violence across the country, there is concern over the ability of the ethnic groups (the majority and the minority) to stay together as a single political entity, considering the inability of the government to deliver socio-economic and political goods, and each ethnic group fighting over control of the central government. The belief is that whichever ethnic group controls the central government also controls socio-economic and political power in the country. This is as a result of the structuring principle that places significant importance on the major ethnic groups. Thus, it is necessary to consider the causes of ethnic conflict in Nigeria. To make for a better understanding of the situation, the discussion will be done at three basic levels; political, economic and social levels.

3.3 Ethno-Nationalism

Nigeria became a politically independent state in 1960 after several anti-colonial struggles. This anti-colonial struggle became the transitional principle of Nigeria nationalists. Incidentally, Nigeria, a federation, along with Canada, India, and Malaysia all got their independence from Britain. Relatively, Nigeria is still forging ahead unlike Pakistan that broke up in 1971, Czechoslovakia in 1993 and Yugoslavia 2003. The spate of ethnic conflicts in the country, a phenomenon that has made the future of the country rather fragile, along with the unbalanced nature of the socio-economic and political structure of Nigerian federation has become a very important topic of discussion.

The belief that the social-political and economic satisfaction of the three dominant ethnic groups (Hausa-Fulani in the North, Yoruba in the West and the Igbo in the East) would
ensure political stability in the Nigerian federation has proved to be a political misadventure. This is as a result of the bitter rivalries and ethnic violence that have, since flag independence in 1960, characterized the socio-economic and political life of Nigerians, the height of which was the civil war of 1967-1970. The reason why this has not worked is that, while it encouraged the ascendancy of the three major ethnic groups, it equally downplayed the stabilizing effect/role of the minority groups as well as the role played in the promotion of socio-economic and political balance of the so called major ethnic groups. In essence, the minority parties served as a key factor in the ascendancy of the three major political parties in Nigeria between 1959 and 1964.

The above it means that, what people thought would have solved the socio-economic and political problem in Nigeria has come to be the bane of its social-political stability. There is more to ethnic conflicts in Nigeria and it is necessary to consider how ethnic nationalism, the adoption of federalism, electoral practice etc. vis-a-vis the role of colonial government in institutionalizing ethnicity in Nigeria have all contributed to ethnic conflicts in Nigeria.

Indisputably, Nigeria is a multi-ethnic society in which there are three major ethnic hegemonic groups in the North, East and West. Among these tripartite ethnic groups are the minorities. Ethnic nationalism connotes seeing oneself as a member of an ethnic group rather than as a member of a nation. Ethnic nationalism is a force that often leads to conflict in multi-ethnic states. More often the socio-political grievances that drive ethnic nationalism have always been the fear of domination by another group and the feeling of a loss of identity. Significantly, ethnic loyalty is championed by the political
class/elites that often provoke ethnic conflict in order to create a domestic political context where ethnicity is the only politically relevant identity (Gagnon, 1994).

The resultant effect of ethno nationalism has been ethnic conflict over socio-political goods as against national cohesion. What constitutes Nigeria today began officially with the establishment of Lagos colony in 1861. By 1900, Britain declared its protectorate over Northern Nigeria in addition to Southern Nigeria. The protectorates of Southern and Northern Nigeria as well as the colony of Lagos were amalgamated in 1914.

The implication of this is that the construction of Nigeria was not a voluntary union of the old hitherto politically and economically independent political units but an imposition of imperial power on an artificially demarcated territory containing different ethnic groups. It should be pointed out here that long before colonialism there had been socio-economic interactions between these ethnic groups but not to the extent of becoming one political unit. Moreover, ethnic groups be they majority or minority have not at any time become part of the vocabulary use to describe Nigeria until the reorganization of the entity into regions that eventually gave credence to ethnicity in Nigeria.

With the amalgamation of all parts of Nigeria, the British government embarked on state building. However, in an attempt to do this the Northern and Southern protectorates were treated differently. For example the 1922 Clifford constitution created a legislative council in the South though its role was mainly advisory but the North was denied such a council. By 1946 when the Richards constitution was adopted the Southern protectorate had been divided into two; Western and Eastern regions, leaving the Northern protectorate intact. In 1951 the colonial government under John Macpherson created a regional legislative assembly with the North and West having a bicameral
legislature (House of Assembly and House of Chiefs) and the East unicameral legislature (House of Assembly). It was only in the 1957 constitution (Lyttleton constitution) that a bicameral legislature was created in the Eastern region. The constitution also dissolved the Federal House of Representatives in 1959 and proposed a bicameral legislative house for the Federal government. This policy, adopted by the British colonial government, was perhaps in recognition of the multi-ethnic nature (in terms of language, culture, religion and political background) of the country, the differentiation in socio-political and economies of the North and South and, significantly, the size of the territory. It should be noted that the North is twice as big as the combination of the two parts of the South.

Removing the walls that surround the above submission, one can deduce that, prior to the amalgamation of 1914, Nigeria consisted of different independent units whose relationship was only at socio-economic levels and which never thought of coming together as one political entity on one hand and on the hand and by implication through the adoption of divide and rule administrative system the colonial government implicitly conceded to a federal system of government and to asymmetric differences in regional policies (Ayua and Dakas, n.d).

Jean-Francois Bayat (cited in Welsh 1996) asserts that if ethnicity is divorced from colonialism the fact of ethnic identities becomes incomprehensible. Thus, ethnicity in Nigeria is not a natural cultural residue but a craftily and consciously created ideology. For example the Northern region of Hausa-Fulani was consciously preserved by the British colonial government as a kind of human game reserve halting the Christian
missionaries and other alien cultures (perhaps Yoruba and Igbo cultures) that may likely alter the delicate structure upon which indirect rule rested (Welsh 1996).

The constitutional implementation of socio-economic and political policies through the three regions by the colonial government indefinitely produced ethnic division between the majority Hausa-Fulani, Yoruba, Igbo and the minority groups thus strengthening these groups to fight for scarce socio economic and political representation and power. The resultant effect of this was that the various groups were prevented from making claims on the Nigeria state; and the federal system focused power on the three regions (Cooper, 2002). By implication the regional strategy adopted by the colonial government gave credence to politicization of ethnicity in Nigeria making the regional leaders in Nigeria to concentrate more on their regions.

Expectantly, ethnic consciousness that resulted from colonialism metamorphosed into political consciousness, thus motivating the majority ethnic groups to develop regional political parties, an action which exacerbated ethnic tension and undoubtedly became one of the major factors that worked against Nigerian nationalism. Each region was dominated by a political party; meaning that a party dominated by members of certain ethnic groups obtained office through which services and patronage was provided. One point that should be stressed here is that the failure of the colonial state to command the much needed political allegiance of Nigerians exposed the system to chaos. The reason for this was that Nigerians tended not to pay allegiance to the state created by the British through the amalgamation of 1914 (Badmus 2009). The reality on the ground is that Nigerians, regardless of their claim to nationalism, tend to identify first with their ethnic root before identifying themselves as Nigerians.
Interestingly, the nature and structure of colonial rule in Nigeria made room for nationwide cooperation among Nigerians to confront the arbitrary and oppressive nature of the colonial government. These ethnic associations provided the platform for nationalistic activities through which colonialism was put under check. In essence, the growth of nationalism in pre-independence Nigeria was a product of the oppressive policies of the British colonial government.

The formation and the establishment of British administration in Nigeria, no doubt, changed the structure of Nigeria traditional society as well as the perspective of Nigerian peoples. This, of course, created situations and attitudes that have predisposed many Nigerians to ethnic consciousness and nationalistic activities (Coleman, 1963). Scholars have conceived nationalism as a political ideology that involves a group of individuals with a political entity defined in national terms. Nationalism emphasises a collective identity; that is people must be autonomous, united and express a single national culture. Which in other words means that nationalism might be portrayed as collective identities towards imagined communities which are not nationally expressed in language, ethnic (race) or religion but rather socially constructed by individuals that belong to a nation.

One factor that has had revolutionary influences in Nigeria since the incursion of the Europeans is Western education. It did not only facilitate the emergence of a separate class (education elites and political class) but endowed them with knowledge and the skills, the ambition and aspirations, that enabled them to challenge the colonial government in Nigeria and ultimately wrest control over the political system from it (Coleman, 1963). The British system policy that stressed the modification and
adaptation of the native administration through which the educated elite were systematically excluded from governance is another major factor. Had they been accepted and treated equally by the Europeans and had they been permitted to achieve a social and economic status that was both psychologically meaningful and satisfying, the course and pace of Nigeria nationalism would mostly have been quite different. In effect, colonial government policies not only ensured that educated Africans were not represented but keep them away from coming to grips with the problems of where they would fit into the total picture and of who would control the native authorities together in a modern political unit.

The new legislative assembly that was inaugurated in 1923 for the colony of Lagos and Southern Nigeria led to the formation of political parties, the first of which was the Nigeria National Democratic Party (NNDP) with four elected African members. This led to the formation of the Lagos Youth Movement (LYM) later changed to Nigeria Youth Movement in 1938. By 1940 nationalist activities had taken another dimension with the formation of political parties whose activities were expected to cut across the length and breadth of the country. In 1944 the National Council of Nigeria Citizens (NCNC) was formed. At its inauguration, nine different tribal and improvement associations teamed up to form the party under the leadership of Nnamdi Azikiwe. This was followed by the formation of the Action Group (AG), the Northern People’s Congress (NPC) also from pan cultural organizations. Nationalism became a regional phenomenon with each party advancing the course of its region.

Of these three major political parties the National Council of Nigeria Citizens (NCNC) was seen as a party whose interest was the unity of the country, unlike the Action Group
(AG), a strong adherent of regional politics dedicated to strengthening ethnic organizations for self-government in the Nigerian state. The same applied to the Northern Peoples Congress (NPC) whose motto was “One North One People”, illustrating its commitment to its regional goals. The NCNC was seen as the vanguard of resistance to colonialism. This is because the party commanded membership from across the country; though the bulk of its members were Igbo people. What this translated to was that the NCNC based its foundation on anti-British nationalism and its powerful urge for self-transformation motivated it to initiate Nigeria nationalism (Lancia, n.d).

Within these regions, there were other political parties considered to be minor. The reason why they were not considered to be a stabilizing agents within the major ethnic groups they were parties such as the Northern Element Progressive Union (NEPU), who, like the NCNC, had the flair for national integration to checkmate the colonial government but were soon pushed aside as a result of the regional politics of the NPC and the reason for which NPC found solace in its alliance with NCNC, the United Middle Belt Congress (UMBC), Mid-West Democratic Front (MDF), Niger Delta Congress (NDC) among others.

However, the political actions of the AG leaders at that time show that the only avenue to access political power, given the situation on ground at that time, precipitated the employment of regionalism by the NCNC among the non-Yoruba to undermine the regionalistic nature of the AG in the 1950s. What this portends is that, while political organizations such as the NCNC aimed at uniting the country, the NPC and the AG put to ground the necessity for regional politics instituted by the British colonialist in 1946 as
the pedestal for the Nigerian government. What this means is that the tripartite division of Nigeria culminated in the failure of Nigeria nationalism and success for regionalism. The resultant effect of this was the uneven development of the country; thus justifying the claim that within a multi-ethnic state such as Nigeria, regionalism was unequivocally better in order to advance politically, socially and economically; which further reinforced the function of regional political parties.

What the above translated into was that the major political parties dominated the politics of each region; NPC in the North, AG in the West and NCNC in the East. The fact that the leader of the NPC (Sir Ahmadu Bello) was a Hausa-Fulani man, made the party appear as Northern party or a Hausa party, the same was applicable to the AG led by Awolowo which was also considered a Yoruba party and NCNC led by Nnamdi Azikiwe as an Igbo party and, thus, drew their electoral strength from the geographical base of these parties. It should be pointed out here that ethnically based political parties resulted in the politics of exclusion of the minorities and denial of socio-economic and political rights, The demand for these rights may likely have raised the stakes in the political game and thus giving credence to ethnic conflicts (Mattiahs et al. 2007).

Consequently, the various ethnic minorities within the major ethnic groups, for the fear of socio-economic and political domination under this regional system, began to demand their own separate states/regions. This was engineered by the three major political parties in a bid to gain political control by encouraging the minorities under the control of other parties to demand political autonomy in order to weaken their supposed rival parties, resulting in a series of ethnic conflicts within the Nigeria political system.
The glue that held the Nigeria nationalists together was fractured with the adoption of the 1954 constitution (Badmus, 2009). The constitution officially introduced and adopted federalism in Nigeria and making the country a federation of three powerful regions through which ethnicity became polarized. The leaders of the three major political parties (Sir Ahmadu Bello, Chief Obafemi Awolowo and Dr Nnamdi Azikiwe), who had hitherto paraded themselves as national leaders, jettisoned the idea and opted to champion ethnic interests instead of national interests. Ethnicity was eventually politicized with the three political parties having their support from their ethnic roots. Thus, what could have been a blessing to Nigeria – the multi-party system – became a tool that polarized the country along ethno-party lines. The leaders seemed to be more interested in the protection of their regional interests neglecting the structural problem within the Nigerian federation. This, inadvertently, exposed the structural imbalance of the Nigerian federation.

In federations, the major responsibilities of political organization, among other functions, is to serve as bridge across ethnic lines, but in Nigeria, political parties not only reflected how deep ethnic cleavages in Nigeria are but also helped to shape and intensify ethnic cleavages. Thus each of these parties, through their leaders, mobilized and manipulated the people from their ethnic base in their quest to succeed the outgoing colonial government. The result of 1959 federal elections attested to this scenario where the NPC and its allies won 134 seats all in the North, the AG won 34 seats in the West and 39 in the East and North, NCNC had 58 in the East and 31 in the West and North (see Table1). These results showed that these parties were regionally based and relied heavily on support from their regions for electoral victory. If one would go with the above
submission, then it means that none of the political parties was strong enough to form a national government, hence the coalition of NCNC and NPC at federal level, pushing the AG into opposition. The fallout from this political friendship was the sharing of federal office comprising ministers from all the regional parties (perhaps if this had continued, it would have saved the country from the seasons of ethnic conflict that engulfed the country). From the political dynamism of that time, emerged centrifugal tendencies.

The post-independence federal elections of 1979 show that the three major political parties National Party of Nigeria (NPN), Unity Party of Nigeria (UPN) and Nigeria Peoples Party (NPP) which incidentally were all offshoots of the NPC, AG and NCNC recorded landslide victories in their regions; the NPN with 121 seats in the North against 48 in the South, the UPN with 96 in the West against 15 in the East and North while the NPP had 60 in the East against 18 in the North and West, and other parties having 92 seats altogether (see Table 2). This negative utilization of the ethnic weapon has made room for the ethnic identity to thrive, thus, challenging the socio-political and economic development of the Nigeria state. One fact that needs to be pointed out here is that the relative success of one ethnic group in mobilization and manipulation for socio-political gain, informs other ethnic groups to demand socio-economic and political rights as well as the privileges that follow it.

The above explains why most of the conflicts in Nigeria invariably feed mostly on ethnic distinctions, the control of which the political leaders use to ascend to political power, to the detriment of the socio-political development of the country. Thus the tripodal ethnic structure of the country has forced minorities to form what Mustapha (2007), called a
bewildering array of alliances around each of the three major ethnic groups. This in turn has made the three hegemonic groups build up sufficient alliances to ensure their preponderance in government or prevent them from been dominated. For example, in the elections of 1964, the NPC, considering its vulnerability because of its disadvantaged position in the minorities areas of the North capitalized on the political crisis in the West, and formed alliances with the minor political parties such as Mid-West Democratic Front (MDF), Dynamic Party (DP), Niger Delta Congress (NDC), Lagos State United Front (LSUF), Republican Party (RP) and Nigeria National Democratic Party (NNDP) to form the Nigerian National Alliance (NNA). United Progressive Grand Alliance (UPGA) was also formed by the alliance of National Council of Nigeria Citizens (NCNC), Action Group (AG), Northern Progressive Front (NPF), Kano Peoples Party (KPP), Northern Elements Progressive Union (NEPU), United Middle Belt Congress (UMBC) and Zamfara Commoners Party (ZCP). Thus a North South dichotomy was formed as a result of the alliance, however the NPC eventually manoeuvred itself through the strings of alliances to clinch power at the centre.

As the dominant party in the North throughout the period of decolonization up to 1966, the NPC did not only dominate politics in the North but also all over the country, thus using its dominant power to exploit its control of the centre to the benefit of the Northern region (Egwaikhide et al, 2009). Hence the centralization of socio-economic and political power fostered by the dominant ethnic groups further deepened ethnic cleavages in the country.

Since 1960, one important constitutional challenge yet to be resolved to date is the fear of domination among the ethnic groups arising from the variations in socio-economic
and political conditions affecting the relationship between the various ethnic groups and with the government at the centre. This fear of domination relates to the non-uniformity of the power allocated to the various regions that constitute the Nigerian federation, which has compounded the problem of a power struggle amongst the ethnic groups, not because of the financial resources and patronage derived from it but to maintain the hegemonic power of the three major ethnic groups. The thrust of this is to control the civil service at federal level, taking into consideration its importance as the soul of the government machine at the core of a huge federal economy and political patronage (Jinadu, 2002). That each ethnic group still struggles to control the centre has put a question mark on the operation of a federal system in Nigeria which should be seen as the bedrock of unity, considering the size of the country and its bewildering diversities.

3.4 Nigeria Federalism and Ethnic Conflicts

Nigeria no doubt was constructed by the British colonial government, joining diverse peoples and regions in an artificial political entity with little sense of a common Nigerian nationality. Inconsistencies in British policy reinforced cleavages based on regional animosities by attempting simultaneously to preserve the indigenous cultures of each area and to introduce Western political and social concepts. Historically, the Nigerian people themselves are different in their backgrounds, in their religious beliefs as well as their customs, hence no signs of willingness to unite. Nigerian unity is therefore a British colonial government dream for the country. Between 1953 and 1957 several constitutional conferences were held in Lagos and London, the political product of which was the constitution of 1957 which officially laid
the foundation for federalism in the Nigerian political system. What this translates to is that Nigeria became a federation of three regions of North, West and East with the North bigger than the West and East combined. The victims of this federal arrangement were the minority groups. This has put the minorities within each region at the mercy of the majority group whose interest held sway within the polity.

The inability of Nigeria to separate ethnicity from governance has made Nigeria federalism to be designed on the basis of Nigeria ethnic diversity; designed by the colonialist and followed by the emergent political leaders who prior to independence assert influence in each of the three major ethnic groups. What this means is that the minorities are likely to be deprived of their socio-economic and political rights and it was just a matter of time before people began to demand these rights. The attendants of this were ethnic conflicts which informed the division of the country into 6 geo-political zones (North East, North West, North Central, South West, South East and South South), constituting North/South dichotomy. It is, therefore, necessary to consider “Nigeria Federalism” vis-a-vis the three major ethnic groups and their role in institutionalizing ethnicity in Nigeria.

Federalism has been described as the method of dividing powers between the levels of governments so that the general and regional governments are each co-ordinated and independent of each other (Wheare, 1967). It is a political concept in which a group of members are politically bound together by political covenant with a governing representative head. It is a political theory that is divergent in concept, varied in ecology and dynamic in practice. The system has to do with how power is distributed or shared territorially and functionally among the various units in a federation (Arowolo, 2011).
a federal state there is division of power between the national government and the local political units-regions/states. Each constitutes an autonomous government, where the national government is supreme over the state or regional government in some matters that are of interest to both the states and the national government.

From the above, one can reason that federalism is a socio-economic and political compromise between region/state where the central government is constitutionally given the mandate to protect and supervise the conduct of the subordinate states thereby giving room for peaceful accommodation of heterogeneous interest of the ethnic groups that constitute the country. This means that, federalism should be seen as an institutional instrument for achieving and preserving both integration and socio-political and economic stability in a multi-ethnic society. This is to say that federalism is not an end in itself but a means to an end. This is the reason why federalism has been described as an abstract ideological model to which a society is to be brought into conformity. It has also been described as a means of bringing people together through practical arrangements with the intention of meeting both the common and diverse needs of the people (Okpanachi, 2010). This, therefore, implies that federalism is an institutional method of solving practical problems in an ethnically divided society. Thus the adoption of a political arrangement and institution that would give room for harmonious relationship between and among groups becomes inevitable to maintain political stability which engenders socio-economic development.

Federalism in Nigeria first came into the lime light following the adoption of Oliver Lytletton’s constitution of 1954. It is believed that the adoption of this system would give room for harmonious inter-ethnic relations between and among the ethnic groups in
Nigeria at least for relative socio-economic and political stability. As said earlier, the Nigerian federation is not completely separated from the ethnic divisions of the country which make it an aberration of federalism elsewhere as well a unique one. This is because it was constructed around the three major ethnic groups and a national government at the centre.

One can aptly say that there may be no ideal form or model of federal system which explains why the federal system a country operates is always peculiar to it and the practice of federalism differs from, nation to nation, and the reason why it is referred to as “Nigeria Federalism”. The adaptability of the federal system to engender socio-economic and political stability in the state depends on the operating context of the system and the attitudes of the political actors within the premise of the federal system.

The major variant of a federal system is decentralization which involves the devolution of powers to state/regional government; that is, the states are given greater power and thus giving room to accommodating ethnic cleavages and strengthening local self-government. But where the system is adopted in an attempt to solve conflict that may arise as a result of the fear of domination and to accommodate ethnic diversities, such a system may be regarded as an expression of federal principles and a variant of federalism to use the words of Osaghae (n.d) which inform us of why Nigeria federalism is different from others elsewhere.

At the inception of Nigeria federalism, there was devolution of power which made the regional governments autonomous, with their own regional Judiciary, Civil Service etc. This allowed the old Western and Eastern regions to enjoy self-governing status from 1957, and the North in 1959 till the country became independent in 1960. It explains the
differences in socio-political development of the various regions at independence, the
height of which was the fear of domination. Thus at independence in 1960, Nigeria
inherited a weak constitutional development oriented politic that consolidated the
hegemonic power of the three major ethnic groups, an unbalanced federation and an
institutional government that deprived most of the majority minorities of their
representation in the national government. Each of the three major ethnic groups
significantly enjoyed a considerable socio-political autonomy which invariably became a
source of conflict and instability.
However, Nigerian federalism after independence has continued to suffer from structural
imbalance, where some states are either bigger or richer and even more developed
than others. This has been a source of natural conflict in the Nigeria political system till
now. For one thing, this has greatly reduced the basis of stability and the point came
where the weaknesses inherent in the system came to a crisis. Ethnic identification and
consciousness was strengthened by choosing regional and administrative units which
coincided with the three major ethnic groups (Hausa-Fulani in the North, Yoruba in the
West and Igbo in the East) though it reflected the pre-colonial pattern of Nigeria but to
the exclusion of the minority groups. Exclusionism is a conscious domination of one
ethnic group over and above another. In Nigeria the most affected groups are the
minority ethnic groups. Unarguably, one can point out that ethnic consciousness has led
to the exclusion of one group or the other in the distribution of socio-political wealth, a
situation that has been the bane of national integration, hence the unstable, divisive and
disintegrative federal structure.
Nigeria federalism is more or less an asymmetric territorial association (Muhammad, 2007). This is because the country features one part that is twice the size of the combination of the other two regions, both in land mass and population which make it politically stronger. Coming to the South (West and East), they are educationally and economically stronger. This is as a result of their earlier contact and their receptiveness to Western education. This differentiation has led to what Suberu (2002) referred to as a huge historic geographical fissure between the political hegemony of the North and the socio-economic ascendance of the South. This has continued to be a clog in the wheels of socio-economic and political progress of Nigerian state to date.

The construction of the Nigerian federation around the three major ethnic groups by the colonial government and the inability of indigenous political leaders to break away from ethnicity are instrumental in the incessant ethnic conflicts being experienced in the country today. As argued earlier, providing mainly for the three major ethnic groups in the country definitely has put the minorities in a position where they can only get what belongs to them through violent means. For example, a look at the census in Nigeria before and after independence in 1960, perhaps will give an insight into why the minorities feel they are being schemed out of the socio-economic and political power play, considering the fact that only the majority groups were reckoned with.

Briefly, the socio-economic and political usage of census results in Nigeria has made the ethnicization of federalism a highly contentious issue. In the First Republic (1963-1966) where the proportional electoral system was used (this also determine the distribution of socio-political and economic goods), coupled with the results of 1952/53 census conducted by the colonial government gave the North 54.55% and the South
45.45%. Politically this gave the three major ethnic groups the opportunity to control the country, on one hand, and on the other hand, it invariably had a damaging effect on the socio-political integration of the country. It also allowed the Northern Peoples Congress (NPC) to hold onto power tenaciously in the North, through which the party was able to gain control of the federation. The subsequent censuses conducted by Nigerians since 1962 have it that in 1962 the North had 56.77% and the South 43.23%, in 1963, the North had 53.51% and the South 46.49%, in 1973 North had the 64.99% and the South 48.15%, in 1991 North and the South had 51.85% and 48.15% respectively and in 2006 the North had 52.5% and the South 46.4% and Abuja, the Federal Capital Territory 0.9% (see Appendix1 A & C). This scenario has reawakened the age long fear of domination of the South by the North.

From the above and based on the official ethnicization of Nigeria (Jinadu, 2002), it becomes possible for the other minorities to be marginalized thus compounding the problem of fear of domination by one or combination of ethnic groups in the federation. However, Nigeria was divided into 12 states in 1967 by the government of Gen. Gowon; which placed the minorities in an important position in the federation. It is undeniable that the creation of states in 1967 solved a number of problems, because the subsequent governments strengthened the majority ethnic groups. For example under the Muritala/Obasanjo regime, Nigeria became a federation of 19 states in 1976 with 12 major ethnic states against 7 minority states. The creation of states in 1967 saw the division of Northern Nigeria into 6 states, satisfying the demand of the Northern ethnic minorities (of which Gowon is a member) for their own states, thus releasing the minorities from the apron string of the majorities. It also gave the minorities the
opportunity to play a very crucial role in determining the affairs of the federation showing that they belong to the federation. The creation also gave credence to the statehood status of the minorities among the majority groups and, most importantly, allayed the fears of the Southerners of the disproportionate size of the Northern region. One fact that needs to be stressed here is that the ethnic minorities in Nigeria have always favoured federal system as a means to an end (the protection of the minority group from being dominated by the majority and the unity of the country), unlike the majority who were always agitating for the dissolution of the federation.

In a federal state, the creation of state is meant to facilitate regional socio-political development; but in a situation where the political/ethnic leaders see it as a means to exert their hegemonic position there is bound to be a crisis. This is the scenario in the Nigerian federal system where states are created for political reason rather than for socio-economic development. For example Kebbi and Yobe states depend solely on the central government for their survival. The argument then is that such states were created to give one ethnic unit more political power than others and as a means of socio-economic control and patronage. This accounts for the continuing agitation of Southerners for more states to level up with the North.

As mentioned above, in a federal state, the component units/states enjoy some degree of autonomy over the resources in their regions with the central government performing a supervisory role. Significantly, the central government, in its responsibility, is not set as an institution to oppose the functioning of the regions/states but to get them to work together with a view to promote national integration. Thus the nexus between the central government and its supervisory role are critical to productivity and effective
ethnic management. Its functionality, however, should be based on the principle that socio-political goods are organized and distributed to promote unity amidst diversity and more importantly with simplicity and inclusiveness in mind.

However, in the case of Nigeria, socio-economic and political power is highly centralized creating a socio-political gap that breeds ethnic conflict. This has undermined the basis of ethnic/state autonomy and its attendant self-government within ethnic sub-national territories. Thus the aim of using states to serve as an alternative avenue of governance in an attempt to moderate the intensity of ethnic competition for power at the centre has been defeated. In essence, what Nigeria would have gained (socially, economically and politically) was all undermined as a result of the contradiction that arises from the operation of the system. Between 1967 and 1996 Nigeria was reorganized into 36 states perhaps in response to agitation for social political decentralization; but it has only served to augment the hegemonic power of the central government and often provokes ethnic conflicts over administrative location and the distribution of socio-economic and political power of such a government, hence the agitation for the spread of socio-economic and political privileges across all ethnic groups in the country.

Another aspect of Nigerian federalism that has often exacerbated ethnic conflict is political marginalization. This entails the apparent exclusion of any particular group (s) by another similar group(s) from either having access to and/ or taking due possession of common key positions and common resources, as manifested in the political, economic, educational, media and bureaucratic realms (Akujieze, 2004). It is a situation whereby one ethnic group dominates the state apparatus politically. In other words, there is a systemic domination of one ethnic group by another politically, the end result
of which is ethnic conflict over the allocation of these political offices. From 1960 till now, as an example, Nigeria has had 13 heads of state both military and civilian including Dr. Azikiwe and the Interim Head of State, Chief Ernest Shonekan. Out of these, five were elected and 8 were military officers. Out of the 5 elected heads of state, 3 were Northerners, and 2 from the South. Out of the 8 military leaders, 6 were Northerners and 2 from the South. This is seen as a reflection of one ethnic group dominating others politically (see Table 3). It has been argued that Nigeria is a country that is not only divided between North and South but also along religious lines, with the North dominated by the Muslims and the South Christians; and considering the ethnic plurality of the country, sectionalism will not only provoke other members of the country but will also lead to ethnic conflict. What this suggests is that leadership positions in the country need not be selfishly dominated by one ethnic group but should be shared among the various ethnic groups in the country, hence the negative effect of this fixation on ethnic relations in the country.

One can say that this is the reason why the annulment of the Presidential elections of June 12, 1993 which is believed to have been won by a Southern Yoruba candidate (Chief M. K. O. Abiola) against the expectation of the Northern military oligarchy almost broke the federation. To many from the South, it was a clear indication that the Northerners are not willing to give up their grip on political power at the national level, showing one of the fundamental problems of Nigeria politics. Again, this further deepened the ethnic cleavage between the North and the South on one hand and between the North and other ethnic groups (major or minority). This assumption was further fuelled by the self-succession bid of General Sanni Abacha while in office. All the
five political parties (United Nigeria Congress Party, Democratic Party of Nigeria, Congress for National Consensus, Grassroots Democratic Movement, and National Centre Party of Nigeria) were made to endorse him as their Presidential candidate, and no opposition party was allowed to register. Under the same government Suberu (2002) writes that the position of head of state, Chief of defence staff, inspector general of police, secretary to the government of the federation, minister of internal affairs, national security adviser, Chief justice of the federation and other key positions were occupied by Northerners. Under the civilian administration of late Musa Yar’Adua, out of 42 ministers appointed, 22 were Northerners and 20 were Southerners.

The institutionalization of federalism in Nigeria is considered to be a socio-political instrument to prevent exclusion of groups and to balance the power between the ethnic groups vis-a-vis the North and the South but this has not come to fruition as a result of the contradiction in socio-political and economic power of the ethnic groups in the country where one ethnic group is more politically powerful than others, culminating a weak Nigerian federal system. Given the centrality of power, perverse governance, allocation of political office along regional and religious lines, the system of restraint which is the electoral practice has also been fingered to be a source of ethnic conflict in Nigeria.

3.5 Partisan Nature of Electoral Politics

For most of the people in a democratic state, for example in Nigeria, Ghana, United States of America, South Africa etc. elections have meaning. The reason is not far-fetched. It is because; through the process of election the majority (the electorate)
makes crucial decisions that will lead to the choice of policy makers who will engender socio-economic and political stability of the country. This means that there is a link between the electoral practice and socio-political development in a country. But what is the electoral system? What is required of it?

Electoral practice is the process through which elections are organized and conducted in a country. Basically, the primary /major requirement of an electoral system is that it give the citizens of a nation the opportunity to elect those that will represent them at the legislative assembly and, in a country like Nigeria, it also provides the citizens with the opportunity to elect the head of state/president. However, there are different types of electoral systems amongst which are: proportional representation, the simple majority system or first-past-the-post system, the alternative voting system, indirect election (Electoral College), the open ballot system, the absolute majority system, the block system etc. This study is going to look at three of the aforementioned systems which have been practice in Nigeria at one time or the other.

Indirect election (Electoral College) is a system of election where citizens (adult males) in each village choose a representative from the district level, who in turn chooses a provincial representative. The provincial Electoral College elects by secret ballot a specific number of representatives to the Regional Assembly. This system was used in Nigeria in the elections of 1946 and 1954.

Proportional representation is an electoral system whereby seats are allocated to political parties in proportion to the number of votes recorded in an election. For example in the 1959 general elections, apart from the elections held in 312 single
member constituencies nationwide, won by the Northern Peoples Congress (NPC), the
vacant seats were proportionally allocated regionally (see Appendix 2).

The simple majority system is an electoral system where the candidate/party that
secures the highest number of votes cast in an election is declare winner. In essence,
the winner takes all under this system. This method of voting was used in the general
still based on the simple majority system, was adopted in the 1993 elections in which
the voters filed behind the party symbols or the photograph of the candidate of choice.

Voters were physically counted and the result declared. This principle has engendered
conflict in Nigeria. Thus the politics of exclusion is institutionalized through the process
of winner takes all, an electoral system which has deepened ethnic cleavages and
further politicized ethnicity in the country.

Arthur Lewis (cited in Murithi n.d) asserted that the surest way to kill an ideal democratic
system in a multi-ethnic society like Nigeria is through the adoption of the American
electoral system of the simple majority. In essence where ethnic cleavages are a
problem there should be a political system that will allow adequate representation of
every ethnic group particularly the minorities. Under this system there is intense
competition as a result of which political parties ensure total maximization and
manipulation of ethnic identities. What is likely to follow this is the emergence of a
political party that may eventually emerged as the mouthpiece of the ethnic group from
where the party came. A good example of this scenario was the situation where the
Northern Peoples Congress (NPC), Action Group (AG) and National Council of Nigeria
Citizens (NCNC) were primarily representing their ethnic groups rather than building a
national party that cut across ethnic cleavages in the country. In other words, ethnicity plays a dominant role in Nigerian elections.

Ethnicity, as a major element of Nigeria’s social-political structure has had a debilitating impact on the origins and trajectory of competitive electoral and party politics in the country (Fall et al. 2011). Evidence of this was the relationship between the three major political parties (AG, NCNC and NPC) who through their leaders had very strong roots in their ethnic base of the North representing the Hausa-Fulani, the West representing the Yoruba and the East representing the Igbo people. However as explained before, the minorities also formed their own political parties which practically served as a force that tended to balance the political equation between the three major political parties. One fact that should be noted is that, when one ethnic group or the other (major or minority) is systematically edged out in the national project of nation building, what follows is the activation of these groups’ identities, the end result of which is conflict.

Events in Nigeria between the 1950s and 1960s witnessed an electoral system that sustained ethnic cleavages and subverted national integration. This was easy because these political parties morphed from one socio-cultural organization or the other which put them in a vantage position to appeal to ethnic allegiances rather than issues of socio-economic and political ideology. Any political party which knew how to play the ethnic card effectively was eventually rewarded with electoral success. The danger that was inherent in such a situation was that it pushed political competition to the extreme; which produced conflict. For example in the election of 1959 where 132 members of the House of Representatives were elected, the seats were distributed in proportion to the population of each region thus the North was allocated 68 seats, West 34 and East 34
seats. From these figures the addition of seats allocated to the West and East equalled the number of seats allocated to the North alone thus fuelling the embers of ethnic conflict.

To understand Nigeria’s electoral process and its attendant conflicts (ethnic) a brief look at some of the elections held in Nigeria will inform us of some of the problems inherent in first-past-the-post system. The first general election in Nigeria took place in 1959; this election was based on the parliamentary system but was marred by violence and a series of allegations of electoral malpractice. The colonial government was suspected of being the major perpetrator of this act. This is because while the leaders of AG and NCNC (Awolowo and Azikiwe) were still negotiating the possibility of a coalition government, the colonial government invited the leader of NPC (Balewa) to form the government. Considering the fact that the NPC had 134 seats, NCNC 89 seats and AG 73 respectively, if AG and NCNC had had a coalition government the NPC would have been pushed into the opposition; thus the action of the colonial government was considered to be too hasty as a result, the Southerners believed that the colonial government manipulated the hegemonic power of the North over other ethnic groups.

Prior to the 1964 general election there was large scale of ethnic violence over the census of 1962/63. There was also the crisis within the national coalition government of the NPC and NCNC over the allegation that the 1962/63 census results were manipulated in favour of the Northern region. In the West there were also clashes between the factions of AG where voters were intimidated, especially in the South West. This action came to be known as the “wild-wild-West”. This political upheaval led to the declaration of a state of emergency by the Federal Government in the South West, a
situation the NPC exploited to win the elections under simple majority system. In 1965 there was another election which was marred by electoral malpractices. The continuing spate of ethnic violence and the state of uncertainty that greeted the country led to the military coup of January 15, 1966, terminating the First Republic. The military took control of the Nigerian political system until 1979 when the country returned to a democratically elected government.

In the 1979 general election where five political parties (Unity Party of Nigeria, National Party of Nigeria, Great Nigerians Peoples Party, Peoples Redemption Party and Nigeria Peoples Party) competed for power, particularly at the centre, the NPN eventually won the election through a simple majority system. There was another election in 1983 with all parties in 1979 contesting, as well as an additional one, the Nigeria Advance Party. The NPN used the instrument of state to win the election at all cost reflecting what happened in controversial federal elections of 1964. Eventually, the military seized power again terminating the Second Republic (1979-1983) as a result of the crisis that followed the election.

Under a peaceful and suitable atmosphere, another election was conducted on the 12th of June 1993 which was adjudged the most credible election ever conducted in Nigeria to date. The annulment of the election which meant the continuation of the legitimation of Northern political hegemony over the rest of the country brought about widespread ethnic confrontations between the South and the North. The political crisis almost led to the disintegration of the country. The emergence of the military in Nigeria politics is integral to understanding of ethnic conflict which has continued to afflict the country like an incurable disease, and it underpin efforts to understand the ways in which the
institutionalization of the electoral practice can allay the fears and the exclusion of the minority ethnic groups socially, economically and politically.

From 1999 to the present, there have been four general elections which have failed to improve the political parties’ reliance on their ethnic identities to win elections at all cost. For example, in the last general election held in April 2011 the CPC (Congress for Progressive Change), considered to be a Hausa-Fulani party, depended solely on the Hausas to win the election; and the result showed that the 12 states (Bauchi, Bornu, Gombe, Jigawa, Kaduna, Kano, Katsina, Kebbi, Niger, Sokoto, Yobe and Zamfara) won by the party were all in the Northern part of the country. This shows that the electorates have cast their votes along ethnic lines. The flawed electoral process and the upsurge in deadly ethnic clashes between and among ethnic groups during and after elections have put to question the integrative role of political parties, on one hand and the type of electoral system adopted in the country, on the other hand. What this is suggesting is that the system used in the country has indirectly downplayed the role of the minority ethnic groups, hence, there is the need to adopt a system that will not only incorporate the minority ethnic groups but will as well make it mandatory for all the parties to have a certain percentage of vote cast in the minority states before been declared winner in any election.

In view of the above, it is apparent that the electoral system in Nigeria acts as a force of ethnic politics where ethnic groups perceived the threat of political marginalization in the polity. Where the winner takes all, ethnic politics also assume different levels. This explains why Nigeria electoral politics before independence increasingly assumed violent; war like forms, emphasized by the winner takes all tendencies inherent in the
first-past-the-post electoral system practiced in the country. As a result of this system, each of the major ethnic group takes advantage of the fact that the system encourages a situation in which it is the winner that forms the government but is done to the disadvantage of other ethnic groups; particularly the smaller ones. This is why conflicts ensue during and after elections.

At this juncture it is pertinent to look at two of the problems associated with electoral politics in Nigeria which, instead of diffusing the fire of ethnicity, it continue to fan it. The overlapping inequalities within the Nigeria ethnic groups have shaped the perceptions of Nigerians politically about the composition of the cabinets of different governments. Encouraged by the majoritarian electoral politics, the North did not hide their hegemonic political power in the composition of civilian governments headed by them; in what Mustapha (2006) referred to as senior partner and junior partner relations, that is, the Northerners as the senior partner and the Southerners as junior partner with the minority ethnic groups playing a supportive role to the major ethnic groups. Between the period from 1959 and 1966 when the military took over the reins of power in the country, the Hausa-Fulani of the North dominated the federal cabinet and also in the Second Republic (1979-1983) when the country was divided into 4 zones of North, West, East and Mid-West. The electoral system on the ground gave the Northern candidate who won the election the opportunity to assert the Hausa-Fulani dominance of Nigerian politics. The North unequivocally dominated the cabinet. (See Table 4 A&B)

Another problem associated with Nigerian electoral politics is that the system demonstrated that the votes for the losers are considered a waste, on one hand and they are seen as not serving as instrument for expressing the will of the voters, on the
other hand. Thus the system is not essentially fair to the ethnic minorities (the winning party) but to the majorities (the losing party). For example, the result of 1979 presidential election where this system was used shows that Sheu Shagari the NPN candidate and a Northerner had approximately 5.7 million votes representing 33.77% of the total vote cast and the remaining four political parties approximately had 11.2 million representing 66.23% of the total votes cast. The same situation occurred in 1983 when the NPN had 47.51% of the total vote cast and others had 52.49% of the total vote cast. From this, it means that the majoritarian system only favours the candidate/party representing the majority ethnic groups at the expense of the minorities, justifying the reasons why ethnic conflict is always the order of the day during and after elections.

Thus looking into the majoritarian electoral system in Nigeria, it can be said to combine with politicized ethnicity to form an exclusionary political system. Cohen (1997) comments that through the first-past-the-post system’s attempt to cross-cut ethnic cleavages into irrelevance in a multi-ethnic society, it only suppress them and preserves them as latent sources of (ethnic) tension, a situation that poses a lot of challenges to governance in Nigeria. Elections should be seen as contributive factors to socio-economic and political integration and a means to promote equity and fairness.

3.6 Nigeria Fiscal Policy (Resource Allocation)

One of the questions threatening the unity of Nigeria is the question of resource distribution. Several attempts have been made by various governments to solve the problem, but to no avail. Fiscal policy is a tool which is used by national government to influence the direction of the economy, generally, with the goal of promoting economic
health and growth. Depending on the head of state in charge, fiscal policies can be approached in a variety of ways because different people have different approaches to resource distribution. This underpins the reason why every head of state in Nigeria has tended to be ethnically biased when it comes to resource distribution.

The federal system requires that the general and regional government of a country be independent of each other within its sphere, it is a system of government in which sovereignty is constitutionally divided between a central governing authority and constituent political units (such as states or provinces). The system is based upon democratic rules and institutions in which the power to govern is shared between national and provincial/state governments, creating what is often called a federation. This means that both the national and state governments must each have its own independent control of its resources thus making diversity management in ethnically divided country a possibility. Under fiscal federalism the component units/states control their resources and pay tax to the central government; but it is impractical in Nigeria federal state, where the resources are unevenly distributed and it becomes difficult to implement. This is one of the sources of the attendant problems associated with resource distribution in Nigeria.

The constituents of present day Nigeria were formerly independent entities which were brought together by the British colonial government in 1914, culminating in the adoption of the federal system. Federalism is a mode of political system that unites separate states/ethnic groups within an overarching political system in such a way as to allow each to maintain its own fundamental political integrity. Federal systems do this by
requiring that basic policies be made and implemented through negotiation in some form, so that all the members can share in making and executing decisions.

The political principles that animate federal systems emphasize the primacy of bargaining and negotiated coordination among several power centers; they stress the virtues of dispersed power centers as a means for safeguarding individual and group freedom. Therefore it is an institutional solution to the destructive tendencies of intra societal ethnic pluralism. This translates to mean that the relevance of the federal system encapsulates all forms of societal diversities be it ethnical, cultural, linguistic or religion.

There is no gainsaying that Nigeria is blessed with an abundance of resources but they are not evenly distributed. As result of this economic imbalance between the North and the South, it is imperative to adopt a system that will ensure even development in the country. This system will grant the less privileged states/regions the opportunity to bridge the socio-economic gaps between them. This action which, by implication, should have made Nigeria more united, till now has pitched the North and the South against each other socially, economically and politically, and impacting negatively on the development of the country.

By 1923, a legislative council whose jurisdiction was within Lagos and the Southern protectorate was established. This legislative council never had the constitutional power to legislate on matters concerning the Northern protectorate. In addition, the colonial government did not, from the beginning, involve the Northerners in the project of nation building. The position of the major ethnic groups has made the issue of resource
distribution a contentious factor and equally destabilizing till date. The reason is that the issue has since been politicized by various governments in Nigeria’s political life.

In a multi-ethnic state, socio-economic and political development and most importantly ethnic integration should be the major objective of fiscal policies; but the inability of successive governments in Nigeria since independence to separate ethnicity and politics of exclusion from fiscal policies has thus deprived the country of corresponding socio-economic and political developments that come through good fiscal policies (distribution and management of economic resources). Put differently, the politicization of the distribution of resources has led to ethnic and regional conflicts that featured frequently in the minds of the people. This has affected the growth of a national identity and its failure to act as a mechanism to address regional inequalities. Moreover, the presence of competitive regional and ethnic blocs of the population complicated by differences in the level of socio-economic attainment, have inadvertently rendered the issue of fiscal policies in Nigeria one of uncommon intensity (Richard, 1987).

The success of a political system in responding to the challenges of ethnic diversity depends on the interplay of a host of factors, such as human rights, democracy, fiscal policies of such country etc. Of importance is the fiscal policy particularly in a multi-ethnic state. Fiscal policy is a contentious subject; this is because it affects the allocation of administrative responsibilities. The percentage of revenue allocated to a tier of government will definitely affect or influence its performance. More so the fiscal power and revenue allocation will determine the tier of government that controls the political economy Ronald cited in Omotoso (2010). The nature of the fiscal federalism and revenue allocation in Nigeria no doubt places the federal government at a vantage
position to control the economy. This situation has polarized Nigeria into north-south divide defined by political and economic power.

As observed by scholars fiscal laws in Nigeria give more powers to the federal government than the other sub-federal units combined. For example the principle of centralized redistribution state that the redistribution functions of fiscal policy should be centralized at the federal level (Ekpo, 2004). This has made the sub-federal units to substantially depend on the federal government particularly for their finances. The effect of this is that state and local governments are not encouraged to generate revenue internally thus making them to be financially weak and contrary to the principle of true federalism. The results of this are discontentment, conflicts and agitation by the two other tiers of government against the federal government for self-reliance. The argument here is that among the different levels of government, fiscal arrangements must be worked out properly and it is this arrangement among the different tiers of government in a federal structure that is often referred to as fiscal federalism or Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations. Intergovernmental Fiscal relations concern the division of public sector functions and finances among different tiers of government (Ifureze, Jibrin and Bernard, 2012). In the context of Nigeria federal system, it connotes how the sources of the federation revenue are controlled and shared among the various tiers of government. It has to do with how the resources available are harnessed, the sharing formula for the revenue collected and how the sharing formula is determined, hence the principle of equalization that places emphasis on differences in resource endowment of states in the federation. This principle if properly implemented will ensure that each state/region have same degree of fiscal equalization.
Explaining the principles that guide the implementation of fiscal relations in Nigeria Ekpo (2004:26-28) writes that under the principle of diversity, the federal system must have the capability to accommodate a large variety of diversities. What this translates to mean is that the fiscal system must provide scope for variety and differences to supply national, regional as well as local socio-economic goods. The principle of derivation places emphasis on the fact that component units of a system should be able to control some of its own resources as they desire. Without any point of contradiction the general principles of fiscal federalism seemed to have informed Nigeria’s attempt at intergovernmental fiscal relations. The different principles have been dictated by a combination of historical experiences, political, cultural and socio-economic factors.

Significantly a number of these factors that have contributed to fiscal centralization in Nigeria include the growing importance of crude oil, the civil war of 1967-1970, the incursion of the military into politics through which centralization was strengthened as well as state creation exercises. Of importance to this is crude oil and proliferation of states. This has however reduced the size and capability of the states and made them intrinsically weak and excessively reliant on allocations that come from the centre.

There is no doubt of the fact that no federation anywhere in the world has its entire component units equally developed socially and economically, thus making the allocation of resources an effective ethnic mobilization force/weapon in the hands of political leaders in a multi-ethnic state such as Nigeria. They have perfectly exploited this system to satisfy their hegemonic interests. For example Northern political leaders have consistently favoured statist strategies as a means of directing economic resources and opportunities toward “disadvantaged” regions and mitigating the
presumed advantages of the south. Equally ethnic groups in the south are more frequently (though not uniformly) proponents of economic liberalization, as they perceive advantages in an environment of relatively competitive markets. All, however, share basic assumptions about political and economic competition (Jekayinfa, 2002). The misuse of revenue allocation can engender political upheaval and eventually destabilized the political economy and undermine the sustainability of unity and socio-political development. Arowolo (2011) argues that revenue sharing among the component units of the Nigerian federation has from the inception, been replete with agitations, controversies and outright rejections due to the nature of the politics that is involved in it. This perhaps has been the reason for which the allocation of resources in Nigeria has continued to be a contentious issue in the polity.

As shall be seen in this section, the various principles being used in the allocation of resources favour certain states (ethnic group). First it favours states with a large population as against those with a small population. It favours the major ethnic groups against the minorities, the system combined (population, equity of states and land mass) favours the states in the North thus allowing them to assert their hegemonic political power. In essence this situation has continued to fuel the struggle for the control of political power at the centre, given that the ethnic group in power allocates resources. This state of affairs has affected the socio-economic and political development of the country.

From 1946 till now, there have been several commissions set up to review, and of course, recommend an appropriate revenue allocation formula that best suits the country but none seems to be working perfectly. The reason has been that not all ethnic
groups are ever satisfied with any of these recommendations. Perhaps a brief look at the recommendations of these commissions will justify the above assertion. The first commission to look into the issue of revenue allocation was the Phillipson commission set up in 1946 by the colonial government. The commission placed emphasis on the derivational system, population and even development. This period was characterized by a strong federal presence in fiscal matters (Olaloku, cited in Ojo, 2010). The newly created regional councils at that time had no legislative power as a result the excess of the budgetary needs of the central government were allocated to the regions.

Another commission – Hicks Phillipson – was set up as a result of the rejection of the 1946 commission by Nigerians. The new commission recommended derivation, needs and national interest., Since the regional councils had fiscal powers, the federal government shared the state revenue equally with the regions, in a bid to promote true federation. However, the major difference from the previous recommendation was the non-inclusion of population. The formula was again put under scrutiny in 1953 through the Chicks commission whose recommendation emphasized the principle of derivation. Under this principle the Western Region had 40% while the East and North had 30% each. Five years after (1958) in a bid to have an acceptable revenue formula, the Raiseman commission was set up. The commission recommended that the North based on its population receive 40%, the West 37%, the East 18% and Southern Cameroon 5% (Southern Cameroon was seeded to Britain in 1945 following the defeat of Germany, its former colonial master in World War II and had to be administered along with Nigeria by Britain).
Following the readjustment of the boundaries of Nigeria and Southern Cameroon being transferred to the main Cameroon in 1961 after the independence of Nigeria, and the creation of Mid-Western Region in 1964, the Binns commission was set up. Its recommendation was based on the principle of needs (a formula based on the socio-economic needs of each region). The commission recommended 42% for the North, the East 30%, the West 20% and the Mid-West 8% from the distributable pool account. This recommendation was based on the population of each region (See Table 5 A).

Perhaps the best formula that was never used was the recommendation of the Dina committee of 1968. The commission pointed to the fact that practically one problem that faces Nigeria is that of uneven socio-economic development among the states of the federation. The commission recommended a minimum responsibility of government as a revenue sharing formula; a situation that will perhaps put the central government in a supervisory position (Ojo, 2010). It also recommended the establishment of a permanent revenue planning commission. The commission retained the principles of need, even development and derivation as introduced by the previous commissions but as stated these were never implemented.

The derivational system means that each unit (regional) of government would receive from the central government the same portion it has contributed. That is, each region receives the proportion of revenue contributed to the centrally generated revenue. This system in principle would make each regional government to generate enough revenue since what they receive would be in proportion to what they have or derive regionally. Suberu (cited in Keller, 2002) however notes that the principle has been a constant impediment to the development of a rational and equitable system of revenue sharing
for Nigeria. More so it has tended to exacerbate tensions between the federal and state governments as well as leading to intense regional rivalry and conflict over the distribution of shared revenues. The resultant effect is the failure to feel a sense of national integration/unity.

In 1977, the Aboyade Technical Committee was set up. The committee recommended a national minimum standard for national integration (22%), equality of access to development opportunities (25%), absorptive capacity (20%), fiscal efficiency (15%), and independent revenue effort (18%). Other recommendations were: Federal 57%, State 30%, Local Government 10% and 3% for special fund. Following the rejection of this formula, in 1980, the Okigbo Committee was set up. The committee recommended percentages for governments: Federal 53%, State 30%, Local Government 10% and special fund 7%. In an attempt to proffer solution to the revenue sharing problem, the Danjuma commission was set up in 1988. The commission recommended 50% for the Federal government, 30% for States, 10% for Local government, and 7% for special fund. In 1999, the Federal government set up The Revenue Mobilization Allocation and Fiscal Commission with the aim of finding a lasting solution to revenue sharing problem as well as provide for every ethnic group/state in the country. The body in 2001 made proposal for a sharing formula thus: Federal Government 41.3%, State 31%, Local Government 16% and 11.7% as special fund. As usual this has not solved the problem (See Table 5 B).

By the time the derivational system was jettisoned on the basis that the principle bred ethno-regional conflicts as well as deepened ethnic hostilities, the principle of Population and Equality of states had been brought in. The implementation of these two
principles has generated and is still generating a lot of crisis in the country. The reason for this is that its implementation places certain ethnic groups above others.

Considering the issue of population first, means that the revenue that will accrue to each state will be based on the population of each state. This translates into a smaller allocation to states with smaller populations than what is allocated to states with bigger populations, which means that, if the revenue that accrues to the central government from the smaller state is more than the revenue that comes from the bigger state, the state with the bigger population still gets more at the expense of the smaller state with more contribution. Thus, considering the last head count (census 2006) in the country means that states like Kano and Lagos with a population of 9.4 million and 9.0 million respectively, will continue to enjoy the largesse of this system more than any other state (See Appendix 1C).

The principle of equality of state means that the percentage of revenue allocated to each state of the federation including Abuja is equal, regardless of the size or the generated revenue from such a state to the central government. Since there are more states in the North, they benefit more from this policy than the states in the South. For example, states which contribute virtually nothing under this system get the same amount as states whose revenue is almost half of the total revenue generated in the country; an action which is seen as a deliberate attempt to pitch the states against each other.

One principle that was smuggled in using the military fiat in 1990 by Babangida’s administration was the Land Mass principle. Resources are allocated based on the land mass of each state. It should be noted that the North is twice the size of the Southern
states combined, which means that this principle favours the Northern states. This was however countered by the Southerners using the political instrument of their population density (Ojo, 2010).

3.7 Conclusion

The formation of the colony and protectorate of Nigeria by the colonial government, no doubt, involved a considerable amount of administrative re-organization. In all respect there was a shortage of European personnel which culminated in the introduction of indirect rule, using the native authorities through which the educated/political elites were excluded from the administration of their country. This however served as an unwitting stimulus to fighting for the independence of the country.

The adoption of federal system, as described earlier, is an arrangement that was to involve and encourage intergovernmental/interregional relations in most contemporary federations. Over the years the fiscal federal system has crystallised and remains dynamic as a result of the multiplicity nature of the system characterized by hostile competition socio-political goods, unending struggle and survival of the fittest syndrome (Arowolo, 2011). The system has been allowed to reinforce the structural vulnerability of the component units while intensifying the pressure for better federal patronage.

The adoption of a federal system which ordinarily would have been an antidote to solving the problem of ethnic conflict in Nigeria has become its bane. This is because of its functional deformity which has asserted hegemonic power of the majority groups over the minority groups. The trend manifested not just through ethnic nationalism within the three major ethnic groups but also the use of its political power to control the
country, and also through misconceived and systemic discriminatory socio-economic policies which apparently appealed more to ethnic identity rather than to national identity.

While there are features that suggest that ethnic groups within the Nigerian polity are protected and that they would be able to function equally within the multi-ethnic federal state, the unconstitutional hegemonic behaviour of major ethnic groups whose politics of exclusion along the lines of ethnicity has continued to nourish rather than reduce ethnic cleavages in the country.
CHAPTER FOUR
On the Tenacity of Ethnic Conflict in Post-Independence Nigeria

4.0 Introduction

Nigeria, Africa’s most populous country and one of the world’s most deeply divided societies, has trod a complex, turbulent and contradictory political trajectory since the attainment of independence in 1960 (Suberu and Diamond, 2002). Nigerian leaders appear to be well informed of the problems facing the nation but they have not always been able to approach them independently of the ethnic interests. Thus the political history of Nigeria is characterized by several examples of ethnic conflict where ethnicity has been manipulated by the political class to satisfy their selfish interests. Put differently political instability in Nigeria is a function of the negative use of ethnicity which in turn generates a reaction from the marginalized groups who seek to establish themselves through violence. This chapter will therefore provide the necessary exposition to promote a clear understanding of ethnic conflict in post-independence Nigeria bearing in mind the fact that ethnic conflict has been very detrimental to national peace, stability, unity and sustainable development. One can reason from here that Nigeria political leaders have not been able to work out a political consensus on the basis of which socio-political and economic institutions can be built to resolve ethnic differences in order for the country to experience the desired development.

Nigeria as it is today is not the only federation with different ethnic groups that passed through the period of colonialism under Britain. India, Canada and South Africa also went through the same colonial experience. Furthermore, Nigeria is not the only
federation that has to contend or still contending with the menace of ethnic conflict. Some such countries have been able to manage conflict and allowed it to engender socio-economic and political development while some like Nigeria, are still battling with it. To some extent, Nigeria has been able to manage it, but the fact still remains that ethnic conflict has become a significant destabilizing political phenomenon in the Nigerian polity. The fact that Nigeria was constructed and structured around the three major ethnic groups by the colonial government and the relevance accorded ethnicity by the indigenous political leaders that took over from the colonial government needs to be stressed.

Nigeria was never one political entity before the advent of colonialism; in fact the various groups that constitute the independent federation of Nigeria today came under British colonial government at different times, which explains why Indirect Rule was first introduced in the North followed by its introduction in the West and later in the South East. For administrative and, most importantly, economic exploitation of the country, the Northern and Southern protectorates were brought together in 1914. Of course the federation of Nigeria which came into being through the adoption of 1954 constitution was built around the tripartite major ethnic groups of the Hausa-Fulani in the North, the Yoruba in the West and the Igbo in the East. The implication of this is the incessant conflict between the majority and the minority ethnic groups over the allocation of scarce socio-economic and political resources.

Ethnic conflict in Nigeria, one would suggest, should not be seen as a function of the existence of the various ethnic groups in the country. Rather, it emanates from the differentiation in the socio-political and economic objectives that each ethnic group is
willing to achieve and at all cost. In essence, the goals behind the demand for scarce socio-political resources are different which explains why the major ethnic groups wanted to maintain their hegemonic power over the minorities at all cost, and the latter wanted their autonomy within the polity through which they can strengthen their roles. This has made ethnic conflict a dominant feature in Nigeria’s fifty one years of nationhood.

Thus the socio-economic and political instability in Nigeria as stated elsewhere is a function of the weaknesses inherent in the institutions set up to manage and to foster the emergence of a society where there will be a healthy socio-political and economic integration that will enhance sustainable development. These institutions were created to structure the integration of the various ethnic groups in the polity as well as proffer solutions to conflict that may emanate from these interactions. But in a situation where stability is almost elusive within the polity as a result of institutional manipulation by a set of ethnic groups that possess the instrument of power, such institutions are bound to fail; which explains why there is still ethnic conflict in Nigeria despite the various ethnic management strategies put in place to contain it. This chapter is therefore dedicated to examining why ethnic conflict still persists in Nigeria.

4.1 The nexus between the persistent of ethnic conflict in Nigeria

When ethnic groups fail to see ethnicity as a weapon for countering perceived injustices and empowering group members but utilize it as an instrument of oppression and revenge in the distribution of socio-economic and political goods (for example the Hausa-Fulani of the North has from time to time used their numerical superiority
negatively to control the affairs of the country, likewise the Yoruba in the West using their educational advantage, the Igbo using the secession threat and those from the oil rich South South using resource control) development of the various ethnic groups no doubt will go into relapse. A situation that have been the bane of post-independence Nigeria’s socio-political and economic development. This gives Nigerian political leaders a reason to deal with the colonial political engineering in the Nigerian polity. The problem of maintaining a conflict free state in the Nigerian polity perhaps should not be seen as the function of the hitherto independent ethnic groups brought together by the amalgamation of 1914 but it should be seen as the inability of the post-colonial leaders to have a decisive socio-political and economic plan of how to use these cleavages as a means to development.

With the political independence of 1960 Nigeria made a giant leap to break away from this foundation and with the adoption of 1960 Constitution Nigeria became an independent state within the British Commonwealth. This, however, did not take away the influence of the colonial government on Nigeria at independence. For example the British Crown was still Nigeria’s Head of state represented by an indigenous Governor General for a period of three years. This meant that the Nigerian political system was still tied to the apron strings of the colonial government.

However with the adoption of 1963 constitution though more or less the same as that of 1960 the British Crown was removed as the constitutional Nigerian Head of State thus making Nigeria a Republic. The Crown was replaced with an indigenous Head of State that also doubled as president (though symbolic). A close look at the constitution of 1963 shows that there is a mixture of the federal system and the parliamentary on one
hand and on the other hand a president and prime minister together with a cabinet members chosen from the members of the parliament. This generated a lot of friction within the executive which culminated in a clash of political leaders representing ethnic groups and thus threatening the unity and socio-political development of the country.

Another problem that can be pointed out is the parliamentary system which Ayua and Dakas (n.d) tagged as a confrontational parliamentary system. This is because the three major political parties (NCNC, NPC and AG) were regionally based and representing the interest of their ethnic group but having national look. Put in another words none of these parties was actually a true national political party that cuts across all ethnic groups. This political situation led to a shattered socio-political system which eventually ushered in the military government under the late Aguiyi Ironsi in 1966.

The military government in an attempt to proffer solution to Nigeria political log jam through the Unification Decree No 34 of 1966 abolished the federal system and introduced a unitary system. The eventual product of this action was the counter coup that returned the country to federal system. This action resulted in the secession of the Eastern Region, culminating in the civil war of 1967-1970. To reduce ethnic tension and maintain the socio-political stability of Nigeria, the military government under Gowon slashed the country into 12 states thus undermining the hegemonic status of the majority ethnic groups in the country an exercise which has continued till today.

The idea of socio-political development should provide a significant ideological foundation for the transition from the previous constitutional management of Nigeria through the British styled parliamentary system and the socio-political log-jam associated with the system. Furthermore, it should ensure adequate participation and
representation of every ethnic group at national level where every political leader is expected to grow beyond ethnic or state loyalty. Thus in 1979 Nigeria adopted the American model of presidential governance in which the whole country is seen as the constituency of the would be president, thus making the president as a symbol of unity. At the heart of this change lay the envisaged functionality of the new system. Through the system, every ethnic group was put at a vantage position where their inclusion in nation building is considered to be very significant.

However the efforts to develop guide and maintain this political culture (presidential system) within the context of African cultural values with the aim of ensuring groups participation was compounded by the diversity and plural nature of the Nigerian society that is characterized by ethnic, socio-economic, religious and cultural cleavages, thus making its functionality a difficult task to accomplish. This has made democratic governance in which sustainable development would flourish a herculean task.

Under this model, there was a separation of power between the three arms government: the legislature, which comprises the House of Representative and the Senate where every ethnic group is supposed to be represented, the executive and the judiciary. This arrangement is also at state and local government level, with the state having a unicameral legislature (State House of Assembly) and the local government having a mini legislative assembly. This structural arrangement was the same in the 1999 constitution. One can say here that the process of redefining the Nigerian socio-political system created an interest on the part of every ethnic group and political leader to participate and have a say in Nigerian governance.
Recognizing the multi-ethnic and multi-religious nature of Nigeria and in order to defuse the flame of ethnicity and bearing in mind the differences within the polity, Nigeria political leaders made Nigeria a secular state. Secularism is a constitutional provision that seeks to preserve the religious neutrality of government and cultures and the institutional separation of politics from religion. The constitution of 1999 section 10 (1) states that the government of the federation or of a state shall not adopt any religion as the state religion. Provision was made for inclusive governance by adopting the principle of federal character and three tier governments (federal, state and local government; where the local government is used as the laboratory for testing the government’s socio-political and economic policies). With this the participation of every ethnic group in governance was ensured in order for them to have fair play in the polity as well as enhancing their socio-political status.

Contrarily, the good frame work for defusing the flames of ethnicity in the country soon faded away as a result of the highhandedness of political institutions, the violation of the universality of Nigeria citizenship, the politics of exclusiveness, weak socio-political institutions, the incompatibility of ethnic groups within states of the federation as well as incompetent national and local leadership. The result of this was the incursion of the military into governance which eventually give credence to the over-concentration of power at the centre. This situation has made ethnic conflict to persist in the polity. In the other words, Nigeria political leaders have not reached the point at which national integration/unity is made the focal point nation building. From the foregoing, it is necessary to discuss the reasons that have since ensured the entrenchment of ethnic conflict in the polity.
4.2 Centralization of Socio-Political and Economic Power

The sustainability of a political system that engenders all round development (socially, economically and politically) depends on the functionality of certain elements within the polity and the role played by the political leaders in ensuring equitable distribution of socio-political and economic goods and taking into consideration the composition of the various ethnic groups that make up the country. But where people (ethnic groups) do not feel secure socially, politically and economically, the result, invariably, will be conflict and where there is conflict development goes into reverse. This is why it is crucial to consider why ethnic conflict still persists despite the attempts made to defuse it.

Observers of a given country would be wise to adopt a more holistic view, and inquire not only into the administrative and political spheres of a system but also into such matters such as the regional distribution of economic activity and revenue capacity, the degree to which political administrative boundaries intersect with economic distributions, the territorial basis of ethnic demands in multi ethnic societies and territorial aspect of policy initiatives intended to conciliate ethnic diversity (Hutchcroft, 2001). However, where this is not considered and the socio-political and economic process is centralized, there is bound to be problem.

Centralization is a form of government that ensures that socio-political and economic relations radiate to and from a centre. Centralized government often claims a leading position among other national agencies by virtue of its jurisdiction over the level of governmental units throughout the country. In a situation like this, power is exerted by a de-facto political executive to which federal, state, local government and smaller units
are considered subject. All constituted governments are to some degree necessarily centralized. In essence what is available to each component state and local government is determined by the centralized government. This is opposed to a decentralized system. Though the latter system was adopted in the Nigerian federal system in principle, in practical, the system is highly centralized, which has always facilitated the insubordination of ethnic groups that feel disadvantaged against the source of deprivation.

Decentralization is considered a strategy of governance and a gradual process of reform that is intended to transfer power and resources to a level of government that is closer to the people, better understood and more easily influenced (Wekwete, 2004:4). The underlying aim of decentralization is to enhance the level of participation of civil society in governance and government. Decentralization seeks to address efficiently the limitations of over-concentration of power, authority and resources at the centre, the lack of equity in the allocation of resources and the insufficient representation of various political and ethnic groups in the decision making process.

The federal system of government gives room for every ethnic group to fully participate in governance but this is far from the Nigeria system which is different from other federal systems. Scholars have described the Nigerian system as a unitary system under the disguise of federalism. This has given the central government undue power to interfere in the affairs of other tiers of government in the country. In essence Nigeria is administratively decentralized but the socio-political and economic power is highly centralized.
The creation of Nigeria is rooted in the country’s colonial history thus making the post-colonial state of Nigeria somewhat fragile, perhaps as a result of the hurried manner in which power was transferred from the colonial authorities to the Nigeria nationalists. Noyoo (2000) reminds us that there was no adequate preparation for the national government bequeathed to Nigerian leaders where they could easily perform the roles and functions of modern states with socio-political and economic institutions geared towards group cohesion. Of course this action had its own effects on Nigeria socio-political and economic development. This is because, at independence, Nigeria never had a clear identity through which Nigerians could be described. As a result, Nigerians still cling to their various ethnic identities. In a bid to transform Nigeria through a functional institution that would prevent the rise and increase of socio-economic and political differentiation, it rather increased ethnic conflict hence the over concentration of power at the centre. By implication, it has been very difficult for the various ethnic groups to operate as one political entity at national level, with each preferring to champion the interest of their ethnic groups. Moreover the instruments of the modern institution created were done in such a way that, provision was never made for proper ethnic management. What Badmus (2009:43) has described as “one of the misleading features of Nigeria federalism”.

As stated above there is socio-political and economic differentiation which seems to have been grudgingly recognized considering the multiplication of governmental units through which the major ethnic groups have been restructured into states and local government areas. In truth, the over concentration of power at the centre which was created by the military government in Nigeria over a period of time was done to the
detriment of the minority groups that constitute parts of the federating units. In essence, it can be argued that the centralization of power no doubt is a function of the competition for the control of the centre. It is the belief of every ethnic group that whichever group controls the centre definitely controls the economy, hence each ethnic group, despite the division of the country into states, will always fight for control of the centre, which is detrimental to the unity and socio-political and economic development of the country.

Another factor that should be pointed out here is that, based on the size and the population of the majority in the country, this majority will always have the upper hand in the country. That is to say the majority will always have the means to appropriate the resources of the country for themselves. For example in the present zoning system, the North West has seven states, the North East six states, the North Central six states; the South West six states the South East five states and the South South six states. What this means is that the ethnic group with the highest number states will always have the largest share of the distributive socio-political resources in the distributive system. This has heightened the mutual fear and suspicion among the groups in the competitive political process. Thus, for all intents and purposes, this has been detrimental to socio-economic and political survival of the minority ethnic groups.

One argument in support of state creation during the Gowon administration was that it would prevent the abuse of ethnic minority rights at the sub national level, which means that their rights would be protected. State creation helps to secure the autonomy of ethnic minorities in the country, but one fact that should be noted is that the excessive centralization of socio-economic and political power is often counter-productive. Ethnic
minorities are likely to be well protected and their rights guaranteed in a decentralized state rather than under the apparatus of a hegemonic state where the majority have greater access to socio-political and economic power.

As in the amalgamation of 1914, it was argued that state creation was not only for administrative purposes but was a product of economic necessity. It can be argued that the desire to have the buoyant Southern states in general and in particular those of the new South South region (the Niger Delta region) where the country’s major resources are located, under the control of central government necessitated the centralization and control of the distributive system, which is an aberration of a federal system. It has been argued that the centralization of socio-political and economic system in the country is a means to exert hegemonic control over the country by one section of the country, which did not go down well with other ethnic groups. This account for various attempts made to thwart the fair distribution of the nation’s resources in the country by the majority groups that places emphasis on distribution rather than production. This has made every effort to integrate the various ethnic groups in the country fruitless, with the result that there are various ethnic conflicts in the country that resist efforts to manage them.

The prevailing character of socio-economic politics has made the contest for power between the constitutive elements of the federation fierce, with each group looking for the opportunity to gain power. Of course this is done by appealing to ethnicity which is used as a scaffolding for the realization of socio-political power, with the group at the centre portraying any attempt at replacing it as an attack on the ethnic group to which it belongs. This is the source of the bitter contention for political power among ethnic groups in the country. This again exposes the need for government activities to be
divided between the levels of government to the advantage of the lower levels; that is, de-emphasizing over-concentration of power at the center. In this way, the activities of the federation which has seen the retention of power at the center by the major ethnic groups and the distribution of resources along patronage lines would be de-emphasized.

Brian (1981) argued that a highly centralized arrangement is best for a federation which did not have its origin in separate political units voluntarily seeking political union, but is a creation of the colonial administration. Since these different political entities were brought together involuntarily, there will always be an element of distrust among them, with each ethnic group wanting to exploit any opportunity to control the center to the detriment of other ethnic groups. This has been the Nigerian experience to date. On one hand, it may well lead to disloyalty to the national government thus making the battle for control of the centre and the resources it holds a fierce one among the ethnic groups that constitute the country. Thus, in a country where each of the ethnic groups is as big as some independent countries elsewhere, the centralization of socio-economic and political power may not be the best.

Centralization of socio-economic and political power may serve two purposes (a) socio-economic and distributive purpose that brings sustainability of all-round development in the polity (b) it can also serve the purpose of socio-political instability where it is been manipulated for the purpose of exerting the hegemonic status of one ethnic group over others. Whichever way the driving force of this action goes, if it is for socio-economic and political sustainability, it must seek to balance the demands of every ethnic group, major or minority, to prevent conflict. What this translates to is that the greater the
concentration of resources in the national government, the greater the motivation of ethnic groups to capture the centre and in the process destabilize the polity. However, centralization of the system may not be beneficial to the polity which has placed a big question on the instrument of state creation in managing ethnic conflict even though the mechanism seems to create a haven for every ethnic group.

4.3 Ethnic Incompatibility of States

The Nigerian federation, which started with 3 regions created by Richard's constitution in 1946, today can boast of 36 states and different ethnic groups within these states are still agitating for creation of their own states. Osaghae (1994:85) described Nigeria as a “disaggregative par excellence”; that is, a federation that started with a unitary system (considering its extreme centralization of social, political and economic resources Nigeria is still considered a unitary state) disaggregated into states. Arguably, the Nigerian federation is yet to determine the number of states suitable for the polity. For this reason, Nigeria can be described as a cell that is capable of dividing itself. However, state creation in Nigeria as an instrument of ethnic conflict management has not solved the problem of ethnicity.

However the above submission has not taken away the reason for which states were created in Nigeria. State creation no doubt, has helped to correct the regional imbalance in the federation. Psychologically it has had a positive impact on the people which are the reason why there are still conflicts within these states. Generally the belief is that states have become the major means through which the various ethnic groups articulate their grievances and it is through states that groups share in the proverbial national
cake, which takes the form of socio-economic and political opportunities that come through these states. However, the people who benefit from this state largesse are a small proportion of the populace, political leaders in particular. This is why politicians see state creation as more important than national integration and socio-political development and the reason for which people still agitate for state creation.

The socio-economic and political factors that explain whether states within the ambit of the Nigeria federation are at risk is not only their ethnic characteristics but also the conditions that favours conflict within these states. These include poverty, which is seen as the symbol or mark of a non-viability state, religion and most importantly the incompatibility of the ethnic groups that constitutes states socially and economically. It has been argued that a greater degree of ethnic diversity by itself make a country more prone to conflicts. In other words an ethnically divided state to be precise is more open to ethnic tension or antagonism with a debilitating implication on a sustainable socio-political development.

During the process of creating states, the ethnic composition of the people was not taken into consideration. As a result, ethnic groups were pitched against each other which accounts for why some ethnic groups within these states are still agitating for their own state. In Nigeria today, the only state that seems natural is Ekiti, which is linguistically, culturally and socially homogeneous. Other states are dominated by one group or the other. For example Ondo state in the South West is a multi-linguistic and multi-cultural state; the Ijaws are different in terms of language and culture from the Ondos, Owos, Akokos and Akure etc. Within the Akokos there are more than 4 linguistically different groups.
In Delta state, basically there are Delta Igbo and Delta Urhobo who have always been in conflict over the allocation of socio-economic resources. In Kwara state there are people who should have been part of the Ekiti state. In fact they constitute a local government in the state. The same situation can be found in the North Central state of Plateau and Nasarawa where there are Birom, Angas, Yergam and the Hausas. In Benue there are Tiv, Idoma, Abakpa, Igede, Akweya etc. This is not to say that the creation of states is not a means to an end but the argument is that it sets the various ethno-linguistically different people against each other. In essence, the creation of states culminated in the emergence of ‘majority’ minority groups (Mustapha, 2003), where a number of ethnic minorities were brought together in a state thus creating conflict even among the minorities. This justifies the assertion of Gazar (cited in Ojo 2009) that marrying federalism and ethnicity suggests one similar solution to the problem of a state containing a number of ethnic groups with different languages cultures and religions. In his own contribution Mustapha (2006) posits that state creation in Nigeria has not curbed ethno-regionalism but has instead, restructured it and that it has made the states a rallying point for the three major ethnic groups.

The relative neglect of minority issues in these states and the failure to articulate specific policies for dealing with minority problems beyond the instrument of state and local government creation accounted for the fact that state creation though a laudable fit has created additional problems within the federation. Thus, the failure to account for the complexity of ethnicity cum minority situation in Nigeria constitutes a very serious setback for ethnic management in Nigeria on one hand and on the other hand a clog in the wheel of socio-political and economic development.
It is no denying that there are rivalries between states and between ethnic groups within the states, even with their smaller geographical dimensions; the national distributive system and party system; where for example, the major political parties control the government and minor parties are in the opposition in the state. This has made the minority groups in these states to complain of adverse discrimination in appointments to government posts and the provision of socio-economic and political resources in favour of the majority. This gives us an insight into the reasons why the Igalas sought separation from Kwara state until they were separated and joined by others from the old Benue state to form the present day Kogi state in 1991, the Modakekes in the present day Osun state demanding a separate local government, the Uhrobo and Igbos in Delta state are always at each other’s throats over distributive socio-economic and political resources. In other words, whenever there was a group different from the dominant group or political force of their area, there is always conflict of socio-economic and political interests, which has put a question on the instrument of state creation in Nigeria as an ethnic management mechanism.

Fearon and Laitin (2003) opine that ethnically plural societies definitely face a lot of changes as a result of state creation which renders them especially prone to intra-ethnic conflict. Thus, state creation, though intended to manage ethnic conflict, has also provided an enabling environment for more conflict. To be precise, the by-products of state creation include displacement of and discrimination against non-state indigenes tagged the new minorities and in some quarters confusion over asset sharing and boundary problems. All these put together engender relations of socio-political and economic competition.
When the majority in a state pose an ascriptive barrier to upward socio-economic and political mobility for minority groups within a state, it eventually leads to a separatist movement that seeks to articulate the grievances of the minorities. When there is a creation of majorities and minorities, in a state, there is bound to be a problem. Though it may not seem to be deliberate, but appears to be the result of the insensitivity of those in authority to ethnic differences in a state. The majority use their position to deprive the minority of certain socio-economic and political opportunities.

One problem that state creation in Nigeria created is the aspect of socio-political and economic discrimination against those regarded the minorities in these states. For example it is very difficult for a minority to hold a political position; this identifies Nigerians with their ethnic units, and undermines the process of socio-political integration. It should be noted that the minority status may be based on religion. This is evident in many states across the country. For example, a state like Kano in the North West has Muslims as the dominant religious group; the same situation is applicable to a state like Imo in the South East, which has Christians as the dominant religious group. This, however, demonstrates the low level of social-political integration among the various ethnic groups in the country.

Ethnicity in the Nigeria polity has become an integral part of competition for scarce social, economic and political resources. The reason why the competition has been so intense is that people see the control of government as very significant to the individual pursuit of life, peace and happiness (Ayoade 1986). The focal point of the strategy of competition is equating individual with ethnic group interests therefore the state creation reinforces this perception and structurally undermines the process of socio-economic
and political integration within the states thereby promoting what Ayoade (1986) called a vicious cycle of separatist agitation which makes room for ethnic loyalties and sentiments.

As mentioned above one of the attendants of state creation in Nigeria which has reduced its effectiveness as ethnic management mechanism is the boundary problem between the old and new states. What brought about the problem is the fact that ethnic groups are not consulted on which state they wish to belong. More so state boundaries most of the time are determined by administrative convenience or what Osaghae (1994) referred to as “national boundaries” rather than the articulated wishes of these groups.

One other factor that has been identified as a variable factor for boundary disputes between the states has to do with economic resources within the states’ borders, especially the oil producing states in the federation. They have contested fiercely for the control and ownership of areas consider being economically viable. The reason for this is its consideration for revenue allocation.

The creation of states from 1967 till today has been administratively unwieldy and ethnically incompatible. Put in another word the creation of states rather than add to the socio-economic and political development of some, it has created a sort of burden to the central government as a result of the inability of these states to generate revenues internally; thereby making them to depend heavily on the central government for their socio-economic sustainability on one hand and on the other hand the differences in language, culture, even political values of ethnic groups in some of these states further exposes the incompatibility of the groups in these states. Though the primary objective/goal was political stability, the fact is that multiple splits of ethnic groups in the
country into states have engendered new forms of conflict. At least the 36 state structures which were effected by the defunct government of General Sanni Abacha in October 1996 attest to the wide range of conflicts that have engulfed the federation.

A quick look at one or two disputes will give a clearer picture of the above statement. Before the creation of the Delta and Edo states in 1991, the two states were an integral part of the old Bendel state which shows that they are not new to each other. But the large deposit of oil within the borders of the two states soon sparked conflict over the control of the place. The most interesting part of it is the fact that the disputed communities are ethnically mixed, with people from both states, making it a complicated issue (Osaghae, 1994). This is because the conflict will no longer be over which state controls the resources but the contest will also be which ethnic group controls these resources on one hand and on the other hand how would socio-economic and political development take place when these groups are in conflict over these resources?

One interesting feature of Nigerian state reorganization is how minority groups have been grouped with majority groups where they are neither linguistically nor culturally compatible. Of course this can and has sparked off conflict within some states. One good example of this is the location of the Arogbo-Ijaw community which if considered properly should be part of Delta state. However, the threat of their relocation to the Delta state on the grounds that they were being marginalized by majority group dominated by the Yoruba of Ondo state invariably made the state government reconsider its position considering the fact that the community (the so called minority ethnic group) is an oil producing area (Osaghae, 1994). The eventual integration of the community into Ondo state has made the state to be recognized as an oil producing state in the country. The
creation of states also pitched the Bauchi and Plateau states against each other over one of the communities that were formerly part of the Plateau state that was ceded to the Bauchi state as a result of the state creation exercise. The community, who happened to be a minority and also dominated by Christians, demanded they be relocated back to the Plateau state also dominated by Christians, on the grounds of domination and discrimination from the Hausa-Fulani who are predominantly Muslims.

The prevailing character of Nigeria politics has made contest for power in the polity to be between the majority and the minority groups. The result of this is that minorities are made to fight for their social, political and economic rights and the creation of more states which has pitched different ethnic groups within these states against each other over the allocation of distributive resources. In these circumstances ethnic groups within states are in bitter contention. Alapiki (2005) questions whether the creation of states in Nigeria has brought the desired even development. Do Nigerians have more peace, harmony and unity than what was obtainable in the country before? Has the exercise reduced the problems of ethnic minorities or has it prevented agitation for more state? The answer to these questions, if closely observed, is negative.

From the foregoing, even though the creation of states seems to be a positive trend towards national integration, the strings of conflict between the majority and the minority groups within these states that have greeted it has made it to be questionable. Perhaps this would not have been so if it had not been manipulated to satisfy patronage through which one ethnic group has been able to dominate others. In addition, if one looks at it critically, it would be discovered that the conflicts between the various ethnic groups within the state are tied to socio-cultural differences, denial of social, economic
and political rights as well as control over economic resources. This means that if most of the states created had not been ethnically manipulated through their political leaders in order to score cheap political points, the persistency of ethnic conflict in the polity would have been reduced considerably.

4.4 Weak Political Institutions

In the political arena of most countries in Africa and Nigeria in particular, where ethnicity has been politicized to the extent of allowing it to serve as a springboard for capturing political power, there has often been conflict over the allocation of resources. Furthermore, political institutions have become a platform for personal enrichment and promotion of ethnic interest.

Political institutions are organizations which create, enforce and apply laws; that mediate conflict; make government policy in the economy and social system, and otherwise provide representation for the citizens (Alistair, 2012). Political institutions provide, in a sense, the rules of the game in political life and are themselves created to resolve some socio-political and economic problems. Some of the general problems that political institutions might resolve are the problems related to collective action, delegation of power etc. Examples of such political institutions include political parties, trade unions and the courts. The term also refers to the recognized structure of rules and principles within which the aforementioned bodies operate. This includes such concepts as the right to vote and be voted for, responsible, responsive and accountable government.
The sustainability of a polity, of necessity, requires workable political institutions devoid of manipulation from the political leaders in the polity. These conditions, considering the dynamic nature of ethnicity in Nigeria, may be social, economic and political, where the political conditions underpin the social and economic factors. In other words, for the sustainability of a state socially, economically and politically, the political instrument through which the character of ethnic identities in the polity is measured remains very significant. Thus a weak political institution no doubt remains detrimental to socio-political development of a state. The success of national integration in a multi-ethnic state depends on the viability of the political institutions devoid of ethnic politics.

The adoption of a multiparty system as an ethnic conflict management strategy has been viewed as a laudable fit. This has given credence to reducing ethnic politics within the polity. Even though the principle of power sharing adopted in the country is adjudged to have reduced ethnic conflict, in a situation where the political system gives room for manipulation by the political group within the various ethnic groups, the system remains weak, thus forcing democratic institutions to be at the mercy of the major ethnic groups. The effect of which borders on the sustainability of socio-political and economic development of the country.

A look at democratic institutions in Nigeria perhaps will give us an insight into why ethnic conflict has persisted in the country notwithstanding several ethnic management mechanisms have been adopted. This is not to say that these strategies are not working. They are indeed working relatively but the argument is that there are still ethnic conflicts. One can possibly reason that, as a result of the success of the democratic system in the developed world and, perhaps, the inability of political leaders
to break away from colonial legacies, gives credence to the consideration and adoption of democratic governance after the flag independence.

Kaur (2007) opines that the primary reason for adopting this model of government (democratic governance) in advanced states must have been informed on the basis that it was linked to development and as well regarded as a channel to the realization of individual and group socio-political values. It has been argued that the system was adopted without taking into consideration the socio-economic and political environment of these advanced states. These are the reasons why Nigeria has been battling with its political institutions which ought to have provided the country leverage to socio-political development.

Considering the context in which this topic is been discussed, democracy can be viewed as a political system that gives room for the participation of people through the electoral process and does not give room for the politics of exclusion; rather, it ensures that every ethnic group is fully involved in the governance/decision making process. In other words, it should be seen as government that is based on the acceptance and operation of rule of law, particularly where the rights of every individual devoid of ethnic consideration is guaranteed and thus, enhance the socio-economic sustainability of the country. That is, it enhances the process of development.

One aspect of democracy which is relevant to this study is developmental democracy. This is a democratic system that provides a multidimensional avenue for socio-political and economic experimentation (Sklar, 1983). If a suitably broad concept of development that incorporate the general well-being of the population (ethnic groups) at large is taken, including some basic civil and political freedoms, a democracy which ensures
these freedoms is almost by definition more conducive to development (Bardhan, n.d.). By interpretation, developmental democracy focuses on the work of growing capacities for self-directed and collective socio-political action across differences for problem solving and the creation of individual and common goods. It conceives of democracy as a society promoting developmental actions and points towards institutional and cultural change (Boyte, 2008). This informs us of the reason why various ethnic management instruments such as federal character principle, fundamental human right, adoption of multi-party; state creation etc. have been employed to manage ethnic conflict in Nigeria. Unfortunately, the deepened social fabric of the country characterized by almost 280 ethnic groups through which the various ethnic leaders, particularly the major ethnic groups, gain ascendancy and exert their hegemonic power has not allowed the system to work. The result of this is the spate of ethnic conflicts in the country. Of course this has shown that, even after 51 years of political independence Nigeria has not been able to produce a strong and viable political institution capable of effectively stemming ethnic conflicts. The development of a state depends on the viability of the social-political institutions of such state.

One thing that should be borne in mind is that, as a result of the policy of divide and rule, the Southerners developed faster than the Northerners, particularly in the area of Western education. The South was able to gain the upper hand at the early stages of Nigeria’s nationhood through Western education, while the North was behind perhaps as a result of the influence of religion and that of colonial government. This was why the policy of indirect rule first started in the Northern protectorate and also why there is a sharp socio-economic and political difference between the North and the South on one
hand and the inability of the country to produce a national agenda for national socio-economic integration and development on the other hand. Rather, the country produced a levelling ground for the emergence of ethnic conflict and the challenge of how to have a strong political institution that can engender all round development.

The foregoing means that political institutions in Nigeria, right from the onset, have been weakened with the result that it became difficult for democratic institutions which should be the vehicle for development to thrive. Perhaps, the reason one can still refer to the statement made by one of the regional political juggernauts, Awolowo, that “Nigeria is not a nation. It is a mere geographical expression” (cited in Diamond, 1988:26). At a time when Nigeria needed a viable democratic environment, ethnicity through the activities of the political parties, thrives in the Nigerian polity. This has shown that the political institutions of the First Republic lacked the political capability to fully integrate the components of Nigerian societies. It is on this weak political institution that Nigeria after independence has been building (Oyediran and Agbaje, 1991).

This explains why the reorganization of Nigeria into 19 states in 1976 could not change the trend of party politics even with the adoption of a multi-party system in the Second Republic. There were 6 political parties among which the three major parties all morphed from the old pre-independence political parties and with the same set of leaders. As a result of this, the parties were weak and lacked the socio-economic and political ideology needed for the country to rise above ethnicity except for the political ideology of their leaders. Uwazurike (in Oyediran and Agbaje, 1991) commented that the Nigeria political pattern exist as an unstable form of democracy, with most of the political parties narrowly based and tied to the whims and caprices of their leaders whose
ideological vision is not nationally oriented but personal biases. These are the reasons for the lack of continuity in the country’s developmental programmes.

One feature of a weakened Nigerian political institution is electoral fraud. Every election held in Nigeria since independence, with the exception of the June 12, 1993 election which would have ushered Nigeria into a new political experiment, has been marred by extreme rigging, the resultant effect of which has always been conflict in the country. The reason one can give here is that there has been the absence of an independent electoral body. Ironically, the electoral body is said to be independent but the fact that the members are appointed by the government (incumbent) has not made them free from the control of the government in office. In fact some of its officials while compiling the result of elections have been known to engage in electoral malpractice to please the political leaders, thus justifying the saying that “he who plays the piper dictates the tune”. The partisan nature of the electoral bodies in Nigeria, including the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) was reflected in the 1983, 2003, 2007 elections.

It has been argued that one of the major factors that led to the fall of the First and Second Republic was the electoral fraud orchestrated by the Federal Electoral Commission (FEDECO) that conducted the election.

The political situation in Nigeria appears to be very problematic and weakened due to the lack of an institutionalized political body free from manipulation and corruption. This has led to a lack of faith in the impartiality and transparency of Nigeria’s political institutions. However, the importance of strong political institutions cannot be overestimated. They would not only boost the country’s socio-political values, but would also boost the morale of the country in the committee of nations and also strengthen the
frame work for addressing the threat of ethnic conflicts to national integration and development.

The political system in Nigeria also lacks a peaceful mechanism for settling political disputes. The rules of the game are not adhered to in order to produce a better and more egalitarian society. In addition, element of a result oriented democratic state such as accountability, responsibility, responsiveness, tolerance of opposition, respect for the rule of law, human rights and constitution are practically lacking. Without any doubt, this has been a serious challenge to peace, justice and the sustainability of socio-political and economic development.

The institution of the judiciary plays a significant role in the sustainability of a polity. Apart from the primary role of acting as an instrument of checks and balances on other arms of government, the body plays a significant role in sustenance of the rights of the populace. Unfortunately, the role of the judiciary has been downplayed in the Nigerian political setting owing to the manipulatory tendencies of the political leaders thereby reducing the body to a toothless dog that can only bark but cannot bite.

One fact that should be pointed out and which has caused the judiciary to lose its revered autonomy is the role played by the military in the Nigerian political setting. During the military era military tribunals were set up to co-exist with the civil courts in the administration of justice. This meant that the judiciary was incapacitated and denied its fundamental role of defending the rights of the citizens. The judiciary under civilian administration is equally manipulated. For example, the appointment of judges of the Supreme Court and attorneys as well as attorney general of the federation is tied to ethnic considerations, which means that it is possible to jettison merit and embrace
mediocrity. This has actually given room for deliberate manipulation of electoral cases. The attendant result is that a political crisis which ought to be resolved without any problem is allowed to degenerate to conflict, thus eroding the power of the judiciary. One argument in favour of weak political institutions in Nigeria is that the country has a problem of human integrity. The point is driven home that these institutions work well in countries Britain, the United States of America, Canada, South Africa etc. Nigerians are corrupt and the human deficits are transferred unto the political institutions to create an institutional integrity problem for the country, hence the attendant repercussion on socio-political and economic development. The above submission has not only reflected but has shown the weakness inherent in Nigeria political institutions. The struggle for political power, with the aim of controlling public revenue has not allowed the country's leadership to give adequate attention to national integration. To borrow the words of Simonsen (2005) reversing the ethnicization of socio-economic and political conflict is not as easy as increasing it; reversal may nevertheless be possible and the design of political institutions can play a role in that. In essence, a deepened ethnicity can still be corrected but it can only be done by strengthening the political institution and, de-ethnicizing politics and the institutions that control political bodies. Thus, where every ethnic group is duly represented, and the dynamic integrative approach of socio-economic and political institutions is embraced there is bound to be peaceful co-existence of the ethnic groups which invariably engenders development. In other words, if political institutions that de-emphasize the politics of exclusion are developed and strengthened, then there is the possibility of
political institutions succeeding in melting the unending and emerging socio-political crisis.

### 4.5 Exclusive Politics

In a democratic state the functions and the interest of the governed is constitutionally carried out by their representatives in government. These representatives play a very important role in carrying out the political and economic affairs of a state, as the state is not merely set up as a democratic one but must functions as one as well. Nigeria no doubt, is expected to function as a viable democratic state where ethnic cleavage and conflict over allocation of socio-political and economic resources do not become a problem.

Unarguably, the major ethnic groups are geographically and numerically bigger than the minority groups. This, however, combined with their political power, puts them in the position which they (the majorities) use to exert their hegemonic power over the minorities some of who are economically relatively stronger than most of the so called majorities, considering the abundance of oil resources located in some regions. The splitting of the country into 12 states in 1967 by Gowon led to the dissolution of the old regions, except for the Mid-Western Region. However, the three main regions to date have continued to exist as a major feature of the Nigerian federation.

Through the division of the country into 6 geo-political zones, all the major ethnic groups are now found within these zones along with the minority ethnic groups, as Mustapha (2006) has put it, the re-engineering of the country into 6 zones has made the minority groups in the country to cluster around the major ethnic groups, thus giving the country
a tripartite ethnic structure. By implication, the mobilization for socio-political contest still revolved around the major ethnic groups. Invariably, this has made it possible for the politics of exclusion to persist even to the detriment of the minorities, which has resulted in conflict over the demand for such rights as well as underdevelopment of the polity.

The foundation for the politics of exclusion was laid by the construction of the Nigerian political environment around the three major ethnic groups which saw this as an opportunity to exert their hegemonic power over the rest of the country. Nolutshungu (1990) in his work; “Fragment of a democracy: Reflections on class and politics in Nigeria” opines that the Nigerian regional political elites within the frame work of regional politics see democracy as a mechanism through which political power can be gained or distributed together with economic power and the social status that follows. It could be reasoned that right from the beginning the minorities have always been sideline within the polity. Or better still the regional political leaders contributed to the ethnic conflict in the country through the consolidation of each ethnic group’s main political parties which was equally evident in the Second Republic.

Thus politics in Nigeria before and after independence was used as an ethnic weapon to the detriment of the minorities in the country. It became a game between the majorities where the distributive resources were under their control with the minorities significantly excluded from the mainstream of governance. That is, they are given positions only to solicit for their political support and not as forces to be reckoned with in the political game. This situation provided leverage for ethnic identity as well as politics of exclusions to thrive. Without mincing words this has been a challenge to the unity of Nigeria or the survival of Nigeria as a state; given the plurality of Nigeria state.
The political judgment that the only people who counted in Nigeria are the Yoruba, the Hausa-Fulani and Igbo before and after independence deepened the resentments of the various ethnic groups; major or minor against one another. This justifies the reason for which the main political parties were located in these regions. The original three regions which finally transformed into 36 states through restructuring still remain as of old as rallying points for the old regions. This is the reason one can state that the creation of states in Nigeria has not been able to nail regional politics. Rather it has restructured it. Moreover, states are used as units of distribution of socio-economic and political resources, which means that going by the number of states in each of the six geo-political zones of the federation, the majority still has more access to the country’s resources than the minority groups.

By the time Nigeria adopted the Republican constitution of 1963, Nigeria had a bicameral legislature (House of Representatives and the Senate). Based on the principle of proportional representation, Northern Nigeria had 312 seats in the House of Representatives but in the Senate the Southern states combined had more seats. However, the fact that political power in the parliamentary system resides in the House of Representatives and the Prime Minister, resulted in the North producing the Prime Minister, thus seeding power to the North. Even after splitting the country into 36 states, the status quo remained. What this means is that, as long as this continues, there will always be conflict over socio-economic and political interests.

A look at ethnic distribution in Nigeria perhaps will help us understand this discussion better. In the North there are ethnic majority and minority groups, where the minorities are located within the present day North Central states. In the South, those in the
present day South South zone are considered minorities. Most of these states were created from the old Eastern and Mid-Western Nigeria. The only ethnic groups that seem to be different are those of the South West, who are predominantly Yoruba. The only group that seems to be in the minority linguistically are the Ondos but they have long been integrated fully into the region.

The explanation here is that, the Hausa-Fulani, the Yoruba and the Igbo all complain of being excluded from the polity by the others but the groups that seem to be adversely affected are the minorities. For example, based on the constitution of 1999, each state of the federation was to be represented by 10 members in the House of Representatives. However, out of the 360 members, the majority Hausa-Fulani, Yoruba and Igbo have 240 seats while the remaining 120 go to the minorities of North Central and South South.

In the distribution of federal cabinet since 1960 the Hausa-Fulani of the North have been at the helm of affairs till today. This, however, has generated a lot of heat among the various ethnic groups. Sometimes, the Igbo of the present day South East were completely neglected. For example in the Gowon and Muritala administrations of 1967 and 1975 non Igbos were made ministers. That the North is bigger than the combination of the Southern states is no longer an issue but when this numerical power is invoked and used to exert their hegemonic control over the rest of the country, there will definitely be conflicts since no group would want to be left out of the polity.

One new dimension that has been used in the distribution of cabinet members among the states (regions) of the federation according to Mustapha (2006) is the classification of portfolios into important and less important portfolios. For example the ministries of
Defence, Education, Petroleum, Finance, Agriculture, and the minister for Federal Capital Territory (FCT) etc. are considered to be very important and such ministries as Information, Culture and Tourism, Sport and Youth Development, Women Affairs etc. are tagged as less important. Till today, no Yoruba man has held the Petroleum ministry, the same is true of the minister for Federal Capital Territory ministry; no Igbo person or any person from the Southern minorities has held that position; even though it has been considered the “center of unity”; whereas a less important ministry such as Sport has been held by all the various ethnic groups. The argument is that where certain ministries are exclusively reserved for some groups, in a country with deepened ethnic cleavages and ignoring the principle of federal character adopted by the country, the result will always be conflict.

Under the principle of power sharing, the top political offices such as the Presidency, Senate president, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Secretary to the Federal Government are to be shared between the North and the South, particularly the office of the President. The reason the Presidency is singled out is that Nigerians believe the ethnic group that controls the Presidency control socio-economic and political resources, which is why each ethnic group wants to occupy that position.

The following questions are pertinent to the discussion so far: which groups constitute the North? Which groups constitute the South? It is evident that the North is more or less a single unit, which puts them at an advantageous position over the South, if the issue of states is put aside, whereas in the South, there are the Igbo, Yoruba and those from the Niger Delta Region. The implication of all this is that, while the North can easily come together and present a representative it becomes a difficult task for the South to
reach a consensus. It will be difficult for the larger ethnic group to concede such a post to the minority groups, as the minorities would not for any reason allow themselves to be edged out of the political game. This makes it difficult for the Southerners to produce a representative for a position the North may use to hold on to power. The attendant result of such a situation will definitely be conflict.

The above justifies the argument and considers the circumstances that brought the present Nigeria President to power that, if Good Luck Jonathan had not been the Vice President at the time Musa Yar’Adua died, it would have been difficult for a South South minority to become the President. As long as no group would allow themselves to be excluded from the political game, there will always be conflict over socio-economic and political interests. Perhaps these accounts for the reason why, out of 13 head of states produced in Nigeria since independence, including Azikiwe and the Interim Head of State, Chief Ernest Shonekan, the Hausa-Fulani had produced 8, the Yoruba 2, the Igbo 2 and the minority South South 1.

Considering the above observation, it is possible to say that some ethnic groups have been politically excluded from the rest of the country, a situation which has made some ethnic groups to be seen as “pawns on the chess board” of other ethnic groups. That is to say, where the distribution of socio-economic and political resources is characterized by ethnic considerations and not for the promotion of inter-ethnic integration there is bound to be conflict. More so the affected ethnic group would in no means be behind of the major ethnic groups in terms of socio-political and economic development.

One disturbing issue in Nigeria today over the office of the president of the federation is how the Igbo of the South East of the country have always been played out of that
position since 1967; most Nigerians believe that Nigeria is not yet prepared for an Igbo presidency for obvious reasons. This scenario is also extended to certain key ministries as mentioned before, with regard to the plight of the Igbo ethnic group within the polity. For example no Igbo person has been allowed to manage the Defence ministry. The explanation that has been given is that the Igbo are still planning to secede.

The above can thus be explain why the allocation of socio-political office has always presented an ethnic picture; a situation that justifies the fact that, notwithstanding the various ethnic management mechanisms, state creation in particular, Nigeria has not been able to de-ethnicized distributive socio-political offices. By implication it has become difficult for national integration of every ethnic group into the mainstream of the political system. It should be stated here that the greater the exclusion of the deprived ethnic groups from the group the greater the likelihood of intense discontent and its articulation in form of violence.

The principle of federal character is but a socio-economic and political cosmetic substance that has hidden the ugly side of ethnicity in Nigeria. That is to say though the principle is a laudable one if put in its proper use but in a situation where appointments are made with one particular ethnic group having dominance, the principle has lost its piquant. For example all the top officers of the oil and gas sector were appointed from the north by late president Musa Yar’Adua in 2010 thereby jettison the provisions of section 171 (5) of 1999 constitution. Using states as units to be represented and balanced, the principle favours the majority and some minorities which are considered to be powerful especially in the North. It can thus be said that the principle is a shadow of what it is supposed to be since some groups socially, economically and politically are
empowered to participate in the mainstream of socio-economic and political activities in Nigeria. That is to say that the rights of some groups to fully participate in the main political process of the federation have unnecessarily been denied by the political policies of the state. The result of this is the spate of ethnic conflicts in the country. According to Orji (2001), Nigeria can be likened to a choral group made up of the sopranos, altos, tenors and basses, and the leader of the group moulds the various groups into a unified body that produces a harmonious melody. Nigeria is very unique in terms of its ethnic composition. What needs to be done is to make the various ethnic groups work together (unity in diversity) in order to achieve the desired socio-political and economic goal. One important point is that failure to recognize the differences in the various ethnic groups which account for the complexity of the minority and majority ethnic groups in Nigeria has allowed ethnic conflict to persist and to ignore the strategies that have so far been adopted to manage it.

4.6 Primordial Contradictions within Ethnic Groups
The heart of a very complex society lies essentially in competition for socio-political and economic resources. The thrust is ethnic conflict among the various ethnic groups. The irreconcilable differences and the difficulty of establishing a political system that will engender socio-political development in an environment characterized by ethnic cleavages and ethnic loyalties implies that conflict within ethnic groups is not conducive to socio-economic and political development which makes the complexity of ethnic differences pertinent to socio-political development in Nigeria. Coigligh (n.d:63) opines that the conflicts within the states are as much a result of ethnic (tribal) arguments as a
result of the state. What this means is that conflicts within ethnic groups emanate as a result of the differences or complexities of ethnics in such a state as well as the mechanism employed by the state to manage it which by implication may further deepened ethnic cleavages.

These differences border on insensitivity to ethnic differences; which makes competition for the allocation of distributive socio-economic and political power contentious, with the result that there is conflict. One fact that should be noted is that ethnicity is a social-political phenomenon situated within the premise of socio-political relations between ethnic groups in a state and its manipulation always triggers off conflict. Within the same ethnic group there are contradictions, a situation that deepens “primordial political games” (Osinubi and Osinubi, 2006:110), hence conflict along clan lines. For example in the Osun state, South West Nigeria, the claims over the ownership of the land on which the Modakekes settled has been vehemently resisted by the Ile-Ife people as well as ethnic claim over the location of local government headquarters are all sources of ethnic conflict. There are other examples such as Zango-Kataf in Kaduna state, the Warri crisis involving the ethnic Ijaws and Urhobos in the Delta state, the Ogoni and the Adoni ethnic crisis in the Rivers state, the Ijaws and the Ilajes in Ondo state, the Aguleri and Umuleri ethnic crisis in Anambra state just to mention a few.

Emeka Anyaoku (cited in Welsh, 1996) asserts that for Nigeria to have a united federation the essential differences between and within the component ethnic groups within the country must of necessity be recognized. That is to say that the plural nature of the country must be recognized for the nation to forge ahead socially, economically and politically; which informs us that a catch-all (Osaghae, 1998) ethnic management
mechanism such as state creation may not be hundred percent correct without underpinning the complex ethnic differences that exist in the country. A catch-all mechanism is a political assumption that once a state or local government is carved out for a particular ethnic group, it has solved their problem, forgetting other socio-cultural differences of these ethnic groups. This is the reason why ethnic conflict still persist in Nigeria notwithstanding ethnic management strategy employed.

The complexity of ethnic differences can be explained in different perspectives, socially, economically and politically. Osaghae (1998) argues that the levels of ethnic consciousness and political mobilization differ among ethnic groups that constitute the country and it is likely to produce different socio-political effects on ethnic groups as various ethnic groups within the socio-political sphere in Nigeria use different means to negotiate access to political and economic power in the country. As stated above the primordial contradictions within ethnic groups in the Nigeria socio-political space is a significant factor which has constituted a setback for the ethnic management strategies adopted so far. To understand the differences in the ethnic formation of Nigeria; a quick look at the pre-colonial history of each ethnic group will help us.

Until 1804, the territories that contain the entire Northern region (North West, North East and North Central zones) were characterized by social, political fragmentation. That is to say before 1804 there was nothing like the Sokoto Emirate. The Hausa overlords were the ones in control of governance, but with the Jihad of 1804-1810 led by Uthman Dan Fodio the Hausas came under the hegemonic power of the Sokoto caliphate led by Fodio with a highly centralized system of governance. For this reason, the Emirs in the North till now, still hold allegiance to the Sokoto Caliphate. The colonial government
which capitalized on the system brought together the entire empire including the powerful Kanem Bornu Empire in the North East and introduced the Indirect Rule system; culminating in the expansive old Northern region Socio-cultural and political differences notwithstanding the unifying factor of Islam enabled the Hausa-Fulani to forge ahead.

The old Western region (South West zone) and the old Benin Empire (now in the South South zone) had a system of government that gave room for checks and balances on the power of the Alaafin and the Oba of Benin. Socially and politically the Yoruba are more homogeneous than most of the ethnic groups in the country and more receptive the reason for which Western education was openly received. It is on record that the first secondary school in Nigeria, C. M. S. Grammar school Lagos was established in 1859 followed by Olivet Baptist High School, Oyo culminating in the early development of political organizations in the area. The same applied to the Benins. Thus by the time Indirect Rule was introduced, the system partially succeeded because of the established system of government that was already in place before colonialism.

There is a clear cut different between the old Eastern region (South East) and other two regions in that there was never a centralized form of government, the reason why they were referred to as an acephalous (stateless) society. The highest ruling body was the Council of Chiefs. Thus, by the time the colonial government attempted to extend Indirect Rule, particularly the aristocratic Northern system, to Eastern Nigeria, the system failed perhaps for ideological reasons (Mustapha, 2006). This implies that, during the colonial era, a different system of governance was adopted in different parts of the country, which explains why there are differences in the level of socio-political
consciousness, meaning that the North and South eventually evolved as separate entities.

However within these tripartite majority groups are the minorities who themselves constitute different Republics with different socio-cultural and linguistic differences whose identities were hardly known politically during the colonial era until the early years of party system when they began to agitate for their own state, The majority ethnic groups use this to score political points.

It can, therefore be argued that the ethnic groups in Nigeria that was woven together in 1914 by the colonial government evolved socially and politically at different times, which explains the differences in their political and social consciousness and development. It can also be said that this development affected their socio-political and economic need as well as the strategy employed by each ethnic group to ensure their participation in governance at the centre, the struggle for which at one time or the other has led to conflict. One thing that should however be noted is that sometimes the policies adopted by the state to meet the demands of each group breed ethnic consciousness and eventually conflict. For example, the attempt by the central government to ensure a balance in the educational levels of the North and South through the policy of the quota system is seen as a means of breeding ethnic consciousness.

Considering the intractability of ethnic conflict in Nigeria, its management must be done in a way that will take ethnic differences into consideration. This accounts for the reasons why there has been continuous conflict between the various ethnic groups in the country on one hand and on the other hand between ethnic groups within the states over the allocation of socio-political and economic resources. Thus as a result of
different perceptions of socio-economic and political privileges open to every ethnic group, the effect of the socio-political and economic policies of states, ethnic dispositions as well as means of achieving their goals, there are differences in the level of ethnic consciousness as well as mobilization.

One significant dimension to the dynamism of ethnic differences in Nigeria was the separate socio-political development that eventually led to the attainment of self-governing status by the ethnic groups at different times. The West and East achieved this height in 1957 and the North in 1959. Ayoade (1986) sees this as an historical event that has since served as rallying point and reinforces the psychology of ethnic cleavages.

Therefore, one can say that the factors that make ethnic difference in Nigeria complex are multifaceted. Take for example, the Ibadan people in Oyo state, South West Nigeria are demanding for states of their own as well as people from Oke-Ogun in the same state, the Ekiti in Kwara state North Central Nigeria are demanding that they be relocated to Ekiti state, the ethnic minorities of Niger Delta Region are also demanding the presence of the federal government in terms of allocation of socio-political and economic goods, as well as more representation in the federal executive council (ministerial appointments). The minorities in the North Central would want the creation of more states so as to break the hegemonic power of the majority Hausa-Fulani. This explains why scholars have come to the conclusion that the ethnic minorities in the country would rather prefer a system of government that will at least give them a say in the polity as against the majority who want to keep their dominance over the minorities.
This difference has made ethnicity in Nigeria a complex issue and the reason for the persistence of ethnic conflict in the country.

Uniform ethnic management policies, as good as they may be, may not necessarily be instrumental in solving the ethnic problem, an attempt which has made ethnic conflict persist. The creation of states, for example, which seems to have been the panacea to managing ethnic conflict has become a source of competition for distributive socio-political and economic goods among the majority groups, and also deepened ethnic cleavages by creating more majorities and minorities within these states. The understanding of each ethnic difference will help in guaranteeing and protecting each group’s socio-economic and political rights, which, of course, translates to the sustainability of the polity. This is the reason that group competition for socio-economic and political goods is seen as an intrinsic feature of ethnic diversity.

4.7 Conclusion

Nigeria in all respect is a product of the British colonial administration and one major outcome of this is the increasing ethnic conflict over the allocation of socio-political and economic resources. This is partly due to the inability of Nigeria political leaders to break away from ethnicity; the political institutions within the polity that tend to perpetuate such ethno centric perceptions as that other ethnic groups are of no effect to national integration.

The organization of multi ethnic units into a federal state no doubt is very important. To this effect this chapter has looked at why ethnic conflict still persists in Nigeria. Post-independence Nigeria started with a view to maintain the unity of the country; but for the
weak political institutions, centralization of power, and incompatibility of ethnic groups within the states in the federation which has a demand on understanding of ethnic differences in Nigeria.

Understanding the complexity of ethnic differences in Nigeria may act as forces of social, political and economic change in Nigeria. The reason for this statement is that, just as there are different ethnic group in Nigeria, there are also differences in their demands socially, politically and economically. By implication it means that the strategy use in managing socio-political and economic problems in the North may not apply to the South.

One fact that should be noted here is that because of inter-group relations, there will always be different approach to managing conflict that may eventually emanate from their interactions. That is to say as long as ethnic cleavage exist in Nigeria there will always be conflict over the allocation of distributive resources; the understanding of their differences would eventually bring out the values in each ethnic group which would translate to the sustainability of socio-political and economic development of the polity.
CHAPTER FIVE

Uncivil Politics and Underdevelopment in Nigeria

5.0 Introduction:

A gloomy picture of the African continent is painted by Ake cited in Fagbadebo (2007) saying; most of Africa is not developing. While most of these countries gained independence in the 1960s, the struggle to ensure national development and political stability has proved negative. Several decades of efforts have yielded largely socio-political and economic stagnation, regression or worse. The consequences of which are social tensions and political instabilities.

The recognition of the socio-political rights of every ethnic group to participate in governance in a multi-ethnic state such as Nigeria is significantly essential for establishing and sustaining a copiously just and egalitarian society. What this translates to mean is that a government must account for the rights of all groups and not just the majority groups. The inclusion of every ethnic group would enhance the likelihood of socio-political and economic development; strengthened by improving the civic capacity of the society and increasing the unity of the country, thus enabling individuals/groups to work as citizens of the country rather than as members of their specific ethnic groups.

Political inclusion may thus be defined as full participation, representation of every ethnic group in important decision-making institutions, influence on power, and adoption of public policies that address appropriate socio-political and economic concerns as the necessary precursor to development. The factors behind Nigeria’s socio-political and economic underdevelopment mostly include misdirected socio-economic policies where the majority ethnic groups want a fair share of the booty to the detriment of the
minorities. To put it in a different way, the majority wants to protect their hegemonic interest and the minority also wants to be part of the system. Levine (2013) opines that it is a violation of a people’s right to self-determination to exclude them – whether by virtue of their ethnic membership, or for any other reason – from full political participation in the state under whose sovereignty they fall. Therefore attempts by the group (ethnic) excluded from political participation and their denial of their socio-political and economic rights often lead to conflicts.

In relation to this work politics is concerned with general socio-political and economic issues affecting the whole country. This involves the pursuit of the public interest, the operation of the state, and the formulation and execution of public policy (Dike, 1999). It is concerned with winning and holding control over a government. It involves competition between various interest groups (parties) or individuals/groups for power and leadership in a government or other group. In other words, politics does involve the struggle for power and wealth – that is, the production, distribution, and use of scarce resources.

Civil politics is therefore conceptualized as the inclusion of every ethnic group in the political process particularly in a multi-ethnic state. Lewis cited in Lijphat (1999) opines that the primary meaning of democracy is that all who are affected by a decision should have the chance to participate in making that decision either directly or through chosen representatives. In the most deeply divided societies, like Nigeria, exclusivity of the minority spells majority dictatorship and conflicts rather than the desired socio-political and economic development. What this portends is that every policy must be geared towards demonstrating the sense of national integration and that people can hold
different socio-political points of view, come from different ethnic group, reach compromise and treat every individual/group with dignity as well as maintain an open society, where a common ground is found for development. Therefore what Nigeria socio-political system need is a political regime that includes rather than excludes. From the above one can conceptualize uncivil politics as the exclusion of individuals/groups from the political processes. Political participation here is derived from the ability to take part in the conduct of public affairs; and to be elected and to hold office at all levels of government. Put in another words every ethnic group/individual have equal right to participate fully in all aspects of the political process. In practice, however, there have always been cry of foul in the political arrangement of the country which by omission or commission has given room for the exclusivity of groups particularly the minority from participating in governance, the effect of which is conflict over the allocation of socio-political and economic resources. The question that arises from here is why uncivil politics?

From the foregoing it is apparent that the overlapping interests – full participation in the distributive socio-political and economic resources – as well as the hegemonic interest of groups constitute the framework for uncivil politics in Nigeria (the various ethnic groups pushing for power and economic dominance at the center, state, and local levels) the effect of which borders on the socio-political and economic development of the country. In other words, the overlapping socio-political and economic interest of every ethnic group have redefined perceptions of various ethnic group’s interests leading to the frantic reformulation repositioning of various ethnic groups in the political terrain to take advantage of particular shifts, or to shield themselves from potentially
negative consequences. Therefore there is no universality of values among the various ethnic groups as so much is at stake in the competition for power.

The hegemonic status of the majority ethnic groups no doubt, has incapacitated the minority ethnic groups depriving them of the opportunity to determine the role they will play in national development as well as determining their socio-political and economic gains in the system. This one would say is a wrong conception of socio-political and economic development which underlies ethnic conflicts in the system. Thus the struggle for survival acquires the character of inter-ethnic competition as groups tend to perceive their material (socio-economy) advancement or otherwise in terms of the activities of other groups (Egwu, 1993:44). This has made ethnic pressures and demands results into tensions and conflicts that threaten to negate the unity of the country.

The objective of this chapter is to examine the uncivil politics in Nigeria vis-à-vis socio-political and economic underdevelopment in the country. This will be done by explaining civic culture, ethnic culture (by culture we mean attitudes of group and individuals that shape socio-political and economic development in Nigeria) the contradiction inherent in the nature of citizenship and belonging (ethnic citizenship and civic citizenship) which constitutes an impediment to socio-political and economic development and foster political instability within the context of the Nigerian state. To understand the focus of this chapter, a look at development and underdevelopment perhaps will place our discussion on better perspective.

5.1 Development
Regional imbalances and overall national development in Nigeria, has been perpetuated in the country over time. The result has been the prevailing unwarranted uneven distribution of resources and benefits of development. The different political administration in the northern and southern regions of Nigeria by the British, especially through the colonial policy of indirect rule was a significant factor in the formation of regional inequalities (Aka, 1995). Without any point of contradiction the differences between the north and south had generated to some ethno-regional sentiments that are gaudily reflected in the inter-ethnic socio-economic competition, the result of which is conflict over the distribution and utilization of available resources.

Development is not purely an economic phenomenon but rather a multi-dimensional process involving reorganization and reorientation of entire economic and socio-political system. Development has many meanings. The meaning a particular person attaches to the term depends on his/her subjective view of the world. Indeed, the meaning of development is not only a product of the individual’s perspective but also of the particular period in time when the word is being uttered. Development is a term that economists, politicians, and others have used frequently in the 20th century (Conteras, n.d). Even within individually contested conceptualizations there is space for considerable diversity of views, and differing schools of thought also tend to overlap. This overall multiplicity of definitional debates includes a general agreement on the view that development encompasses continuous change in a variety of aspects of human society (social, political and economic).

The dimensions of development are very diverse, including economic, social, political, legal and institutional structures, technology in various forms, the environment, religion,
the arts and culture. One can thus say that development is a process of improving the quality of all human lives with some important aspects; which include creating conditions conducive to the growth of peoples' self-esteem through the establishment of social, political and economic systems and institutions which promote human dignity and respect. Put in another form, development can be couched as the actions taken to involve not only economic growth, but also some notion of equitable distribution, provision of health care, education, housing and other essential services all with a view to improving the quality of life of every individual and group.

Gran (1983) conceive development as a social and practical process which aims at the liberation of human potential so that people acquire maximum socially feasible and practical control over all the available resources needed for the realization of basic human needs and security. Put in another word development is all about the liberation of human potentials towards absolute control over socio-economic and political resources to meet their needs. Significantly one can say that development is for the people and by the people.

Young (1982: 15-19) identifies six goals of development which includes growth which he says is the central objective of development; equality of distribution of socio-economic and political resources, autonomy and self-reliance, the preservation of human dignity through constitutional form of governance or charter of human rights the absence of which may lead to repression of people, participation in governance; that is to say there must be a mechanism for citizens access and involvement in administration and the ability of the state to respond to new challenge and demand to adapt to changing needs.
5.2 Underdevelopment

Underdevelopment is not lack of development, because development of some sort and degree thus exists in the state of underdevelopment (Otite, 2011). What this translates to mean is that it does not mean zero-level development, it is greater than zero. Underdevelopment takes place when socio-political and economic resources are not used to their full capacity, with the result that local or regional development is slower in most cases than it should be. Furthermore, it results from the complex interplay of internal factors that allow less developed groups only an uneven development progression. In the light of the above, underdevelopment therefore can be seen from the comparative perspective. Taken from the socio-economic angle, the term underdevelopment only makes sense when we compare societies (ethnic groups) and we observe that one of the two has advantage over the other, as a result of which the quality of life of individuals of that society is really higher than that of the individual member of the other society. A look at the educational sector will give us a better understanding of this argument.

According to Graham (cited in Mustapha, 2006) it was precisely in the sphere of education that regional differences were increasingly manifested during colonial governance in Nigeria. And this then had a knock-on effect on the regional formation of human capital and general socio-political and economic development. Colonial educational policy in Northern Nigeria was driven by two intertwined policies; fear of the development of a class of educated Africans, as was the case in Southern Nigeria; and the related attempt to create an alternative Anglo-Muslim aristocratic civilization in
Northern Nigeria. In the view of colonial government, education had produced a discontented group of people impatient of any control and infatuated with their own importance in southern Nigeria.

In colonial Northern Nigeria, therefore, the British did everything possible to prevent the emergence of an educational system that might threaten British control. According to Mustapha (2006) under the guise of protecting Islam, Lugard banned missionary activities, including the founding of schools; and while colonial subsidies were used to run three Muslim schools providing modern education in Lagos, no such schemes were put in place in the North. Because of this educational policy, the head start that the South had in Western education due to its earlier contact with Europeans intensified, and a destabilizing inequality in educational attainment was built into the fabric of the Nigerian state. For example, in 1957, the South had 13,473 primary schools with a total population of 2,343,317 pupils, while the North had only 2,080 schools and 185,484 pupils (Okeke cited in Mustapha, 2006).

By 1958, a paltry sum of 9 per cent of the children of primary school age was enrolled in the North; the comparable figure for the South was 80 per cent. In the same year, while the North had 4,000 children in secondary schools, the South had 40,000. By 1960, while the Western Region had 47.3 per cent of the students at the University College Ibadan, the Eastern Region had 39.8 per cent and Northern Nigeria only 8.4 per cent (Yoloye 1988). The East and West were far ahead of the North.

Considering the multi-ethnic nature of Nigeria and the perceived disadvantageous position of some ethnic group in terms of educational attainment, the Federal government introduced quota system policy as an instrument for bridging the
educational gap between the north and the south. It has however been criticized as a fraud designed to stagnate the educational movements of the educationally advantaged states. One fact that needs to be mentioned here is that while the gap in educational attainment between the North and the South flowed as result of government policies, other inequalities also emerged, fuelled by differences in geography and natural economic endowments. As a result of this the combined and collective effects of the educational and economic inequalities continue to bedevil Nigerian society to this day (See table 6).

These patterns of educational and socio-economic inequality have persisted to the present day. According to Mustapha (2006) persisting educational and socio-economic inequalities between different regions and ethnicities form the context for the observable inequalities in the staffing of governmental institutions in Nigeria. The inequalities between the north and the south and between the various ethnic groups are now expressed, not in the old regional terms, but in terms of the 36 states and the six geopolitical zones that make up the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

Persisting educational and socio-economic inequalities between different regions and ethnicities no doubt, form the basis for the apparent inequalities in the staffing of governmental institutions in Nigeria. The inequalities between the north and the south and between the various ethnic groups are now expressed, in terms of the 36 states which have been grouped into the six geopolitical zones that make up the entirety of Nigeria. The continuing educational inequality between the various zones in the country is indicated in tables below which show the number of post-primary and post-secondary institutions in each zone. Since post-primary and post-secondary institutions are
responsible for preparing entrants for administrative recruitment, this discrepancy between population size and density of institutions no doubt will have a bearing on the ethnic composition of applicants seeking to enter the bureaucracy based on their qualifications (See table 7 and 8).

From the above tables, one can conclude that the states with the least number of post-primary and post-secondary schools were all from the north. With a total of 76 higher institutions, north has 39.5 % against 60.5 % from the south. In the distribution of post-primary institutions, out of 75,032 secondary schools, the north has 44.3% against 55.7% that comes from the south. Without mincing words certain sections of this country particularly the northerners (by zone North Central and South East) will be highly disturbed about their educationally underdeveloped position in Nigeria from the above pattern of higher educational opportunities in the country. It is this kind of disturbance which promotes among the people some actions and counteractions, common distrust, prejudice and loss of trust in the concept of fair play within the polity the result of which is conflict and economic underdevelopment.

Economic Development implies a lot more than economic growth. It is a qualitative measure of how the economic wealth of countries (or regions) has improved the economic, political, and social well-being of its citizens (Soubbotina cited in Dike 2012). Economic development is the tool to mitigate the discontents and the misery in various regions or zones in the country.

Without any point of contradiction Nigeria is a nation that is endowed with several mineral, natural and human resources which are unevenly distributed among the states or regions. Thus, the development level of each state depends on its access to the
material and nonmaterial resources. Differences in the value of export crops in the global market meant that each region developed a different pattern of wealth accumulation and the related development of social infrastructure and social capital. What this translates to mean is that each region definitely will have different manufacturing activities and indirectly dictate the pace of socio-economic development. In Nigeria, the number of industrial manufacturing establishments a state has is often equated to its development level (See table 9).

As noticed by Ekanade (2011) the federal government controlled by the northerners in the First Republic rejected an expert advice which suggested that it was cheaper to use gas (which was and is still being flared in oil fields of the Niger Delta) than a dam to generate electricity in the giant power station that was to be built in the country during the Second National Development Plan (1970-1974). Thus rather than use gas which could have made it unavoidable on the Federal government to build the station in the South, the North led Federal government wielding its hegemonic power opted to build a hydro-electric power station which was located at Kanji, deep in Northern Nigeria. What this suggests is that there is a link between ethnicity and the viability of economic development which is powerfully influential on a region’s prospect for development.

Development could be accomplished when the operation of the political system is in line with the prevailing legal and ethical principles of the political community. But where one ethnic group lord it over others there is bound to be instability and eventual underdevelopment. Regional inequality in socio-economic development among geographic units is a phenomenon common in multi-ethnic states. It becomes disquieting and may result in dissension among geographic units of the same state due
to the imbalance in socio-economic development. Therefore one fact that needs to be mentioned here is the fact that the increasing insecurity and indeterminacy of existence that faces the various ethnic groups particularly the minority ethnic groups one way or the other linked to conflicts over the allocation of resources. In essence the determination of resource distribution based on the three main ethnic and geographic groups in Nigeria – the Hausa-Fulani, Yoruba and Igbo – may be one of the reasons why the problem of ethnicity has remained intractable.

One dysfunctional impediment to development in Nigeria has been the use of political manoeuvrings to disempower groups. This has made the overriding objective of national development a failed project. One phenomenon that seems to be common to every ethnic group in Nigeria is the word marginalization – in Nigeria political system marginalization of any ethnic group is considered to be tantamount to underdevelopment, this is because the more representation they have at national level the higher/faster the development of such zones/ethnic group. Marginalization stems from groups perception of their treatment in the allocation or distribution of socio-economic and political resources which may be factual and apparent. For example the Yoruba of the south west zone believe they are being marginalized in the distribution of topmost positions in the country claiming their absence in apex of political positions such as the President, Vice president, Senate President, Speaker, House of Representatives, Chief Justice of the Federation, Deputy Senate President, Deputy Speaker of the House of Representatives, President, Court of Appeal, Secretary to the Government of the Federation, Chief of Staff to the President, National Security Adviser and Head of Service of the Federation, control of the principal economic and financial
agencies. The Yoruba contended that the absence of Yoruba in the above power apex has consequential adverse effect on the zone in respect of appointments and job security throughout the Federal Government (Ajayi, 2013).

The above claim by the Yoruba justifies why Adedeji cited in Anugwon (2000) conceive marginality as the relative or absolute lack of power to influence a defined social entity, while being a recipient of the exercise of power by other parts of that entity. In other words other group lacks the socio-economic and perhaps political capability to influence significantly, those who are in charge of the allocation of socio-economic resources in the larger social entity. Marginalization is therefore considered to be the deliberate disempowerment (marginalization is believed to be a means through which a particular region can be underdeveloped) of a group of people in a federation politically, economically, socially and militarily by another group or groups which during the relevant time frame wield power and control the allocation of materials and financial resources at the center of the federation opines (Anugwon, 2000).

The anxiety that has emerged in Nigeria as a result of marginalization which translates to the underdevelopment of some regions has produced ethnic conflict which is a reflection of the economic frustration endured over time by these groups. This is the case of the Niger Delta region. The bulk of Nigeria’s revenue is derived from crude oil extracted from this area. The Niger Delta communities are provoked that the proceeds from oil were being used by the government to develop other areas of the country while they were left to bear environmental problems of oil exploration. Despite the fact that they produce over 85% of the nation’s wealth in oil revenues, they lacked adequate pipe borne water, electricity, good health and other social facilities. When an ethnic group is
left in the cauldron of neglects, the group no doubt feels that it occupies an inferior position in the process of resource allocation and access to societal resources (Ekanade, 2011, Oritsejafor, 2000).

Significantly, such feelings, especially within ethnic groups, tend to lead to various forms of conflict with other groups or the group that is seen to be the committer. This accounts for the establishment of The Oil Mineral Producing Area Development Commission (OMPADEC) in 1992, later Niger Delta Development Commission (NDDC) established in 2000; located in the Niger Delta area in response to environmental insecurity and underdevelopment in the area. This represents the most notable official responses to the crisis and contradictions of the Niger Delta of Nigeria. The condition of the area is abysmal; it manifests the paradox of poverty in plenty, epitomized by infrastructural decay, widespread poverty, rising tensions, and the escalation of ethnic militias, amidst rising oil revenues (Omotola, 2007). Arguably, positive socio-political and economic change is possible in Nigeria. As long as the change agents – one of the change agent is the civil society – ensure the legitimacy and responsiveness of the state, the deepening and expansion of democracy, good governance that will midwife development and national unity in Nigeria.

5.3 Civil society and political development in Nigeria

Civil society can be described as organized group of people whose activity is not associated with major institutional systems; government and administration, education and health delivery, business and industry, security and organized religion. Civil society is a reinforcing mechanism for effective governance in the overall interest of the majority
of the people. They include religious/faith based organizations, cooperatives, trade unions, academic institutions, community and youth groups. The people who constitute civil society are citizens, associating neither for power nor for profit. They are the third sector of society, complementing government and business. Civil society, in short, is an actual or anticipated condition of possibility of the on-going struggle for egalitarian society. Put in another word civil society is very important to socio-political and economic development of a state. They are unique group of individuals who is capable of making unique contribution to decision making. Where there is no active civil society engagement, there can be no responsible and responsive political society (Fayemi, 2012).

This brings us to the role played by the civil society in the enthronement of democracy in Nigeria. The first military government came into office in 1966 following the termination of the civilian government under late Tafawa Balewa with late Gen. Aguiyi Ironsi as the head of state. The military was in power between 1966 and 1979 when the first executive president, Sheu Shagari was voted into power. He was in office till December 1984 when the military struck again; the military was in control until 1999 when another civilian government came in and till date Nigeria has passed through one leader or the other. All through this period the civil society was at the fore front to ensure the enthronement of democracy.

The development of any nation does not rest wholly on the government alone but on the contributions of every citizen generally and stakeholders in particular. This informed the role of the civil society in general and its contributions to socio-political development in Nigeria. The need for all hand to be on deck for the progress and development of the
country cannot be over-emphasized and here in comes the civil society. The dire need to institutionalize the culture of good governance within the regime of democratic governance is the cornerstone of civil society initiatives, especially in emerging democracy such as Nigeria (Omodia and Erunke, 2007). In essence civil society which is seen as operating from the public space is a reinforcing mechanism for effective governance in the overall interest of socio-political and economic development. A strong correlation exists between civil society and democracy. Generally, civil society is seen as the engine of democratization.

The concept of civil society in Nigeria and the struggle for political independence is dated back to the colonial era, though repeated attempts to sustain and consolidate democratic government faltered. The 1980s witnessed the activation of their operations in the quest for democratic governance. Governments, hitherto unaccountable and despotic, abuse of office, reckless political decisions became the order of the day, as the state became the property of the political class. This activated a civil society, determined to check the erosion of rights, freedom and civic values. In the view of Mutfang (cited in Odeh 2012) civil society is a wide range of association and other organized collectives, capable of articulating the interest of their members, moulding and constraining state power. According to him, their demands provide inputs for the democratic political process, which at times are aggregated by political parties. Their approval or disapproval of what goes on in government contributes to its accountability.

If we take civil society as the Third Sector defined as constituted by all those organizations that are not-for-profit and non-government, together with the activities of volunteering and giving which sustain them, then community based organizations such
as town unions, faith based organizations, Non-Governmental Organizations like the Campaign for Democracy (CD), Civil Liberties Organizations, (CLO), Committee for the Defence of Human Rights (CDHR), Transition Monitoring Group (TMG), Alliance for Credible Elections (ACE), Centre for Democracy and Development (CDD) as well as professional associations such as Nigeria Bar Association (NBA), Nigeria Medical Association (NMA) and Nigeria Union of Journalists (NUJ) will all qualify to be member of the civil society constituency.

In Nigeria, the civil society facilitated the process, which led to democratic reforms through mobilizing significant resistance against military rule. Historically, the civil society in Nigeria has been at the forefront of struggle for a national development (Aderounmu, 2003). However, the struggle for democracy found new meaning in the context of economic crisis and structural adjustment climate of the 1980s. Other civil groups found meaning or relevance within the military autocracy and transition to civil rule programmes. With the annulment of June 12, 1993 presidential election, the persistent economic crisis and the impasse that followed, fuelled the internal and external struggles by civil society to promote democracy. In other words, civil society can positively contribute to the sustainability of democracy by legitimizing and entrenching institutions, processes and the culture of democracy, as well as by contesting, de-legitimizing and opposing authoritarian, undemocratic and uncivil practices and dispositions Jega (cited in Iyekekpolo, Nasiru and Ebubeku, 2011).

The role of civil society organizations (CSOs) in democratic Nigeria is an indisputable fact, if the nation’s quest for sustained democracy, good governance and development must be actualized. Democratic governance was established in Nigeria on the most
part, due to civil society activities. Civil society supplement the role of political parties by stimulating political participation, promote the development of political attribute and creating channels other than political parties to articulate, aggregate and represent their interests. Thus, the state advances politically, economically, socially and otherwise only when there is a strong civil society or it can boast of one. Some of the ways they have done that include: Fight for return to democracy – Many of these groups like CD, CDD, CDHR and CLO were instrumental in the restoration of civil rule. Between 1993 and 1999, in collaboration with the Nigeria Labour Congress (NLC) another civil society organization, these groups fought the Nigerian military to a standstill. They mobilized students and workers for civil disobedience, strikes and protest marches across the country.

In the present political dispensation, efforts are being made by civil society to consolidate the hard won democracy through its various intervention activities on issues of human rights, electoral reforms, constitutional reform, gender equality, civic education, transparency and accountability. The efforts of civil society to promote good governance are likely to remain futile as long as the problems of unemployment, corruption, political apathy, and people oriented constitution and the like are not addressed. This is because civil society has put Nigeria in a market place of idea and ideologies, the essence of which is to propel healthy competition towards national integration, growth and development. This has made civil society an indispensable tool in the consolidation of socio-political development due to the fact that citizens can actualize their goals through their operations in the state.
Without mincing words lack of socio-political stability accounts for many of the development problems in post-colonial Nigeria. The ethnic diversity of the country is extraordinary. Thus making participatory development (where every ethnic group is involved) very difficult. National endeavours have been hampered by ethnic conflicts. The forces behind these conflicts are often complex thus making ethnicity to override all other forms of loyalty to the national government. Shrewd and ambitious politicians take advantage of the ethnic instinct for all it is worth. What this means is that ethnic differences and political and cultural traditions have made it difficult to build strong socio-political institutions – of the kind developed in Malaysia – that have been able to address the challenges of ethnicity. Ethnicity therefore plays significant roles in explaining the current state of underdevelopment in Nigeria.

5.4 Politics of civic and ethnic culture in Nigeria

According to Lijphart cited in Haliru (2012) all multi-ethnic nations are profoundly divided along religious, ideological, linguistic, cultural, ethnic or racial lines. They are virtually made up of separate sub-societies each with its own political party; it owns interest group and its own means of communication. What this translates to mean is that in such society flexibility necessary for national integration would be lacking. Thus situation like this promotes the uncivility of the ruling majority; they become more dangerous to those minority ethnic groups who are persistently denied access to political power.

The Nigerian state after a long period of military rule returned to civilian governance in 1999. Nigeria has witnessed numerous ethno-religious and socio-economic and political crisis which has almost become a regular feature of the state. The interplay of power as
well as ethnic forces in Nigeria has downplayed the existentiality of civic culture that can foster socio-political and economic development. The Nigerian federation has been enmeshed in contradictions, paradoxes, controversies and crises. These are subsumed in the national question, and social groups of varying ideological leanings cohere on the central issues. These are linked to national unity, local autonomy and self-determination, equitable distribution of socio-political and economic resources (Oshewolo, 2011).

Nigeria unarguably has been struggling against the forces of socio-political cohesion. The cardinal goal of federalism as the case of Nigeria is the promotion of unity in diversity. Therefore, federalism as a system is not only about uniformities, but also the recognition of diversities. Where every ethnic nationality (big or small) will have significant access to social and economic factors which is likely going to contributes to integration and development in a variety of situations. The success of ethnic integration depends on the perception by the various ethnic group of how equitably cordial the binding order is, at least, in terms of harmonious federal-state relations and interethnic relations.

The inability of a central government to equitably relate to the interests of the ethnic groups gives rise to centrifugal forces within the polity. When this happens, the levels of citizenship become entangled in perpetual conflicts as the central government and the various ethnic groups fail to agree on vital issues of interest to the latter. In a situation like this citizen’s loyalty gravitates towards their respective ethnic groups and the legitimacy of the central government becomes questionable. It is under this notion that we are going to discuss the above subject.
The term civic culture and ethnic culture are two socio-political terms relating to individual and groups beliefs/orientations towards the political system in a multi-ethnic state like Nigeria. If we are to ascertain the relationships between civic ethnic attitudes and developmental patterns, we have to separate the former from the latter even though the boundary between them is not as sharp as our terminology would suggest. The term civic culture thus refers to the specifically socio-political orientations – attitudes toward the socio-political system and its various parts, and attitudes toward the role of the self in the system. When we speak of a society, we refer to the socio-political and economic system as internalized in the perceptions, feelings, and evaluations of its population. People are inducted into it just as they are socialized into non-political roles and social systems. From the perspective of this work civic culture is pro national integration and development as against ethnic culture which give preference to ethnic development as against the overall development of the polity. The result of this therefore is conflict over the distribution of socio-political and economic goods.

According to Almond and Verba (1989) the political culture of a nation is the particular distribution of patterns of orientation toward political objects among the members of the nation. In essence what determine the attitudes of members of a political society hinges on their orientations to the political system – what they can gain from the system as individuals or group. Significantly in a multi-ethnic state like Nigeria peoples political allegiances is sometimes determine by the shape of their ethnic affiliations which invariably determine their political objects (desires).

In a plural society – a society divided by segmental cleavages Eckstein (cited in Lijphart, 1977:3) there is always political divisions that follows lines of socio-political and
economic differentiation, most especially those particular salient in society. The effect of this is that political parties, interest groups and voluntary organizations tend to be organized along ethnic cleavages; some of these organizations may have national outlook but in principle they are actually representing their ethnic interests. For example in the First Republic, the Action Group (AG) though claims to be a national political party but the party under the leadership of late Awolowo was an apology of ethnic politics, the same thing applicable to Northern Peoples Congress with the motto “One North One People”. Although the National Convention of Nigeria Citizens cannot be faulted for the genuineness of it national orientation and nationalist commitment, an ethnic perception of it emerged, partly by the flamboyant and controversial personality of the NCNC leader, Nnamdi Azikiwe argued (Young, 1976:289). This primordial loyalty unarguably has been detrimental to socio-political and economic development in Nigeria.

This brings us to the assumption that socio-political and economic development is dependent on national integration. What this suggests is that development in general cannot take place without a sense of deep identification of every ethnic group with the total system. Lijphart (1977) argues that the importance of national integration in developmental process leads to political development which translates to nation building which must be accorded priority by the political leaders, thereby eradicating primordial subnational attachments and their replacement with national loyalty.

This was demonstrated by the Gowon administration when he divided the old regions into twelve states (Nigeria now consists of thirty six states). Under the state structure the former minorities are now majorities and may be independent actors and no longer the client of the three major ethnic groups. Put in another words the twelve-state system
provides the minorities the structural resources to play an influential role in the polity. The polity within the twelve state structures makes of its sheer complexity of cultures an integrative asset rather than a threat to its survival opines (Young, 1977). As argued earlier in this work Nigeria’s diversity was reinforced by the administrative division of the country into three regions, each dominated by one of the three major ethnic groups. This no doubt created a three person game whose stakes of cultural anxiety were far too high. The argument here is that the dismantling of the three major ethnic groups apart from curtailing ethnic conflict has enhanced the socio-political and economic development of these states.

Significantly the adoption of a federal system can be seen in the light of efforts geared at promoting national integration, a defensive reaction to the threat of ethnicism, fear and a reasonable political security of every ethnic group particularly the minority groups. Nigerian federal state forged by, the British colonial administration through different experimentations of policies, coupled with the prevailing circumstances and inferences compelling a federal structure for the nation in 1954 unarguably promotes unity amongst people of diverse culture, religion and history which makes them put national interests beyond and above that of their individual ethnic groups. However one disturbing feature of Nigeria federal system is the prevailing culture of ethnicism in its politics; for example in the general election of 2003 the Yoruba-based Alliance for Democracy (AD) in the South-West supported the candidature of Obasanjo, a Yoruba man. The All Nigerian People’s Party (ANPP) backs the Hausa/Fulani elites in the North, the least industrially developed area. The All Progressive Grand Alliance (APGA) supported the Igbo political
elites in the South-East. This situation without mincing words is an aberration to socio-political development in Nigeria.

Aiyar and Tiwari, (2009) notes that the key component of progressive socio-political and economic development can be located in inclusive governance as the means of empowering the disadvantaged, with the aim of enabling them to overcome socio-political and economic deprivation. Therefore for accelerated socio-political development that breed’s national cohesion in a multi-ethnic state there is needed to hitch the horse of political system to the wagon of inclusive governance. The political mobilization of ethnicity, exclusive claims, significantly is a threat to national integration and emergence of corporate identity in a multi-ethnic state. Therefore considering the implication of ethnic culture as against socio-political development efforts must be made to create a political atmosphere that will boost the confidence of every ethnic group in a multi-ethnic state.

This study elucidates the importance of inclusive governance to national cohesion in Nigeria. Inclusion is conceptualized in terms of degrees of representation that legitimately exclude either many or few political interests. On such a continuum, a more inclusive policy process generates a broader representation of every political interest. No doubt inclusive governance will significantly impact socio-political development. Put differently where the political system favours inclusive governance, there is tendency for ethnic integration which in turn translates to a united and sustainable socio-political development. It is however very significant to state here that good governance as against uncivil politics will define the sustainability of inclusive governance in Nigeria. Good governance is the critical variable in the mobilization and utilization of societal
socio-political and economic resources for the satisfaction of popular expectations and fundamental needs, protection and promotion of citizen’s rights observes Jega (2007). Good governance is related to the extent to which government address the socio-political and economic needs of the people. Good governance therefore has to do with the process of managing public affairs across all tiers of government; which is seen to be responsible and responsive to the basic socio-political and economic needs as well as aspirations of the people. On the other hand bad governance is associated with unresponsive, irresponsible, corrupt, authoritarian, indecent, crude and exclusive process of management of public affairs (Jega, 2007).

Explaining inclusive governance in Nigeria political context it is a process through which every ethnic group and particularly the traditionally underrepresented ethnic group participates in governance. The system seeks participation/representation from every group in a multi-ethnic state thus ensuring socio-political and economic growth of every ethnic group. What informs political inclusion in Nigeria is the degree to which the socio-political interests of some ethnic groups are excluded from governance; the consequence of which is lack of national cohesion as well as socio-political and economic development on the part of the group excluded. In essence every ethnic group is given the chance to be represented in every sphere of governance either as part of the executive or other arms of government. Significantly this process will help stem the potentialities of ethnic conflict over the distribution of socio-economic and political goods.

The assumption here is that inclusive governance will no doubt enhance equitable socio-political and economic development as well as engender national cohesion,
knowing fully well that uncivil politics of exclusivism may form the basis for ethnic conflicts the result of which is underdevelopment. Inclusion in Nigeria context includes federal character, power sharing and other socio-political mechanisms designed to ensure the participation of every ethnic group in governance.

Briefly, federal character is an integrative protection mechanism aimed at ensuring equal representation of Nigerians, regardless of their ethnic affiliation in the distribution of socio-economic and political powers among all the various ethnic groups in the country. It is a socio-political system that transcends ethnic loyalty and symbolizes the aspiration for national integration and development. It is a principle that seeks to relate the structural integration of every ethnic group through a socio-political balancing formula in the composition of government and its various agencies. Put differently it is a distributive principle which is aim at preventing the domination of government, and it's resources by people from only one ethnic group its aim is guaranteeing every ethnic group, access to political power and distributive resources. Undoubtedly the rationale behind the introduction and adoption of this socio-economic and political strategy is a laudable one. The reason is that it discourages the socio-economic and political imbalance which has made some groups to remain perpetually underdeveloped within the polity.

However, the unfortunate thing about this principle is the uncivil political behaviour of the political class who have revert it; incorporating the principles of socio-political strategies for regional, geographical, religious, and ethnic and sub-ethnic balancing at both federal and sub-federal levels. Put in another word the uncultured political leaders who see nothing but their own ethnic group in the distribution of socio-political and
economic resources; the system has failed to produce the expected national integration which would have translated into development.

5.4.1 Ethnic Culture

Ethnicity has been a subject of study in the recent years in many disciplines of social sciences. This concept has gained momentum in the academic world as the socio-political process have been moving in a direction which is quite opposite to the expectation of the liberals and socialist over one and a half century despite the development of the nation-state system and mass communication (Palanithurai, 2005). Human beings are decisively in search of an identity to form a group to exert pressure on the government to maximize the allocation, both in terms of decisions and resources for their advantage. The result of which has always been ethnic conflict in multi ethnic states.

In an ethnically divided society a determined effort to defeat the negative ethnic tendencies that choses to assert its control over other ethnic group proclaiming success and closing its minds to the underdevelopment of others, must be made. This statement is an eye opener to the dangers of ethnicity in a multi-ethnic state. According to Baumann (2004) the term ethnic falls under the irreconcilable difference of “Us” and “Them.” The “Us,” the majority, are regarded as non-ethnics and the “Them,” new minorities, as ethnic. Therefore ethnic culture as use in this work derives its foundation from combined memories of the past and common expectation. Significantly individual’s consciousness of himself/herself in terms of his/her ethnic group is a continuous process. The intensity of the consciousness definitely will vary from period to period. In
essence his/her socio-political activities may be very high or low depending on what he/she intends to achieve or gain.

From the above we can conceptualize ethnic culture considering the term of this work as a dynamic reflection of structural conditions in which people are consciously manipulated in the pursuit of socio-economic and political interests. Individuals/ethnic groups are therefore viewed as social agents acting strategically in the pursuit of their group's interests, hence ethnic culture as a shared disposition of a particular ethnic group. Ethnic culture is concerned with the role of ethnicity in the mediation of social relations and the negotiation of access to resources, primarily economic and political resources forms of human agency.

Overall, the underlying truth of ethnic culture is that it is a product of self and group identity that is formed in intrinsic contexts and social interaction. It is in part the symbolic representations of an individual or a group that are produced, reproduced, and transformed over time. Ethnic culture is the product of actions undertaken by ethnic groups to assert their control over distributive socio-economic and political resources. It acts as a pole around which group members are mobilized and compete effectively for state-controlled power and economic resources. Under the leadership of the predatory elite, members of the ethnic group are urged to form an organized political action-group in order to maximize their corporate political, economic, and social interests (Aquiline, 2008).

Significantly as socio-political situations changes in a multi ethnic society the individual/group that carries the portfolio of ethnic identities also change in various situations and vis-à-vis various groups. As group change, the socially-defined arrays of
ethnic choices open to the individual/group changes. For example when Nigeria decided on option of federal form of government at the 1953 constitutional conference with self-government to be first devolved upon the regions; the north was unwilling to see a Nigerianized central government until they were better equipped politically to compete within it. The south was equally unwilling to defer African (Nigerian) access to political power waiting for the northerners who at that time were not ready for political independence opine Young (1976). The political effect of this was the delay to acceptance of federal type of government on one hand and on the other hand each region came heavily under the control of the three major political parties. Apart from this one event that support the above claim in Nigeria was the division of Nigeria into twelve states, an action that made the hitherto minorities to become majority or rather an independent actors in the Nigerian polity; this one would say made them the strongest in the preservation of Nigeria as one political entity.

What this translates to mean is that the uneven rates of socio-political and economic development among the groups, which generally coincided with regional boundaries, strengthened the forces of regionalism. The creed became north for northerners, west for westerners, and east for easterners. This has continued to affect national politics (socio-political and economic development). Generally ethnicity is regarded as the most basic and politically significant identity in Nigeria; this assertion is supported by the fact that both in competitive and non-competitive settings, Nigerians are more likely to identify themselves in terms of their ethnic affinities than any other identity (Nigerian). This situation has emerged because of unequal distribution of socio-economic resources, unabated corruption at the national level, and irresponsible leadership. The
situation is combined with the political unwillingness to address structural injustice. The inability to go beyond the ethnic framework has intensified the climate of political crisis. Ethnocentrism has been described as the cancer that threatens to eat out the very fabric of the nation. Almost every political leader in multi-ethnic states, practices it, most of them are more ethnic chief than national statesman, and it remains perhaps the most potent force in day-to-day African life. It is a factor in political struggles and distribution of socio-political and economic resources (Aquiline, 2008). Ethnic culture often determines who gets jobs, who gets promoted, by its very connotation it implies sharing among members of the extended family, making sure that your own are looked after first. In Nigeria for a political leader to choose his closest advisers and bodyguards from the ranks of his own ethnic group is not patronage, it is a good common sense. It ensures security, continuity, and authority. Therefore ethnic culture focuses and encompasses the process, such as mobilization and solidarity, by which members of ethnic groups attempt to use their ethnicity to compete and dominate others. This is applicable from the political and economic viewpoint, they (ethnic groups) dominate a particular trade and they create entry barriers for any one from another ethnic group. Such ethnic group build an ethnic solidarity on the basis on which members are mobilized to advance a course which they may not all believe in but seen as collective ethnic action. The economic development of ethnic groups transforming into interest groups is a contributing factor in this approach. The relative success of ethnic groups in the Nigeria polity informs what their interests are. In recent years, the economic resources, political advantages and opportunities groups attain are aligned to ethnicity for their members. It is often argued
that economic insecurity makes self-interest seekers recruit men and women of their own ethnic groups into authoritative positions for the interest of their ethnic groups. Ethnic identities, taken from this perspective, generate a loss of national culture, a culture that could be enriched immensely by the absorption of different ethnic identities. If ethnic identities are constructively appropriated they could become a national a national treasure. For example there have always been high representations of Hausa-Fulani in the federal cabinet whenever a Hausa-Fulani is the head of state or president. A look at the cabinets of selected leaders from the north would explain this submission (See table 10).

According to Mustapha (2006) the ethnic group from the north ruled Nigeria for more than 35 years or 80.5 per cent of its existence since independence, while people of western origin have been in charge for about eight years or 18 per cent of the time. People of eastern origin have been in power for only six months, or 1.5 per cent of the time. This time chart is often used to support the argument of northern domination. What this suggests is that the ethnic culture characteristics of Nigeria cannot be separated from its development as well as socio-political stability. This feature influences the discussion of identity for Nigerians and is constantly linked to several ethnic conflicts. This is the consequence of politics based on ethnicity rather than any of the usual ideologies and principles that hold modern democracies together. Instead of evolving, it seems Nigeria’s democracy have degenerated to producing ethnic leaders more intent on leading their people in warfare against rival ethnic groups.

In a departure from the above it is a common knowledge that the coastal states (oil producing states) are Abia, Akwa Ibom, Bayelsa, Cross River, Delta, Edo, Imo, Ondo
and Rivers. But the indigenes of these states are not gaining much from the oil while the northerners benefited more from the rewards associated with oil. For example the appointments made by late Musa Ya’Adua in the oil and gas sector shows that the sector was dominated by the northerners. Good governance in multi-ethnic state no doubt is about the process of managing public affairs across all ethnic groups by responding to and satisfying the basic socio-political and economic needs as well as aspirations of the people no matter their origin.

Because of the ethnic competition for the scarce economic resources and political power, each ethnic group tends to fight to have a president from their group. For them, the president will use the power of office to ensure the appropriation of the proverbial national cake and political offices to better the lot of his ethnic group. In other words, the president is not for the state, but his ethnic group. This is the essence of the struggle to control the state. This can be termed “ethnic strategies” which are often connected with the resources of modern economy, such as in gaining employment, education, and seizing appointments for lucrative political and economic offices. The competition for the limited socio-economic resources within the polity today, to a certain extent, has changed the meaning and utilization of ethnicity in Nigeria.

As noted by Ubochi (2010) in the appointments, Alhaji Abubakar Lawal Yar’Adua from Katsina state (North West) as Group Managing Director of the NNPC, later replaced by Mohammed Barkindo from Adamawa state (North Central), Aliyu Sabonbiri from Kano state (North West) was appointed the acting Director of the Directorate of Petroleum Resources, Professor Sambo from Kaduna state (North West) was appointed the Director of the Energy Commission of Nigeria; Mustapha Rabe Darma from Katsina
state (North West) was appointed the Executive Secretary of the Petroleum Technology Development Fund (PTDF); and Engineer Bello Suleiman from Kaduna state (North West) was appointed the Chairman of the Transition Board of the Power Holding Company of Nigeria (PHCN). What this translates to is that the northernization of these positions will enable the Hausa-Fulani to consolidate its hegemonic dominance over the rest of the country. Therefore frustration among other ethnic group particularly those in the Niger Delta has created a growing tendency to use violence as a viable means to correct the situation, hence the emergence of ethnic militia like Niger Delta Frontier Force (NDFF). The conclusion here is that when the ideology that animates the competition between ethnic groups over socio-economic goods clashes, socio-political and economic development under the influence of ethno-political ideologies in turn takes the form of ethnic loyalty.

The introduction of multiparty politics in the early years of 1950s opened a competition that has shaped the context of struggle for political power among the political leaders and ethnic groups in Nigeria. Under the influence of ethnic politics voters need not appeal to the standards of economic performance or socio-political deliveries and the common good. The important concern for them is to ensure that many from their ethnic group control government offices. Political leaders convince ethnic groups to believe that they rule the country on their behalf. Obviously the elected leader is seen as an ethnic leader. The believe is that whosoever holds the office is held in trust for the benefit of their ethnic group. It is from this perspective that a number of political parties promote ethnic politics, and regard the introduction of multiparty democracy as a way of decentralizing the state in favour of ethno-nationalism. Of all the political parties that are
in existence in the country today it is very difficult to ascertain which one is national considering their orientation to national and ethnic questions. Arguably this has created mutual mistrust between ethnic groups. Those who belong to the minority ethnic groups feel left out and discriminated against by the system. In turn, they feel obliged to act, legitimately or illegitimately, to ensure their survival in the polity. The tendency of self-assertion emerging from different ethnic groups – big or small – for survival is, in fact, a bane to development as well as political stability in the country today.

Ethnic differentiation as promoted by ethnic leaders, revolve around the practice of ethnic discrimination. The phenomenon of ethnic discrimination comes into play when each region is identified with a certain ethnic group, and whenever political misunderstandings emerge those who are identified as outsiders are always forced to retrieve back to their original ethnic home lands.

The challenge is not how to overcome the culture of ethnic identities, but how to integrate them into social relationships and political processes that will engender development. The effort of promoting an ideal democracy cannot succeed without taking into account the challenge of appropriating ethnic identities into the structure of nationality. Lijphart (1984) explains ideal democracy as government whose actions would always be in perfect correspondence with the preferences of all its citizens. Any project, be it social, political, or economic, which involves the mobilization of people must take into account the cultural contexts in which individuals live, rather than those in which someone may think they ought to be living. The process of building democratic institutions will succeed insofar as it starts with what people are and from where they are.
Significantly ethnic identities provide meaning and content to the nation-state. Whatever point of view is adopted, the issue of ethnicity must be approached in a constructive way. This is because it cannot be suppressed by the state. In acknowledging the role of ethnic identities, however, we must be ready to contend with this question. Because of the multi-ethnic nature of Nigeria polity, what form should Nigerian state assume? What form should national and ethnic integration take for development to take place? Put in another word the failure to recognize the power of ethnic identity and adoption of the institutionalization of political integration will continue to foment political instability, and thereby exacerbate the situation of socio-political and economic underdevelopment of the country.

5.5 Politics of citizenship

One contentious phenomenon in the Nigerian polity today is the uncivil systemic prejudiced policies; motivated by ethnic consciousness and used by different states in the country to protect the socio-economic and political rights of their citizens. Jinadu (2002) called it the ‘son of the soil syndrome’, and is a situation where states in the country pursue policies of preferential treatment to favour their citizens over the perceived non-citizens. The adoption of this system negates the principle of citizenship of the Nigerian state, and has made ethnic conflict persist in the country. Compounding this problem is the fragmentation of the country into several states, which invariably brings conflict between the indigenes and the citizens within a state. This is manifested at several levels of the social-political and economic life of Nigerians.
Citizenship, it is said, is the hallmark of the modern nation-state. But in most of the so-called new states of Africa, Asia and Latin America, citizenship is quite a problematic issue, partly because most of these states are artificial colonial creations, and partly because they are bedevilled by enormous conflicts arising from the mosaics of centrifugal forces which separate them (Osaghae, 1990: 593). Citizenship has been given various connotations by scholars. Citizenship is a phenomenon associated with the state. It involves a strong identification with the state. It is a status that is applied to a person endowed with full political and civil rights in the state (Lenshie and Johnson, 2012). Alubo (2009) sees citizenship as a relationship between the individual and the state in relation to mutual rights, duties and obligations. Citizenship is also a form of participation in the running of the state and society, and in this sense an agency and subject.

According to Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (2006) the concept of citizenship is composed of three main elements, the first is citizenship as legal status of a person in his/her country, defined by civil, political and social rights. Here, the citizen is the legal person free to act according to the law and having the right to claim the law's protection. The second considers citizens specifically as political agents; actively participating in a society's political institutions and the third refers to citizenship as membership in a political community that furnishes a distinct source of identity. Therefore the institution of citizenship is the political product through which the state constitutes and perpetually reproduces itself as a form of social organization. Citizenship is an instrument of social closure through which the state lay claim to and defines its sovereignty, authority, legitimacy and identity. It is the means through which the modern nation-state made of
various nationalities seeks to forge a common identity and collective experience for its people.

Marshall (1992) sees citizenship as a status bestowed on those who are perceived to be full members of a community and that all who possess this status are equal with respect to the rights and duties with which the status is bestowed. In essence, citizenship is a principle of equality and, in theory, capable of enjoying socio-economic and political rights. The way, the idea of citizenship is perceived in Nigeria in relation to the protection of socio-economic and political rights of citizens are different from how it is seen and practiced elsewhere.

Citizenship has an integrating effect; or, at least an important ingredient in the integrating process that requires a direct sense of community membership based on loyalty to a civilization which is a common possession, with rights and protected by a common law. Contrary to this principle the state of Nigeria seem to have shifted from this reality which has made citizens, particularly those from the minority ethnic groups, believe that the state does not see them as relevant to national integration. This explains why the ethnic minorities of the Niger-Delta always feel neglected, hence their agitation for national recognition.

In a given state every citizen owes a duty to that state and the same state has a duty to protect the socio-economic and political rights of such citizens. Conceptually citizenship is mostly used in relation to the modern state. Structurally, citizenship involves what (Obianyo 2007) referred to as a reciprocal relationship between the individual's rights that is the benefits which his membership of the state entitles him to including the popular fundamental human rights and duties which the individual owes the state for the
enjoyment of his rights. For example, it is obligatory for every citizen to pay his/her taxes and the government in return ensures adequate provision of socio-economic and political goods. It does avail the state to provide rights equally for all its citizens who must, in turn, reciprocate by performing their civic duties.

Citizenship bestows equality of all citizens. Significantly this point of equality featured in the Nigerian constitutions of 1979 section 39(1) and (2) section 42 (1) and (2) of the 1999 constitution. It is provided that national integration shall be actively encouraged, whilst discrimination on the grounds of place of origin, sex, religions, status, ethnic or linguistic association or ties shall be prohibited. What this mean in essence is that citizenship in Nigeria refers to equality of socio-political and economic rights bestowed on all who are Nigerian citizens. In other words, all Nigerian citizens are equal not minding the place of their birth (state of origin) or where they reside.

In many ways, the identity dimension is the least straightforward of the three. Scholars tend to include under this heading many different things related to identity, both individual and collective, and social integration. Arguably, this is inescapable since citizens' subjective sense of belonging, sometimes called the “psychological” dimension of citizenship necessarily affects the strength of the political community's collective identity. This translates to mean that if citizens display a strong sense of belonging to the same political community, social cohesion is obviously strengthened. However, since many other factors can impede or encourage it, socio-political integration should be seen as an important goal that citizenship aims to accomplish rather than as one of its elements.
Citizenship is a term that defines a citizen as one who, by birth or naturalization, belongs to a state. Theoretically this is a problematic issue, what makes it a problem is in its practicability in assigning equal status both in theory and in practice to all citizens. In explaining ethnic citizenship and civic nationalism we are going to use state for ethnic and national for civic. The reason for this is because, Nigeria though has since been divided into states but there are still manifestations of ethnicism in the polity. More so nearly some of the states still exhibit the culture of majority wanting to sniff life out of the minorities in these states. As it were, while the state provides that all citizens are equal and should be treated equally, the centrifugal forces of ethnicity and regionalism among others produce discriminatory socio-political practices in the subunits of the state which of course contradict the constitutional provisions, by treating citizens unequally. One of the greatest problems states are facing particularly multi ethnic state like Nigeria in their search for national cohesion is sociological component of citizenship defined by differentiation.

Taken as a whole it thus means that these discriminatory policies and practices fundamentally will relegate non-citizens to the status of second class citizens in their own country; a status that can only be changed or escaped by the relocation of the affected citizen back to their state/community of origin. This phenomenon manifest at three levels: state and Local Government levels and at the worst at federal level where it is manifested as ethnicity.

States (ethnic groups) see this practice as a means of exerting their hegemonic control of their states on one hand and their ethnic groups on the other hand, thus preventing the incursion of other ethnic groups seen as “socio-economic and political parasites”. In
the Northern part of the country a non-citizen cannot be employed in the state civil service. Where he/she is employed, it will be on contract basis and with the understanding that if they have a qualify indigene, the non-indigene will be asked to give the so called indigene a place. Sometimes it may be an outright dismissal of non-indigenes. For example Imo state indigenes were dismissed from neighbouring Abia State’s civil service to accommodate their indigenes in October 2011 (Vanguard Newspaper, 14th October 2011). There is, therefore, preferential treatment given to citizens over those perceived as non-citizens in the appointment and promotion of public servants to protect the socio-economic rights of the citizens. This is not peculiar to the states in the North but also occurs in the states in the South. Perhaps the reason why non-citizens may not be promoted to higher positions, particularly very sensitive ones is the belief that if, a non-indigene is promoted to such a position, there is the probability the person would bring people from his/her state and eventually dominate such ministry/department. Thus, the lack of reciprocity in extending normal citizenship rights to non-indigenes in states other than their own has continued to make ethnicity a recurring phenomenon in the polity.

Politically, a non-citizen cannot be allowed to represent a state where he is adjudged to be a non-indigene in any elective and public political office. In essence, a citizen of Ogun state who has long been in Edo state may not likely be allowed to stand for a political office in order for him to represent a constituency in Edo state at federal or state level. If by chance the person scales this hurdle of the party nomination process, the probability is high that their non-citizenship status will be used against them.
One fact that has emerged from this situation is that a woman who becomes a citizen of another state by marriage would not be allowed to represent that state because she is not an indigene. For example, the former speaker of the House of Representatives, Mrs. Patricia Ette who is married to an Akwa-Ibomite represented Osun state her indigenous state and not Akwa-Ibom where her husband comes from. The only state that has appointed a non-indigene to occupy a political post is Lagos state. For example the present Osun state governor has been a commissioner in the Lagos state, but it should be noted that he is a Yoruba man and Lagos state is one of the states in South Western Nigeria.

Article 4 section (2) of the United State of America states that “the citizens of each state shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states” In essence there is common citizenship. But in Nigeria ethnicity is in the driver’s seat as a means of identifying Nigerian. This has shown that Nigerian states have not been able to transcend old ethnic cleavages. It does not matter how long a Nigerian has lived in a state, as long as he is not a citizen/indigene of that state by birth he cannot enjoy the right to fully participate in the public life of his state of residence.

Virtually all the states of the federation have their own institutions of higher learning ranging from Colleges of Education, Polytechnics to Universities. What has led to this is the politicization of educational policies of the states even at federal level where preference is given to the indigenes in admission and school fees. In the appointment of Principal officers of these institutions, the position of a Vice Chancellor, for example, cannot be given to a non-citizen no matter how long he/she has been there and neither does his/her year of professorship matter. A new trend that has been added to this
disintegrative system is the role being played by the federal government. For example during the military era, all the federal Universities were given the autonomy to elect their own Vice Chancellors but this policy was overturned where the supposed Vice Chancellor was not an indigene of the state where the University is located. Thus putting a question on the role of national unity and social integration these institutions would have facilitated. In a country like South Africa for example there is no such discrimination because citizenship is considered to be legal connection between a state and the person considered to be its nationals which entitles the person to socio-political and economic goods of the state irrespective of where the person comes from.

The argument here is that government policies, be it the Federal, State or Local Government, place the interests of indigenes above the “unwanted citizens” in order to maintain the domination of socio-economic power. This action has created the impression that Nigeria is not actually united in the real sense. This deepens ethnic cleavages in Nigeria and creates a situation where future generations would find it difficult to believe in one “indivisible Nigeria”.

In Nigeria citizenship is still largely a (primordial) group phenomenon rather than an attribute of individual political actors (Osaghae, 1990: 597). Reinhard Bendix cited in Osaghae (1990) distinguish between the functional representation principle and the plebiscitarían principle of citizenship. Under the functional representation principle, there is no direct relationship between the individual and the state; the individual is a citizen because the group (ethnic) to which he belongs is a part of the state, and he is represented by those who rule or lead his group. Under the plebiscitarían principle however, all powers intervening between the individual and the state must be destroyed
so that all citizens, as individuals possess equal rights before the sovereign national authority.

If the above assertion is applied to Nigerian citizenship, the constitutional provision which assumes that all citizens are equal is plebiscitarian, while that which requires belonging to a group indigenous to Nigeria is functional. Ekeh cited in Osaghae (1990) believes the first is civic citizenship and, the second, primordial citizenship. The (Nigerian) effort to integrate these two types citizenship is more or less the basis of the problems of citizenship in Nigeria. Accordingly, it means that there are two levels of citizenship. The first is state (ethnic) citizenship, meaning that one is an indigene of a particular state, and the other, national (civic) citizenship, meaning that, at a larger level one belongs to Nigeria, suggesting that Nigerian citizenship is still hanging on a balance. While the first is mutually exclusively, preventing non-indigenes of a state from citizenship where non-indigenes and indigene’s are treated differently, the other is all-inclusive, and provides that all citizens are equal. What this portends is that there is still no common citizenship in Nigeria.

The implication of this is that a Yoruba person can only belong to one group and it is the status of his/her group that boost his/her own status. Put in another word as a Yoruba person he is from the majority and if he belongs to Ijaw that makes him a minority person. Explaining further it means all groups as well as all Nigerians are not equal in terms of national relevance and access to political power. According to Osaghae (1990) to emphasize the facts that there are two levels of citizenship in Nigeria and that while every Nigerian is a citizen of the Nigerian state, they could lose their citizenship statuses in state other than those of their origin.
Observably, state (ethnic) citizenship contradicts the constitutional provisions on national citizenship. As Osoba and Usman cited in Osaghae (1990: 600) put it, this dubious notion of state citizenship is even more stringent and biologically determined than national citizenship, in the sense that it does not make on state citizenship comparable provisions to those on national citizenship by registration or naturalization. In spite of the rhetorical and platitudinous pronouncements on the duty of the state to encourage free mobility of people throughout the country and to secure full residence rights for every citizen in all parts of the country, a culpable implication of its definition of state citizenship is that non matter for how long a Nigerian has resided in a state of Nigeria of which none of his parents is an indigene, such a Nigerian cannot enjoy the right to participate fully in the public life of that state.

Clearly defined under state (ethnic) citizenship, the individual cannot belong to all the thirty six states – this states has been grouped into six geo-political zones with each of these zones having major and minority ethnic groups – or all the ethnic groups which make up the Nigerian federation which alone can guarantee that he is not discriminated against in any part of the federation. Logically the implication of this is that though one is a Nigerian citizen, arguably, outside one’s state (ethnic) of origin, one is not a citizen.

One phenomenon that will help us to understand citizenship (ethnic and civic) is the need to look at how colonialism created a split in the personality of average Nigerian under colonial rule. Until recently, engagement with state–society relations in Nigeria has been dominated by the idea of a divided society as espoused by Ekeh (cited in Aiyede, 2009). To him, colonialism worked to set state and society apart in Nigeria. The forces of the colonial state alienated the individual and led to the emergence of two
domains; the primordial (ethnic) domain, which is the domain of modern social formations associated with ancient structures of kinship, and the civic domain, which is the political space within which the formal state operates. This division has created a dilemma for public accountability and collective action because people are attached and committed to the primordial domain against the civic public realm. Predatory rule reflects the underlying illegitimacy of the civic realm. Morality holds sway in the primordial realm, but the civic realm is amoral. Politicians are inclined to steal from the civic realm for personal benefit and for the benefit of the primordial realm.

As espoused earlier the most noticeable feature of British colonial rule from the very beginning was the divide and rule style of administration of the Northern and Southern parts of the country. While Western education, mainly sponsored by the missionaries, thrived in the South and was fully embraced by southerners, British officials, especially in the North, were opposed to missionary penetration of the North, apparently to protect the Islamic North from the debasement of missionaries and Western education. The result was a Southern lead in Western education and other so-called modernizing forces, such as urbanization, schools and commercial enterprise.

In addition to the unevenness of modernizing forces, economic resources were also unevenly spread. The North was landlocked and depended on the south for outlets to the sea, while at various point, the bulk of revenue yielding cash crops was derived from the south opines Osaghae (1990). What this resulted to was a spate of mutual suspicions and hostilities occasioned by fears that the more advanced groups could dominate the less advanced ones. This fear was particularly rife in the North because, as the nationalist movement gathered momentum, the Southern and Western educated
elites emerged as champions of self-government. The emergence of regions in the mid-forties precisely 1946 with the introduction of Arthur Richards constitution; therefore gave the ethnic leaders an avenue for protecting their interests and averting foreign (non-indigenes) domination. The emergent political class in the regional parties therefore advocates for regional protectionism because; to belong to the national league of political class at the centre they had to have control of regional homelands. Any threats to their control were repelled by threats of secession or calls for confederation. For example the North threatened to secede in 1953, the South East called for a confederal system in 1967 and their attempt to secede finally led to the civil war of 1967-1970 (Crowder, 1978).

Under this circumstance, it was inevitable that the regions which formed the federation in 1954 would be very powerful and to a large extent, autonomous. The push for regional autonomy was enhanced by the creation of regional legislative houses, public services, judiciary to mention the most significant ones. The end was regionalism, a principle which seeks to attribute to a unit within a federation a distinct individuality, with a claim upon the loyalty of its inhabitants competing with, if not overriding, loyalty to the federal state. In practice, the North existed only for Northerners, the East for Easterners, and the Western for Westerners.

Dudley cited in Osaghae (1990: 604) comments that in many different ways, the Nigerian citizen now found he had to live with the fact of regionalism. The regionalization of the bureaucracy meant that the civil servant no longer had a choice of what region he could serve or, for the prospective civil servant, a choice of where to seek employment. The regionalization of the public service meant that the civil servant
could now work or seek employment only in his region of origin. Easterners working in the West had to move to the East or face the loss of employment and what applied to the west applied equally to the other regions.

Simply put regionalism under this system meant that a region (West, East or North) existed only for its citizens as all non-citizens were discriminated against virtually in all spheres of socio-political and economic life. Within the regions, the ethnic majorities (Hausa/Fulani, Yoruba, and Igbo) never give the ethnic minorities the chance to enjoy socio-political and economic rights like the majority. Although they belonged to the regions as well as to the federation, the minorities could never hope to rule both in the regions and at the centre. The implication of this is that if the institutions of a state favour one ethnic group among its citizenry, the only members of that group will feel themselves fully a part of the life of the state. True citizenship equality, therefore, is only realizable in a state that is based on civic peoplehood observed Levine (2013). Hence, their agitation for separate states, and more so foremost advocates of a strong federal system which, they reckoned could chunk the oppression of the majority-dominated regions.

Therefore it is not surprising that during colonial administration the anti-colonial political struggle in Nigeria was couched in the language of citizenship. Ethnic expressions gained meaning as the independent movements sought to mobilize the rural population in the liberation struggle. There are three major political parties in the era of decolonization; the Northern Peoples Congress, the Action Group and the National Council for Nigerian Citizens; these political parties reflected ethnic configurations in their origin and character. Arguably the interaction of the twin-factors of the colonial
antecedent and the direction of state policy combined to shape the nature of the post-colonial identity of Nigeria.

What the above portends is that post-colonial politics was destined to be ethnic because the mainstream of the nationalists mediated the link between the people and the post-colonial state through political ethnicities. For example when the country returned to civil rule 1979, all the political parties were ethnically inclined in their policies and programs, the states became separatist in character, placing primary emphasis on the welfare of their citizens against non-citizens. In the West where the Unity Party of Nigeria controlled five states – old Oyo, Ondo, Bendel, Ogun and Lagos – non-citizens were excluded from enjoying the party’s free education programme while, in many of the states, discriminatory fees were introduced for indigenes and non-indigenes (Osaghae, 1990). As it was in the regions, it became increasingly difficult for people to get employed in states other than their own and, where they got, they were in some cases given contract appointments.

Significantly the colonial policy of indirect rule under the native authority system which divided African society into two namely civic and native (ethnic) formed the basis for the creation of ethnic citizenship. The bifurcated native of African society created by colonial policy of divide and rule and the fact that ethnic identity formed the basis of a person’s participation in the colonial society helped to create and sustain ethnic citizenship. This makes conflict resolution difficult and citizenship within the nation almost unmanageable. More importantly, the British Indirect Rule froze and conserved each group culturally and technically following the triumph of colonialism in 1900.
Mamdani (2001: 654) made a very insightful analysis of the policy of divide and rule and how it was revolutionized in the post-colonial era. From his explanation, colonialism divided the population into races and ethnicities. Ethnicities were horizontally demarcated and governed by tradition. There was no sharp division between colonizers and the colonized but rather a nuance of relations; there were master races and subject races. Master races were the colonizers, subject races were middle men, and their position was marked by petty privilege economically and preferential treatment legally. Subject races could be non-indigenous migrants, such as Indians, or were constructed as non-indigenous by the colonial powers, like the Tutsi of Rwanda and Burundi. Ethnic groups were the colonized. While the rule of law circumscribed power, government by tradition used the language of custom and custom was enforced. It did not circumscribe power. The real institution for governing the African was therefore the native authority as the case in Nigeria. Therefore the colonial state was an ethnic federation of many native authorities.

Colonialism prevented mostly inter-regional co-operation between each group in regard to inter-group and cross-cultural leadership, hence, no mechanism for the making of socio-political development existed, these factors lead to the category of ethnicity based on inter-ethnic group rivalry. As matters turned out, ethnicity nurtures communal violence and ethno-religious conflicts in the country. Thus ethnic citizenship has its theoretical roots in cultural citizenship, and practically in colonial policy of divide and rule with each possessing a duality that is seemingly contradictory, universal citizenship emphasizing equality before the law, and cultural specificity which emphasizes socially
constructed differences that can be used to claim distinct socio-political and economic rights.

In post-colonial Nigeria the forces of regionalism loomed larger than ever, producing in their wake, the series of events such as political cynicism and regionalism, exacerbated by the North having greater influence than the West and East combined. There were strikes, and political instability in the West. In January 1966 there was a coup headed by officers of Eastern origin, followed by another coup staged by the Northern officers, which eventually led to the collapse of the First Republic and the subsequent civil war.

In an attempt to ensure peace and stability as well as national unity the forces of regionalism was destroyed by dividing the country into states. As explained earlier in this work though regionalism seems to have been destroyed with states creation but what has emerged today is as much force as regionalism had, and, in some cases, with greater force.

In a broad-spectrum however, the emergence of states is as similar as regionalism this is because the states always ensure the full protection of their socio-political and economic interests, serving only their citizens. As before, non-citizens are discriminated against and denied citizenship rights even though they – citizen of other ethnic group – perform duties required of them. This is the present threat to citizenship in Nigeria as well as socio-political development.

Citizenship principles as it applies to most states (ethnic groups in Nigeria) do not accord citizen equal rights in the state. This is because it also tends to exclude those who have not been endowed with full citizens’ rights. The people that come under this category are often referred to as settlers or non-indigenes; as the case in Nigeria
system. The categorization of citizenship on this paradigm is enhanced by status of birth (the law of blood), law of place, and naturalization Kazah-Toure (cited in Leshie and Johnson, 2012). The unequal treatment of ethnic groups on certain basis of identity is central to citizenship question. Citizenship question in Nigeria is a contested outcome of individual and group struggles for rights to participate and enjoy socio-economic and political welfare that would significantly enhance development.

From the framework of this study one can also explain civic and ethnic citizenship in Nigerian within the background of her federal system this is because, it is the system that provides the institutional basis for states to exist separately at one level, and the federal government to exist at another. What this implies is that in a federal system, every citizen is subject to two levels of governments which both act directly upon him without interference on the activities of each other. As a result of this the notions of state (ethnic) citizenship and national (civic) citizenship, as they correspond to the two levels of government may be said to be necessary aides of a federal system. But this is not to suggest that before the eventual adoption of a federal system, there was no discriminatory system of differentiating between indigenes and non-indigenes in the provision of rights in Nigeria.

As urban centres developed and opportunities for education, white collar jobs, business and other commercial enterprises developed, but largely because of the transformation of the economy marked by increasing competition for economic resources and its benefits, an indigeneity complex involving a “son of the soil” syndrome developed (Osaghae, 1990). The Yoruba of the West will say “Omo wa ni”. The major aim was to protect the interests and claims of indigenes to their homelands against all non-
indigenes who were denied the basic socio-political and economic rights, notwithstanding the fact that they also contributed so much as the indigenes did in terms of their duties to the communities. During the colonial era in the Northern Nigeria Sabongaris were created for non-citizens, to differentiate them from citizens. This has extended to the South even in post-colonial era, where the Hausas leaves and trade majorly in Sabongari markets.

From the foregoing the constitutional provision of the principle of “Federal Character”, an ethnic formula for the allocation of public goods which was designed as a political technique for managing Nigeria’s federal system; of giving equal opportunities to all ethnic groups, has proved to be largely counter-productive, especially in respect to the idea of common nation identity and citizenship reward. The federal character clause, according to (Aiyede, 2009) was first instituted in the 1979 Constitution, section 14 (3), to ensure inclusiveness in government. In practice it is interpreted and operationalized as a means of distributing state amenities and opportunities, including public employment, on an equal basis among the states and localities of the federation. The principle seems to have placed ethnic identity as the primary identity for state entitlements and socio-political rights. The principle has de-individualized citizenship and made it more of a group phenomenon. Thus in attaining or gaining access to state socio-political and economic institutions, the individual does not relate with the state directly as citizen, but relates with the state as a member/representative of an ethnic group.

The deleterious effects of federal character itself could be attributed to the continuing unevenness in the rates of development among the states. If the states are not
protective of their interests, it is possible that well qualified people from states whose federal quotas (allocations) are already saturated would migrate to states where low educational advancement has resulted in the inability to fill their quotas in many federal institutions. Even in the saturated states, it is apparently unwise to allow non-indigenes to compete with indigenes for the very few places available. Arguably then, for as long as development among states remains uneven, states would necessarily have to be protective of their interests (Osaghae, 1990).

This has made the central government a showground of ethnic competition with the more powerful ethnic groups excluding and submerging the minority ones and denying them the benefits of citizenship. For example whenever a Hausa, Yoruba or Igbo man is in power, other ethnic group are supposedly left out of the scheme of things. In essence the legacies of ethnicity speak of the failure of the Nigerian state to address popular demands for a more just and equitable form of citizenship. Significantly, the need to overcome the politics of exclusion, expressed within the dynamics of ethnicity, must be extended to the task of redefining the concepts of ethnicity and citizenship. The importance arises because the debate on citizenship brings forth the challenge of examining the tension between ethnic citizen and civic (national) citizen.

With regard to the institutional dimension, the logic of dualism in the state structure has not been obliterated. Rather it has reproduced and assumed a new dimension. The nature of the dichotomy between the central and local states, though reformed, still has implications for the issues of citizenship in the present day Nigeria. While national citizenship was liberalized with civil laws applicable to all, the state remains largely ethicized (Awoshakin, 2002). For example the idea of “One Indivisible Nigeria”
notwithstanding contained in the anthem and pledge to give a sense of single national identity to every citizen, the definition of a citizen of Nigeria as stipulated in the 1999 constitution section 25 (1a) is rooted largely in primordial origins. An individual's membership or origin in an ethnic group or community is a major criterion for the qualification of citizenship. Thus citizenship gains expression more from the primordial, than the civic perspective in Nigeria. In fact the Nigerian legal concept of citizenship fosters communal violence and ethnic conflict.

Significantly citizenship question in Nigeria polity is invoked when there is an entrenchment of ethnicity and other primordial factors such as the manipulation of ethnicity by the political class and the monopoly of political power by a dominant ruling class from particular ethnic group while others are deprived of sharing power. The inability of the state to make adequate socio-political and economic provisioning heightens sentiments among ethnic groups directed against one another and the state, thereby depriving the state of the needed loyalty. The predominantly ethnic understanding of nationhood in Nigeria is very hard to reconcile with liberal-democratic politics because it implicitly recognizes full citizenship rights only for the majority ethnic group.

At the national level the logic of difference of an ethnic nature is factored into the rules, and norms of political interactions and the state system especially with regard to social rights. Ethnic citizenship as opposed to civic citizenship in Nigeria seems to be the determinant factor of who gets what, when, how, and how much in the state. Issues of employment, public appointments, education grants, scholarships, etc. are subjected to ethnic arithmetic by the central state. Unarguably ethnicity indirectly is an entrenched
system of discrimination, a negation of the constitutional provisions on national citizenship in Nigeria because, it involves state citizenship which makes non-indigenes of a state in which they reside, non-citizens.

Any search for solutions to the problems of ethnic vis-à-vis civic citizenship must, of necessity, begin with recognition that, in new states bedevilled by centrifugal forces, citizenship in its national dimension is a vehicle of national integration as well as socio-political and economic development. What this means is that citizenship will almost certainly remain problematic for as long as the rates of development among the states are uneven.

5.6 Development under siege

The assertion that Nigeria is a creation of British colonialism is no longer irrefutable. Driven by economic considerations, the colonialists annulled the sovereignty and independence of the hitherto disparate autonomous socio-political entities which had inhabited Nigeria. The conquest of the country by the British inevitably led to the establishment of a system of administration alien to the people. The consequence of this resort is that the various nationalities inhabiting Nigeria have not been welded into a nation, in which all of them would have a stake it rather provided a favourable environment for mutual suspicion and distrust among the disparate groups in Nigeria (Bello, 2012).

Much has been espoused on how the British colonial administration reinforced the policy of divide and rule, a policy which formed the foundation of post-colonial Nigeria. The problem of acrimonious existence among the diverse ethnic groups and interests in
Nigeria leading to mutual distrust, suspicion and inter-communal conflicts has become perennial and endemic in the nation’s body politic and has worked against the socio-political and economic development of the country. As a result of mutual suspicion existing among the various ethnic groups, whatever the issue at hand in Nigeria, the patterns of reaction to it will be determined by ethnic considerations.

The working of this post-colonial variant of the divide and rule strategy is clearly evident in the practice of federalism in Nigeria, in the way citizenship in Nigeria is defined and their access to government opportunities and services, as institutionalized by some innovative federal principles introduced to promote national belongingness, loyalty, and even socio-political and economic development. This situation no doubt impedes efforts at national unity as it applies to the building of a united Nigeria out of the incongruent ethnic, geographic, social, economic and religious elements in the country.

One question that rightly comes to mind here are what efforts had been made and what are the effects of these efforts considering the fact that most of these efforts were geared towards development and sustainability of the polity but the uncivil politics that revolve around socio-political and economic policies has since been an impediment to development in Nigeria. Policy (ies) is defined as governmental socio-political actions or course of actions, or proposed actions or course of proposed actions that are directed at achieving certain developmental goals (Ikelegbe, 2006).

Ethnic culture arguably is a complex socio-political phenomenon; defined as a set of beliefs about the superiority and differences of one’s ethnic group and a defence of its socio-political and economic interest above all others. In the theoretical model of loyalty writes Aluko (2009) allegiance and loyalty of a typical Nigerian is illustrated below, first,
a typical Nigerian thinks of self before others. And when he or she thinks of others, the thought is about member of both the nuclear and the extended families. From that level a typical Nigerian think of people from his/her native town or village and then to the level of his/her ethnic group. And from the level of the ethnic group, the final stage to be reached is that of the nation. Everyone puts the nation last in the scheme of things. What this translates to mean is that an average Nigerian is more committed to his/her ethnic group more than the national cause; hence the low level of socio-political and economic development in the polity.

Arguably one can aptly say here that one significant dimension of the problem with ethnic nationalism is that most Nigerians are not patriotic. Right from 1960, the national question, as far as Nigeria is concerned, has been thrown into the river and ever since, it has since been replaced with individualism, ethnicism, regionalism, favouritism and parochialism. To worsen matters, hardly one could find loyalty to a socio-political cause, a symbiotic construct of patriotism, in an average Nigerian. The highest levels of loyalty are expressed at the sub-national levels. The common explanation for this is that Nigeria is not doing enough to attract the patriotism of its citizens.

Fayemi (2013) comments that ethnic attachments on the part of Nigerian leaders have been described as the bane of the practice of true federalism in Nigeria. On federalism and the quest for national integration which is the awareness of a common identity amongst the citizens of a country; though we belong to different ethnic group, religions and speak different languages we recognize the fact that we are all one, and very important to socio-political and economic development in Nigeria. The character of leadership since the advent of federalism in Nigeria has betrayed the concept of true
federalism as they only advocated federalism in name, but actually worked towards the accrual of advantage to their ethnic units. He added that the question of citizenship in Nigeria has prevented many Nigerians from operating effectively outside their (ethnic) states of birth, saying that this primordial sense of identity in relation to a space precludes a person from being granted equal status like another who was born or locates his/her origin in that state.

Equally, the character of the leadership that Nigeria has experienced since the advent of a federal system in the country has constituted a very significant challenge that has been remarkably formulated into the notion of Two Publics, Ekeh cited in Fayemi (2013) which make ethnic affiliations and affirmation privileged over the national good. As such, some of Nigeria's leaders/rulers have been described as nationalists by day and ethnicist by night, as they only advocated federalism in name, but actually worked towards the accrual of advantage to their ethnic units.

Mustapha cited in Alubo (2004) opines that while the nation-building project was going on, along with the rhetoric of national unity, old patterns of exclusion and domination were continued and new ones invented. Consequently, the reality of nation-building was often that some ethnic groups consolidated their grip on state institutions to the exclusion of others. The promise of common citizenship therefore remained largely unrealized. This thus makes the competition for power so fierce, because if an ethnic group loses at the centre, it has lost all. This is more so because politics is a zero-sum game in Nigeria. The way power is obtained and used in Nigeria is usually in terms of what the various ethnic nationalities can benefit; this has been a great challenge to socio-political and economic development of the country.
From the foregoing it is significantly important to say that socio-political and economic development is at its lowest ebb considering the spate of ethnic conflict over distribution of political goods. Responsible for this is the coloration of the polity into ethnic and national culture where citizens are more loyal to their ethnic affinity than to the national. Arguably there are two levels of citizenship in Nigeria (ethnic and civic citizenship). Responsible citizenship no doubt is a basic requirement for sustainable socio-political development and nationhood. National development is an aggregation of the aspects of the society’s development effort. It borders on political, economic, social, cultural, educational and technological. Every society desires to attain maximum development. Put differently without responsible citizenship – a situation where every Nigerian sees himself/herself as a member of the national body – developmental goals may not likely be achievable. Nigeria would like to promote the sense of oneness for all Nigerians. Yet through its uncivil political practices it has not only retained the original differentiated identities that have characterized the area since the colonial period, but has added to the sense of divided identities in its citizens.

In Nigeria citizenship must be seen as very significant to the conception and practice of democracy where every citizen would be treated as equal regardless of state (ethnic) affiliation with respect to making socio-political development as the basis for participation in governance. Citizenship in a democratic society is an important criterion for understanding inclusive and exclusive citizenship and a guiding principle to inclusive governance. Put differently where certain groups are excluded from participating in political processes on the basis of the fact that they are not citizen of that state (ethnic group) socio-political development will relapse. Inclusive citizenship arguably has the
political capacity to drive the transformative process from ethnic conflict to peace, seek to transform the society from one that resorts to violence to one that resorts to political means to resolve conflict and shape the framework of the political system to elicit socio-political development. In essence ethnic citizenship is tantamount to denial of socio-political and economic rights which negates developments.

As noted by Ayoade (1998) going by the constitutional definition of Nigerian citizenship, a dangerous dichotomy has developed between Nigerian citizenship and nativity of a state similar to the situation in the colonial period when Nigerians living outside their states (ethnics) of origin were regarded as native foreigners. This category of Nigerians did not enjoy full citizenship rights in those states to which they migrated. Thus the implementation of the federal character principle tended more to differentiate than to integrate. Hence, its effect on Nigeria’s socio-political development.

This brings us once again to the principle of federal character. Much as one would say the principle is a laudable one. In theory it refers to the distinctive desire of the peoples of Nigeria to promote national unity, foster national loyalty and give every citizen of Nigeria a sense of belonging to the nation notwithstanding the diversities of ethnic origin, culture, language or religion which may exist and which it is their desire to nourish, harness to the development of Nigeria.

The regime of federal character in Nigeria negates various definitions of national or territorial integration that will engender development. It has been argued that the principle will make for a more equal federation to which more people will owe loyalty because, they see themselves represented meaningfully therein but unfortunately, the principle while stressing the imperative of ethnic balancing, invariably enthrones
ethnicity and deemphasizes, the nation. In the process, too, it strengthens the parochial, particularistic orientations and individual ethnic attachments of Nigerians. Thus by focusing on regional and ethnic representation, federal character exacerbates differentiation instead of enhancing mutual trust, accommodation and national development. Hence, the basis of disaffection among various ethnic groups in Nigeria with its attendant effect on Nigeria’s socio-political and economic development.

5.7 Conclusion

The phenomenon of ethnicity in Nigeria has become the most essential aspect of national identity in Nigerian political system; this is because people are more susceptible to their ethnic identity than being a Nigerian. From all the discussions made so far it is obviously clear that the socio-political and economic development of Nigeria is on shaky grounds. As long as the problem of uncivil politics anchored by ethnic nationalism and the coloration of citizenship where the determinant of socio-political right of citizens hinges on their ethnic affiliation remains; national integration will continue to elude the polity. As it is today in Nigeria, arguably, there seems to be no empirical socio-political evidence to suggest that ethnic divisions and the nationalism attached to it are losing their significance in any part of the country.

The interplay of ethnic culture as supported by the politics of citizenship in Nigeria has meant persistent threat to socio-political and economic development and national integration. The preponderance of the spirit of ethnic culture as discussed earlier in this work has given rise to the emergence of ethnic militias all over the country. For example Odua Peoples Congress (OPC) for the Yoruba nationality, Arewa Peoples Congress
(APC) for the Hausa/Fulani nationality, and Bakassi Boys for the Igbo nationality and Egbesu Boys for the Ijaw nationality. The emergence of these ethnic militias translates to an increase in the level of political violence, and ethnic conflicts with its attendant effects on development and national cohesion.

Within the Nigerian experience, the access to political power is vital in determining the allocation and distribution of resources, and it provides the opportunity for those who control power to expropriate a large percentage of the wealth from the resources to their own advantage, even at the expense of those who possess the resources. And, while this control and mode of distribution in Nigeria have been highly contentious, they have also been underscored by numerous socio-political and economic policies that place ethnic loyalty above national loyalty. Therefore this had made the interplay of ethnic culture vis-à-vis national culture a hindrance to socio-political development as well as national integration.
CHAPTER SIX

6.1 Conclusion

Ethnicity in Nigeria, no doubt, has been a significant challenge to the socio-political development of the country; not because the phenomenon is in itself dangerous but that the tendency is for political leaders to manipulate it. Thus, the functionality of ethnicity can either be negative or positive. Ethnicity can be problematic if not managed properly and at the same time, a highly rewarding phenomenon if well managed, which means that ethnicity will continue to remain a force to be reckoned with notwithstanding the strategic mechanisms adopted to diffuse its flame.

Arguably, one can reason that ethnicity can be a powerful force for national development where its potentiality is fully recognized and judiciously exploited. This brings us to the realization that every ethnic group in the country; notwithstanding size, has its own strength and weaknesses. It is the responsibility of the political leaders to discover and mobilize the strength of each ethnic group in the polity for the socio-political and economic development of the country. Furthermore, development may not be accomplished without conflict since conflict to some extent exposes the inherent cohesion of every ethnic group and their socio-economic and political needs. Sometimes ethnic conflicts suggest a means through which the problem of socio-political inequality could be resolved. Change, they say, is inevitable if development is going to take place, therefore, the country must arm itself with the right socio-political and economic tools for it to achieve the desired goals. Ethnicity in Nigeria should be seen as an additional variable when its potential is recognized and developed as well. As Chien (1982) has put it; it is the responsibility of those involved in the administration
of a multi ethnic state to mobilize the socio-political and economic strengths of each ethnic group as leverage to resource-input towards the realization of the goals of socio-political and economic development.

This study has demonstrated that the colonial government did not take the diverse nature of the pre-colonial ethnic groups in Nigeria into consideration, while trying to have administrative (socio-political and economic) ease of flow. One can thus conclude that the challenges that ethnicity poses to the sustainability of Nigerian socio-political integration had its roots in the colonial administrative system carried to the post-colonial period along with self-inflicted ethnic motivated socio-political and economic policies of Nigeria political leaders. The result of all this is ethnic conflict over the allocation of distributive socio-political and economic goods.

This study has also demonstrated that the tripodal satisfaction of the three major ethnic groups, which has led Nigerians till the present to assume that the only people that matter in Nigeria are the Yoruba, Hausa and Igbo; is significant to ethnic conflict in Nigeria. Put differently the struggle for socio-economic and political goods to revolve around the tripartite ethnic groups and thus making every other ethnic group in the polity feel dominated, not only at national level but also within the states of the federation. The inequality in socio-economic development among geographic units in Nigeria is disquieting and has resulted in dissension among geographic units of the same state due to the imbalance in socio-economic development. Therefore the increasing insecurity and indeterminacy of existence that faces the various ethnic groups particularly the minority ethnic groups one way or the other is linked to conflicts over the allocation of resources. In essence the determination of resource distribution based on
the three main ethnic and geographic groups in Nigeria – the Hausa-Fulani, Yoruba and Igbo – have been one of the reasons why the problem of ethnicity has remained intractable.

Where one or two ethnic groups are getting more “attention” in terms of the allocation of distributive socio-political and economic goods, perhaps as a result of their hegemonic control of the central government, there will always be conflict. Nigeria, definitely, is a multi-ethnic (which make the country a multi linguistic state) and a multi religious state. What this implies is that the deeper the level of ethnic cleavages; the lower the level of socio-political and economic trusts which invariably translates to socio-political and economic underdevelopments within the polity. In other words, the need to build trust among the various ethnic groups in Nigeria cannot be overemphasized.

However ethnic conflict notwithstanding, the various socio-political and integrative mechanisms such as decentralized governance, the federal character principle, power sharing, human rights and the adoption of multi-party democratic system to manage ethnic conflict have become part of the Nigerian polity. This is as a result of the consistent maintenance of a highly centralized socio-political and economic system which has placed the tripartite ethnic groups in a vantage position. In addition, the incompatibility of ethnic groups within the states in terms of language, culture and even political awareness, weak and corrupt socio-political and economic institutions, the systemic exclusion of the majority minority ethnic groups from laying claim to the Nigerian state through the construction of the Nigerian political system around the three major ethnic groups, the complexity of socio-political and economic differences of the ethnic groups in the polity as well as systemic discriminatory and exclusive policies
motivated by ethnic consciousness in the name of indigenship make ethnicity in Nigeria polity a significant feature in competition for scarce distributive socio-economic and political goods.

Nevertheless ethnic differences in Nigeria can still be maximized to enhance socio-political and economic development which means that ethnicity can be deconstructed and reconstructed, to borrow the words of Osifo (2009) in a way that will encompass all ethnic groups through which a more stable polity can be obtained and taking into consideration the complicated nature of ethnicity in the country. A multifaceted socio-political and economic approach is needed. In essence it is possible to approach the challenges of ethnicity from many perspectives. Thus, for the Nigerian State to move forward, calls for the reconstruction of the polity, where every ethnic group will be included and see the task of nation building more important and above ethnic loyalty. The recommendations in the following section will go a long way in supporting this.

6.2 The Way Forward

From an understanding of ethnic composition of Nigeria, there should be different methods through which the ethnic groups in Nigeria can be composed into states (provinces). Considering the dynamic distribution of ethnic groups in Nigeria prior to the state creation experiment that gave birth to the current 36 states, there were majority and minority ethnic groups within the polity. This indicates that the ethnic composition of Nigeria raises more question than answers. Consequently, consideration should be given to the diversity and the homogeneity of each state to be created, in terms ethnic group, size, and economic viability. The religious factor is also crucial. Furthermore,
consideration must be given to the fact that there are many different socio-political and economic challenges that are peculiar to each ethnic group as well as each ethnic group’s interests politically and economically.

The suggestion therefore is that the creation of states (province) should be done in a way that will make each state a uni-ethnic group instead of the present multi-ethnic ones. Nigeria can take a cue from India’s experiment when its former 29 states were reconstituted into 14 states in 1956 with each state having the same language as well as equal socio-political and economic status. It will help resolve the question of citizenship and indigeneship which poses more challenges for the unity and socio-political integration of the country.

Regional imbalances and overall national development in Nigeria, has been perpetuated in the country over time. The result has been the prevailing and unwarranted uneven distribution of socio-political and economic resources and benefits of development; the brunt of which have been bored by the minorities. What this translates to mean is that decades after independence Nigeria has fell short of evolving a strong mechanism to mediate and reconcile a series of conflicts and contradictions that arose from the nation’s constellation of economic, socio-political and ethnic forces on one hand. On the other hand the socio-political and economic distributive mechanism of federal character has been used by the political class to serve ethnic interest at the expense of national development and national integration. What the nation is witnessing has been inter-ethnic competition and winner takes all politics. The tripod theory of power which has subsisted in Nigeria since the First Republic seems to have encouraged unhealthy rivalry among the three major ethnic groups,
notwithstanding the fragmentation of the country into smaller states. The major ethnic
groups particularly the Hausa-Fulani used federal might to concentrate federal
expenditure in their region. Put in another word the ethnic group with political power
use the opportunity of having federal power to mobilize and divert federal revenues,
infra-structures, industries, public work projects and federal patronage to their ethnic
home land.

It is no longer news that the reconstruction of the old 3 regions into the present day 36
states provides leverage for fierce competition for socio-economic and political goods,
the resultant effect of which is ethnic conflict. To some extent, the discriminatory attitude
of the majority ethnic group against the minority ethnic group within these states is a
product of what Osaghae (1994) described as the centre-inspired competition that
underpins these cleavages. Hence, there is the need for basic information on each
ethnic group at least before any decision is taken. This may, eventually throw light on
the ethnic situation in the country, as well help to avoid ethnic conflict.

The search for a balanced and sustainable state (politically, economically and socially)
can end in reconstructing the country, taking into consideration it’s the ethnic
composition. One basic fact that has greatly undermined Nigeria’s socio-political and
economic stability is its structural imbalance even after the fragmentation of the country
into its current 36 states (with 774 local government areas) and the subsequent division
of the states into 6 geo-political zones for the purpose of administration and distribution
of socio-political goods, but the fact remains that within these zones lie powerful
majority ethnic groups, making it difficult to diffuse the flames of ethnic conflict in
Nigeria. Therefore the major ethnic groups of the Hausa-Fulani in the North can be
divided into three, the Yoruba of the West as one and the Igbo as one taking into consideration language, culture and religion. The remaining major-minority groups can be reconstructed into a number of homogeneous separate states. For example the ethnic groups in the present Benue, Plateau (excluding the Hausa ethnic groups which are expected to join the Hausa of the North) and the Igalas from the present Kogi state can become one state (province) considering the religious factor. The same can be done to the Ijaw in Ondo state, Edo, Delta Urhobo, Bayelsa, Rivers, Akwa-Ibom and Cross Rivers in the Southern part of the country taking into consideration religious affinity and language. This of course should be in form of well-grounded provincial governance like that of South Africa.

Where there are ethnic cleavages there should be a political system that unequivocally allows adequate representation of every ethnic group; thus replacing the current electoral system of First-Past-The-Post System used in the country with the Proportional Representative System. It's been argued by scholars that there cannot be a perfect electoral system. Every electoral system has its flaws and peculiar problems. One can argue that what makes an electoral system a perfect one for a state depends on what the populace intends to achieve (politically, socially and economically) through the adopted electoral system. In other words, the primary goal behind the adoption of an electoral system should of a necessity be whether the product of such system will enhance the sustainability of the country’s socio-political system. Whichever type of electoral system is adopted should be seen as a means to an end (socio-political stability).
Based on the discussion above, one can advance here that Proportional Representation seems to be the best option for Nigeria. The reason is that it will give an accurate translation of votes into parliamentary seats to use Gerard Newman’s (2006) words. Every political party big or small would be represented as well. It is important to develop an integrative socio-political system/frame-work that will explicitly recognise the participatory role of every ethnic group. It is also important to note that differences are important to socio-political development; this will reinforce the fact that ethnocentric and exclusionary socio-political policies are alien to socio-political development.

Under this system it will be difficult for one ethnic group to deprive others of their claim on the Nigeria state. This is because the system will guarantee adequate representation of every ethnic group in the parliament. This however does not necessarily mean that ethnic conflict will be completely wiped out. The suggestion is that it will be much easier to manage ethnicity within the polity. This, to some extent, will promote better socio-political integration and enhance the sustainability of socio-economic and political development.

One significant fact that needs to be pointed out is that the functionality of the socio-political system in a pluralistic state depends on the ability of the administrative system to identify the strengths and the weaknesses inherent in each ethnic group. A systemic political and economic approach can be exploited to better the country’s development, on the one hand. On the other hand, the country’s socio-political and economic strength arguably can only come from the unity of its ethnic groups and the fact that the differences (socially, economically and politically) in the ethnic groups if utilized can make the country a great, peaceful and a developed nation.
In other words, not all the ethnic groups are economically and politically strong. The weaknesses and strengths of an ethnic group can be measured by its ability to mobilize its political and economic resources for developmental objectives. This is the reason why development must be seen as a political process that will involve every ethnic group through functional socio-political and economic institutions. In essence “development must be total and inclusive of all ethnic groups irrespective of where they stay and what they do”, Abolarin (Tell Magazine, January, 2012: 60). It therefore means that if the quest for socio-political stability is to be achieved the features of a federal state must be taken into consideration.

Central to chaotic ethnic relations in virtually every multi ethnic state (Nigeria in particular) is unequal access to and competition over the allocation of scarce resources; particularly resources controlled by the central government. This makes the polity a dangerous one where allocations of resources are easily manipulated in favour of the major ethnic groups. As earlier stated in this work, the over concentration of socio-political and economic power in the centre in “Nigeria’s federal system” has not produced the desired socio-political integration. Rather it has become a vehicle for fuelling ethnic conflict over the allocation of resources and invariably depriving each ethnic group of the opportunity to create avenues for socio-economic and political development. Additionally, the system has succeeded in encouraging federal-state relations, where power only flows “vertically” from the centre to the subordinate units (states) within the polity. As long as this continues, it further causes the states (ethnic groups) to drift apart thus deepening ethnic cleavages.
Furthermore, the sustainability of Nigeria’s unity can only be encouraged through the process of healthy inter-state relations; a situation that will create an avenue for the interdependence of every ethnic group (economically, politically and socially). Nigeria’s multi-ethnic state should, therefore, be seen as a variable in the socio-political and economic development of the country. States are encouraged to look inward economically, politically and socially towards enhancing their overall development within the federation. Hopefully, they may even reduce ethnicity in the allocation of socio-political and economic goods. Economically aggressive ethnic groups are encouraged to uplift the wellbeing of the economically disadvantaged through trade or what can be called “Nigeria states socio-economic bilateral or multilateral agreement”. There is an agreement among scholars that the Igbo ethnic group is the most mobile in Nigeria. This is of course due to their flair for commercial activities. This can be exploited to enhance socio-economic integration. One of the best ways of resolving ethnic conflict lies in healthy socio-political and economic ethnic relations; the end product of which is development.

This would make socio-political development more meaningful to all ethnic groups. It would also promote interdependence of states; the product of which is likely to be unity and prosperity of the states in particular and Nigeria in general. Moreover, it will make competition for political power at the centre less attractive. The overall result will be the sustainability of Nigerian unity and the desired development.

To every ethnic group in a multi-ethnic state, the pursuit of socio-political rights within the coffers of a state is as important as the control of government, the denial of which always triggers ethnic conflict. Hence, there is a need for, stable socio-political
institutions devoid of socio-political corruption. In other words, the socio-political and economic administrative system of a country plays a significant role while determining how best a multi-ethnic state can be governed to prevent ethnic conflict; thus good governance is fundamental to having a sustainable socio-political development. It can therefore be concluded that a country like Nigeria that is characterized with deepened ethnic cleavages and where socio-political issues are violently contested along ethnic divisions no doubt should see good governance and its attendant features as the hallmark of national integration. Features of good governance include protection and promotion of the significance of every ethnic group through the institution of democracy. In other words when each ethnic group is “treasured” the probability of an ethnic conflict-free society is very high and this is likely to result in the development of the polity. One means through which a share of the proverbial national cake is guaranteed is through socio-political and economic competition which has been the bane of good governance within the polity. Thus ethnic identification is seen as the bedrock of competition for socio-political goods among the ethnic groups, the gain or loss of which always fired up ethnic consciousness, creating the belief that as long as each ethnic group is guaranteed its share of the national cake they will always play along. However, in a situation where one ethnic group uses its numerical or political power to wrestle and manipulate the distribution of socio-political goods, there is bound to be conflict. This is because ethnicity was sharpened and consciously or unconsciously institutionalized. It, thus, becomes easier for ethnicity to thrive within the Nigerian polity. No doubt ethnicity
significantly increases in a multi-ethnic society where contestation over distributive socio-political and economic goods coincides with ethnic affinities.

The above informs us that the only and probably workable solution to ethnicity in Nigeria is good governance through stable and reliable socio-political and economic institutions where every ethnic group irrespective of their size will be adequately represented and catered for via inclusive governance knowing fully well that ethnicity to some extent has the ability to throw developmental programmes into disarray in a multi-ethnic state. The functionality of good governance will eventually and among other things, fosters the desired development. Ideally this will engender peace and stability (politically, economically and socially) and no doubt guarantee the security of the populace as well as maximum and effective utilization of the nation’s socio-political resources for development.
## 6.3 Tables

### Table 1: Federal House of Representatives Election Results of 1959

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parties</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG &amp; Allies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCNC&amp;NPU</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPC&amp; Allies</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 2: Federal House of Representatives Election Results of 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parties</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPP</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPN</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNPP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Nigeria’s Heads of States/Government and their ethnic and geographical spread, from 1960 till date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Ethnic</th>
<th>Zones</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nnamdi Azikiwe</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>1960-’66</td>
<td>Igbo</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Abubakar Tafawa Balewa</td>
<td>Prime Minister</td>
<td>1960-’66</td>
<td>Hausa</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aguiyi Ironsi</td>
<td>Head of State</td>
<td>January1966-July 1966</td>
<td>Igbo</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yakubu Gowon</td>
<td>Head of State</td>
<td>July 1966-July 1975</td>
<td>Hausa</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Murtala Mohammed</td>
<td>Head of State</td>
<td>July 1975-Feb. 1976</td>
<td>Hausa</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Olusegun Obasanjo</td>
<td>Head of State</td>
<td>Feb. 1976-October 1979</td>
<td>Yoruba</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sheu Shagari</td>
<td>Executive President</td>
<td>Oct. 1979-Dec. 1983</td>
<td>Hausa</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mohammed Buhari</td>
<td>Head of State</td>
<td>Dec. 1983-August 1985</td>
<td>Hausa</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ibrahim Babangida</td>
<td>Military President</td>
<td>August 1985-August 1993</td>
<td>Hausa</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Earnest Shonekan</td>
<td>Interim Head of State</td>
<td>August 1993-November 1993</td>
<td>Yoruba</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sanni Abacha</td>
<td>Head of State</td>
<td>November 1993-June 1998</td>
<td>Hausa</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Abdusalami Abubakar</td>
<td>Head of State</td>
<td>June 1998-May 1999</td>
<td>Hausa</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Olusegun Obasanjo</td>
<td>Executive President</td>
<td>May 1999-May 2007</td>
<td>Yoruba</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sheu Musa Yar’dua</td>
<td>Executive President</td>
<td>May 2007-Feb. 2010</td>
<td>Hausa</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Goodluck Jonathan</td>
<td>Executive President</td>
<td>May 2010 Till date</td>
<td>Ijaw</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 4A: Composition of Federal Ministers by Regions 1959-1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4B: Composition of Federal Ministers by Regions 1979-1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Mustapha (2006:19)

Table 5A: Revenue allocation formula from 1953-1967

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Mid-West</th>
<th>S/Cameroon</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Ojo (2010:21). The 1953 formula was based on derivational system while 1958-1967 was based on population.

Table 5B: Revenue allocation formula from 1977-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Federal Government</th>
<th>State Government</th>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Special Fund</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: Adapted from Arowolo, (2011: 10-11). A close observation of Table 5 B shows that the Federal government has more allocation of the total revenue than the states. A situation which has made the control of the central government highly contentious among the ethnic groups.

Table 6: Secondary School output in North and Southern Nigeria 1912-1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Number of Schools (North)</th>
<th>Number of Schools (South)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Adapted from Mustapha 2006: 8

Table 7: Post-primary institutions in Nigeria by zone, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 8: Number of Post-secondary institutions (Universities) in Nigeria, showing Federal, state and private’s institution in each zone, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zones</th>
<th>Federal University</th>
<th>State University</th>
<th>Private’s</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South South</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10: Ethnic representations under selected northern leaders in percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Hausa/Fulani</th>
<th>Yoruba</th>
<th>Igbo</th>
<th>Niger/Delta</th>
<th>Middle Belt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balewa</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shagari</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buhari</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yar’Adua</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: The figures from Balewa to Buhari was adapted from Mustapha (2006:21) and the figure for Yar’Adua was adapted from The Nigeria Tribune Archive [www.tribune.com.ng](http://www.tribune.com.ng) Retrieved 27/2/2013.

Source: Adapted from Mustapha, 2006: 10 and Aka, 1995: 72
6.4 Appendices

Appendix 1 A: The population of Nigeria (North/South) 1952-2006 (in Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.84</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>51.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The figures in parentheses are the percentages of North/South within the Nigeria polity.

Appendix 1 B:

The Population of Nigeria by geo-political zones (2006 Population in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North West Zone</td>
<td>39,338,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Zone</td>
<td>20,525,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Zone</td>
<td>17,668,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Zone</td>
<td>27,581,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Zone</td>
<td>16,382,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South South Zone</td>
<td>21,034,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total North</td>
<td>77,532,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total South</td>
<td>65,009,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuja (FCT)</td>
<td>1,405,201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abuja (FCT)                 1,405,201

Total Nigeria = North + South + Abuja = 140,534,792

Abuja is separated from the North because of its status as the Federal Capital Territory.

Appendix 1 C: The population of Nigeria by states (2006 population in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abia</td>
<td>2,833,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>3,168,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akwa Ibom</td>
<td>3,920,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>4,182,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>4,182,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>4,676,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bornu</td>
<td>4,151,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross River</td>
<td>2,888,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>4,098,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebonyi</td>
<td>2,173,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edo</td>
<td>3,218,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekiti</td>
<td>2,384,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>3,257,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gombe</td>
<td>2,353,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imo</td>
<td>3,934,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jigawa</td>
<td>4,348,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>6,066,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kano</td>
<td>9,383,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>5,792,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kebbi</td>
<td>3,238,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kogi</td>
<td>3,278,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwara</td>
<td>2,371,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>9,013,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasarawa</td>
<td>1,863,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>3,950,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogun</td>
<td>3,728,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ondo</td>
<td>3,441,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osun</td>
<td>3,423,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyo</td>
<td>5,591,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plateau</td>
<td>3,178,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>5,185,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokoto</td>
<td>3,696,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>2,300,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>2,321,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamfara</td>
<td>3,259,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Capital Territory</td>
<td>1,405,201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 140,003,542

Lagos = 9,013,534 and Kano = 9,383,682

Appendix 2: Number of seats allocated to each Region on proportional basis in 1959 general elections

Northern Region           174 seats
Western Region            62 seats
Eastern Region            73 seats
Lagos Federal Territory   3 seats

Source: Dawodu (2011 pp. 2)
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