

**POLITICS, GOVERNANCE AND DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA: RELATING
THE PAST WITH THE PRESENT.**



EKORUARIE EDMOND OKE

SSC1809587

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

UNIVERSITY OF BENIN

BENIN CITY

OCTOBER, 2023.

**POLITICS, GOVERNANCE AND DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA: RELATING
THE PAST WITH THE PRESENT.**

BY

EKORUARIE EDMOND OKE

SSC1809587

**BEING A RESEARCH PROJECT PRESENTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF
POLITICAL SCIENCE, FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES,
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN, BENIN CITY, EDO STATE, NIGERIA**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD OF
A BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (B.SC.) DEGREE IN POLITICAL SCIENCE.**

OCTOBER, 2023.

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that this project was carried out by **EKORUARIE EDMOND OKE** in the department of Political Science in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of Bachelor's degree (B.Sc.) in Political Science, University of Benin.

MR. A. A. IGBAFE

Project Supervisor

Date

Dr. Aihie Joseph

Head of Department

Date

DEDICATION

This Project Research is dedicated to God Almighty, my sustainer and defense and also to my parents for their steadfast love, support, and motivation towards me which have propelled and fueled my academic pursuit. May this accomplishment mirror their vision for me.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to the individuals whose unwavering contributions have been instrumental in the successful completion of this project

I wish to express my gratitude first of to the Almighty God who made all things possible especially during my studies in University of Benin. I also want to appreciate my supportive parents Mr. Ekoruarie Moses and Mrs. Ekoruarie Rose for their financial and moral support throughout my stay in the university of Benin. Special thanks to my wonderful and dependable siblings, my journey in this school wouldn't have been easy without their incessant support and motivation. I love and appreciate you all.

A special acknowledgment goes to my esteemed supervisor, Mr. A. A. Igbafe, whose invaluable insights and dedicated involvement proved to be the cornerstone of this project's development. Despite his demanding commitments, Mr. Igbafe generously provided his time and expertise, offering indispensable guidance and constructive suggestions that significantly elevated the quality of this endeavor.

My appreciation goes to the Lecturers in the department of Political Science, University of Benin, who have guided me through my path to the journey.

I must also extend my sincere gratitude to my most cherished friends, the entirety of my class, and the exceptional members of Class Erudite. I really am grateful for the unwavering support and encouragement throughout my educational journey as your

motivations, discussions, and friendship were vital in the successful completion of this project.

In sum, this project's realization stands as a testament to the collective efforts and support of these exceptional individuals. My heart is full of appreciation for their roles in making this achievement possible.

Lastly, I really do genuinely appreciate myself for my determination and resilient pursuit towards my educational path as it has been instrumental in achieving this milestone, a step towards even greater achievements.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Pages	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	i
Approval	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ii
Dedication	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	iii
Acknowledgment			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	iv
Table of Content	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	vi
Abstract	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ix

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
1.2 Statement of the problem	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
1.3 Objectives of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
1.4 Research Questions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
1.5 Significance of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
1.6 Scope and Delimitation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
1.7 Limitation of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
1.8 Definition of terms			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13
------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

2.2 The Concept of Politics	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13
2.2.1. Politics as an Art of Government	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
2.2.2 Politics as Public Affairs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16
2.2.3 Politics as the Study of Conflict Resolution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16
2.2.4 Politics as the Study of Power	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17
2.3 The Concept of Governance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18
2.4 The Concept of Development	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21
2.4.1 Development’ as a Long-Term Process of Structural Societal Transformation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22
2.4.1 Development’ as a Long-Term Process of Structural Societal Transformation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22
2.4.2 Development as a Short- To Medium-Term Outcome of Desirable Targets								24
2.4.3 Development’ as a Dominant ‘Discourse’ of Western Modernity	-							24
2.5 The Nexus between Politics, Governance and Development	-	-						25
2.6 Theoretical Framework	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28

CHAPTER THREE: POLITICS, GOVERNANCE AND DEVELOPMENT IN PRE-COLONIAL NIGERIA

3.1 Politics in the Pre-Colonial Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30
3.2 The Governance System in Pre-Colonial Nigeria-									35
3.3 Development in the Pre-Colonial Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38
3.4 The Link between Politics, Governance and Development in Pre-colonial Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	42

CHAPTER FOUR: POLITICS, GOVERNANCE AND DEVELOPMENT IN POST-COLONIAL NIGERIA

4.1 Introduction	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	45
4.2 Colonialism and the Construction of Nigerian State									46
4.3 Politics and Governance in Post-colonial Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50
4.3 Development in Post-Colonial Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52
4.4 The Link Between Politics, Governance and Development in Pre-Colonial and Post-Colonial Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	57

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	62
-------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

5.2 Conclusion	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	67
5.3 Recommendations-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	68
References	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70

ABSTRACT

This study comparatively examined the politics, governance and development in pre-colonial and post-colonial Nigeria. Politics is conceived as the study of the state and its institutions and the relationship these institutions have with the people living in the state. Governance refers to the activity, process or quality of governing. Development is concerned with changes in environment, health, economy, politics, social and cultures that create and supports lives. This study was qualitative, relying on secondary materials such as books, articles, newspapers and other secondary materials. The study found that politics in pre-colonial and post-colonial Nigeria are significantly different. While both can boast of operating under checks and balances, the principle was more entrenched and respected in the pre-colonial period than in this contemporary post-colonial period. In post-colonial Nigeria, various institutions appear to be serving the interest of the executive headed by a president who wields so much power. It was also found that governance in pre-colonial Nigeria and post-colonial Nigeria are different in that in pre-colonial period, governance was based on decentralized and centralized system. The exigency of power depended on the region or community. In post-colonial Nigeria, the governance system is characterized by high corruption, foreign domination, exclusion and socio-economic crisis. Leadership is a very big challenge since independence orchestrating agitations from the people. Lastly, it was found that development in pre-colonial Nigeria and post-colonial Nigeria are different in that in pre-colonial period. Development during pre-colonial period was seen in the areas of commerce and trade which provided the needed harmony and peace for communal living. Whereas in post-colonial Nigeria, there have been preponderance of poverty, malnutrition, insecurity, health-related issues, rapid inflation and poor infrastructure. The study therefore recommended that there is need for the current post-colonial Nigerian government to revert to the era of agriculture-based economy; entrench the principle of checks and balances that would address tyranny and entrench accountability and transparency in the

public dealing and the political system of Nigeria should reflect the ethnic, religious and socio-economic background of the people.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Since independence in 1960, Nigeria has undergone profound changes in governance cycles. It has witnessed a mixture of democratic and authoritarian regimes with mixed successes and failures (Ebonine, 2022). Specifically, the military has ruled Nigeria for 29 years with gory experiences of corruption, financial embezzlement, abuse of people's rights, abuse of rule of law and loss of individual liberty (Ikelegbe, 2019). While it must be acknowledged that the various military regimes in Nigeria performed below popular expectations, the various democratic regimes since independence has not even fared any better. In fact, one important ground upon which the military had rested their reason for intervention was the failure of the democratic regimes to ensure probity, accountability, transparency and foster good governance (Abutudu, 2014).

Nigeria was expected to compete at the same level as the developed countries of the West given its abundant material and human resources. It has been reported that Nigeria is blessed with diverse mineral resources such as iron ore, tin, bauxite, oil, limestone, coal, timber and others (Aghedo, 2012). Beyond these natural material endowments, it is also blessed with purposeful and determined blossoming youths who have distinguished themselves within and outside country in the various positions, they have been entrusted.

However, the scourges of corruption, insecurity, ethnicity, religion, willful exclusion of the poor, elites capture and inter-ethnic and inter-religious conflict have continued to impede the optimum utilization of these resources for the collective benefit of the people (Ikelegbe, 2010). In all, poor governance system has dwarfed the dream of Nigeria of becoming one of the greatest countries in the world.

Governance entails policy formulation, implementation and evaluation. It is on this basis that governance has been divided into bad and good governance. However, for a state to experience good governance, a purposeful leadership that pilots the political framework of a nation is highly desired (Abutudu, 2014). Unfortunately, Nigeria appears to have been unfortunate with bad leadership since independence whose main objective is to wrestle power, capture the state and utilize the state to profit itself and its cronies (Ikelegbe, 2019). To that extent, the lingering crisis of trust, legitimacy and disaffection among the majority of Nigerian have often led to competing loyalties for those who are privileged and aggression for those who are not privileged to have access to those in the corridors of power (Aghedo, 2012).

The link between politics, governance and development has been well established. As stated earlier, politics is the direction of state's policies towards the common good of the people. Development cannot be said to have taken place until the common people begin to experience quality and affordable health services, education, reduction in poverty, malnutrition and starvation, improved security and general quality of life (World Bank,

2022). The poverty level in Nigeria has grown exponentially in the past decades. It has been reported that 65% of the poor (86 million people) live in the North while the remaining 35% live in the South. It has been also reported that two-thirds (67.5%) of children between the ages of 0 and 17 are the most affected with the multi-dimensional poverty (NBS, 2022). Unfortunately, 70% of the poor live in the rural areas where the bulk of these poor children and women live (NBS, 2022). On this score, the core challenge facing the government is how to approach this mind-blowing statistics and improve the lives of rural dwellers in Nigeria. Little wonder did Dudley Seers (1972) conceptualized development as the creation of conditions for the realization of human personality and such realization must be based on unemployment, poverty and inequality. In fact, he was of the view that development cannot be said to have taken place without answers to these questions: what has been happening to poverty? What has been happening to unemployment? What has been happening to inequality?

Most scholars over the years have implicated the impact of colonialism on the contemporary Nigerian development struggle. Indeed, the British colonial masters, by 1884/1885 had bifurcated the entire African continent and by 1900, had established their full presence in Nigeria (Ebonine and Akinyetun, 2022). Their economic interest influenced the various policies they made. These policies eschewed the people and served the interest of the colonial masters who successfully integrated most of the local elites, including the traditional rulers in their governance and administration of the region (Ekeh,

1975). The effective use of divide and rule system was orchestrated by the desire of some elites to trade their people for their narrow interest. Upon independence in 1960, some of these elites became the leaders of the new Nigeria, replicating the policies of the British colonialists that were exclusionary, corrupting and exploiting (Osaghae, 1998). It appears that Nigeria is still battling to reinvent itself amid mounting colonial economic and political structures.

While some scholars have implicated Nigeria's colonial experience in the nature and character of Nigeria's politics, governance and development systems, others have opined that Nigerian pre-colonial politics and governance system fostered the needed development at the time than presently experienced in Nigeria (see Gennaioli and Rainer, 2007; Michalopoulos, and Papaioannou, 2013; Hodgkin, 1960). To them, pre-colonial system recognized the varied needs of the people and ensured it actualized them through popular participation, communal living, separation of powers, checks and balances and measures for checkmating crime. As these scholars argued, though rudimentary at the time, the quality of life and improved standard by whatever measurement standard at the time unleashed development and reduced crime rate.

This study seeks to investigate the veracity of otherwise of these latter claims by comparatively examining the politics, governance and development systems in the pre-colonial and post-colonial Nigeria.

1.2 Statement of Problem

Politics, governance and development have become recurring concepts in the discourse of Nigeria as a state. These three concepts, though not conceptually similar, can be completely discussed without the mention of the other. Politics connotes the activities aimed at governing a country. These activities entail actions and decision government in its quest of improving the lives of its people. Governance entails the process of applying these activities for the development of a state. It is on this basis that David Easton conceptualizes politics as the authoritative allocation of scarce resources. The distribution and redistribution of these resources is what can be termed governance.

Nigeria has three important periods: the pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial periods. While these periods are remarkable in the analysis of Nigerian historical and contemporary existence, scholars appeared to have beamed their research lights more on the colonial and post-colonial Nigeria. This reality is perhaps due to the connectivity between colonial and post-colonial Nigeria in terms of politics, governance and development. The argument that Nigeria's contemporary political and governance system since independence have been British-modeled and as such, it has unleashed underdevelopment on the state with various indices of insecurity, poverty, unemployment, increasing mortality rate, increasing rate of out- of -school children, increasing migration and exclusion evident.

However, the explanation of Nigeria's political, governance and development system cannot be deeply understood without recourse to pre-colonial history. While this may seem too remote a study to some readers, it can provide the basis for critical assessment of the present reality particularly as the clamour for the need to borrow a leaf from the pre-colonial activities continue to grow among Nigerians such as in agricultural revolution, imbibing positive values, separation of powers and recognition and respect for diversities in religion, ethnicity, class and wealth. It is for this reason that Rochas Okorochoa, an ex-governor of Imo State opined that Nigeria should consider the use of traditional deities in extracting oaths from public office holders given that people revere deities than the conventional bibles and Quarans (The Punch, March 2, 2017).

On the other hand, some scholars appear to have contended that the post-colonial Nigerian has moved on from the past (See Osaghae, 1998). They argue that the current form of civilization and globalization has orchestrated a radical change in political, governance and development systems independent of the impacts of the pre-colonial system. While these sets of scholars do not appear to utterly discard the relevance of pre-colonial system in today's Nigeria, they however argue that the modern structural factors that shape the relations among states are beyond what pre-colonial structural can account for. Instead, they contend that even if comparison should be made, it should be between colonial structure and post-colonial structure given that the modern Nigerian economic, political and social structures are replications of the British colonial constructions.

It is based on these scholarly arguments that this study sets out to comparatively examine the pre-colonial and post-colonial Nigeria with the intention of drawing conclusions and providing the solid basis for lessons. Could there be similarities and/or differences between political, governance and development systems in the pre-colonial Nigerian and post-colonial Nigeria?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The following are the objectives of the study:

1. To comparatively understand whether or not there is difference between political systems in pre-colonial and post-colonial Nigeria
2. To comparatively examine whether there is difference between governance systems in pre-colonial and post-colonial Nigeria
3. To comparatively investigate whether there is difference between the process of development in pre-colonial and post-colonial Nigeria
4. To provide insightful recommendations based the findings made in the study

1.4 Research Questions

The following research questions are derived from the objectives of the study

1. Is there any difference between political systems in both pre-colonial and post-colonial Nigeria?

2. Is there any difference between governance systems in both pre-colonial and post-colonial Nigeria?
3. Is there any difference between the process of development in both pre-colonial and post-colonial Nigeria?
4. Are there insightful recommendations that be derived from the findings made in the study?

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study will immensely benefit the academic community in the following ways:

First, the study will provide the Nigerian government and Nigerian policy makers with the knowledge on the overall relation between Nigeria's past and present. As Nigeria is presently experiencing myriads of economic, political, social, security and environmental crises, it is believed that the lessons from the past would engineer legal and non-legal frameworks that would provide solutions to the crises.

Second, the study contributes to the Nigerian historiography. Over the years, there have been arguments, particularly from Western scholars that Nigeria does not have a history and that any history the country has is created and made by the colonial masters. While this argument may be plausible at the surface level given the long years of colonial rule in Nigeria, it is believed that this study will water down this argument by showing whether or not Nigeria's actually has a past and whether or not this past has a contribution to the present Nigerian governance system.

Third, as study in this area is relatively scarce, this study will expand the frontiers of knowledge on the link between Nigeria's past and her present. Indeed, there are avalanche of scholarly works on the link between colonialism and post-colonialism in Nigeria and dearth of scholarly works on the link between Nigeria's pre-colonial and post-colonial eras. Therefore, it is hoped that a study of this nature will contribute immensely to further development of knowledge in this area.

Last, this study provides a robust platform for further studies. Knowledge is not static and research is a continuous enterprise. Therefore, it is also hoped that this study will escalate debate among scholars, concerned students and the entire academic community in their quest to further uncover the truth about Nigeria's past and its link with the present and even the future.

1.6 Scope of the Study

This study covers pre-colonial and post-colonial Nigeria that starts from 1960. It does not hope to account for colonial administrations in Nigeria. However, attempts are made to draw some useful insights from colonial administration in Nigeria where it is necessary to advance the argument in the study.

1.7 Methodology

This type of study falls within the prism of comparative studies. Thus, this study deploys historical method (ex-post facto research) given that the pre-colonial era is past. This method utilizes existing secondary materials such as articles, journals, media prints,

documentaries, newspaper prints, archival records and others. These secondary materials are manually screened to ascertain their usefulness and relevance in the study. In addition, these materials are sourced from Google Scholar.

1.8 Structure of the Study

This study is divided into five chapters. The first chapter as already discussed above captures sub-themes such as background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, scope of the study, methodology, structure of the study and definition of terms.

The second chapter reviews existing and relevant literatures, particularly as they relate to the concepts of politics, governance and development. It also discusses the adopted theoretical framework for the study.

Chapter three discusses the political, governance and development systems in the pre-colonial Nigeria.

Chapter four discusses the political, governance and development systems in the post-colonial Nigeria.

Chapter five summarizes and concludes the entire arguments in the study. The chapter also highlights useful recommendations based on the various findings made. The area (s) for further studies is suggested so as to have a comprehensive understanding of the link between pre-colonial Nigeria and post-colonial Nigeria.

1.9 Definition of Terms

Colonial Nigeria: Colonial Nigeria represents a period in history in which the British effectively started the administration of Nigeria in 1900. The period spanned between 1900 and 1960.

Development: This is concerned with changes in environment, health, economy, politics, social and cultures that create and supports lives.

Governance: Governance is concerned with providing quality leadership through provision of social amenities and other infrastructures that would enhance the quality of life of a people in the society.

Nigeria: It is one of the states in the West African sub-region. It gained independence from the British in 1960 and has a landmass of 923,769 km². It constitutes the most populous country with a population estimated at 230 million people (World Population Prospects, 2023). It has 36 states with Abuja as its capital.

Politics: Politics is concerned with the distribution and redistribution of scarce resources in order to avoid conflict among individuals or groups.

Post-colonial Nigeria: This is a period when Nigeria has attained independence from the British government in 1960. This period spanned from 1960 till date.

Pre-colonial Nigeria: This is a period dating back before 1900 which marked the official colonial administration in Nigeria. This period was characterized by traditional policies and practices championed and executed by Chiefs, Kings, Emirs, Obas, and other administrative personnel.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews relevant literatures on politics, governance and development. The essence of literature review is to critically examine arguments advanced by authors in relation to topics of study. With reviews, it becomes easy to establish relevant theories, methodologies and findings. With these in mind, this chapter reviews themes such as concepts politics, governance and development. The chapter also applied modernization theory in light of the pre-colonial and post-colonial epochal periods.

2.2 The Concept of Politics

The concept of politics is a contested one among scholars. \This is not surprising in the field of social sciences, as concepts are not always subjected to definitional controversies based on the perspective of scholars. This in contrast to other fields such as in natural sciences where concepts have been built with their exact meanings without contestations (Miller, 1962). Moreover, the concept of politics has undergone profound refinements since nineteenth century when the spheres of business and commercial activities were not considered as parts where politics are played (Tansey and Jackson, 2008). Notwithstanding this conceptual controversy, politics has been defined as the exercise of

power and authority, making decisions for the allocation and distribution of scarce resources (Heywood, 1997).

Political decisions arise out of disagreement. Disagreement is part of human existence. It arises out of differences in opinions, tastes, lifestyles, experiences, aspirations and interests (Modebadze, 2010). Most often, these differences stem from the distribution and redistribution of scarce resources needed to satisfy human wants and aspirations (Bentley, Dobson, Grant and Roberts, 1995). In a plural society, the disagreement arises from considerations for the persons, group, organization and institution to be favoured over others. Which group needs more resources? Why do they need more resources? How would the resources be shared? Who should be responsible for the sharing? These and more interesting questions orchestrate disagreement and require politics to solve.

People live in a social setting with constant interaction with one another. They live in harmony by working together. However, in the process of working together, there is bound to be disagreement among them which needs to be solved. The process of finding solution to the problem is what can be regarded as politics (Hague and Harrop, 2013). Therefore, politics, at its basics, is the study of how decisions should be made and how they are actually made. Politics is the study of how such decisions are made. Some scholars have defined politics as the process of allocation of scarce resources to units, individuals, groups, organizations for the purpose of satisfying human growing needs (Modebadze, 2010). However, in the litany of definitions of politics advanced by scholars,

the points of intersections are that politics can be regarded as an art of government, study of power, conflict resolution and public affairs.

2.2.1. Politics as an Art of Government

Some scholars see politics as an art of government. This traditional meaning of politics stemmed from the conception of politics from Greeks. This is because the \politics comes from the Greek word, polis, meaning anything belonging to the state or city (Heywood, 1997). However, given that city-states do not exist anymore in the contemporary state system, the conceptualization of politics changed. Thus, generally, politics is conceived as the study of the state and its institutions and the relationship these institutions have with the people living in the state (Modebadze, 2010). It can also be conceived as the study of the government officials, their activities, rulemaking and rule enforcement in the state (Modebadze, 2010). While this definition is apt, it is restrictive in a sense. By this definition, it means that politics is played by politicians and within government institutions. It also connotes that individuals and institutions that are not part of the running of the government cannot be involved in politics (Heywood, 1997).

In examining the definition further, it suggests that politics is what political parties play and only their activities can be considered political. Therefore, civil servants, interest groups, religious groups and even civil society groups cannot be involved in politics and therefore cannot be regarded as politicians. This narrow conception of politics explains

the negative view of politics by the public. The public perceived politics as only within the domain of political parties and therefore should remain there.

2.2.2 Politics as Public Affairs

While some scholars have conceived politics as an art of government, some others see it as a public affair. This set of scholars contends that politics is not only a state or government affair but can also take place in other public realms. People have often been accused of being political with their colleagues or management in the offices (Modebadze, 2010). However, in the western world, there is a deliberate distinction between private and public realms. The classical distinction between public and private realm conforms to the distinction between state and civil society. Government and its institutions are usually classified as belonging to the public realm whereas civil society is considered as belonging to the private realm (Modebadze, 2010). This means that public sector is regarded as political while private sector is regarded as non-political. Thus, proponents of this definition contend that politics is basically a public activity and therefore should not take place in the private sphere so as not to infringe on people's private lives.

2.2.3 Politics as the Study of Conflict Resolution

Conflict is part of human existence. It is hardly conceived that within human existence and interactions, conflict would not occur. As interests, opinions, tastes, status, ambitions and experiences intersect, there is bound to be conflict (Crick, 2000). It is within this

sense that some scholars have conceived politics as the process of resolving conflict among the members of a community (Schattschneider, 1960). Basically, the unifying cause of conflict in a society is competition over the scarce resources. Thus, the process by which the state distributes and re-distributes the scarce resources in a bid to settle conflicting individuals or groups is regarded as politics (Bentley, Dobson, Grant, Roberts, 1995). Therefore, while conflict is inevitable in a society, the state is expected to resolve it for harmonious and peaceful co-existence of different groups with different interests and choices (Schmitt, 1979).

2.2.4 Politics as the Study of Power

Politics is not only about the art of government nor does solely take place within the public sphere. It takes place in every sphere of human existence. However, while this is reasonable, scholars have sought to determine the nature of interactions and relationship between groups or individuals. Why do people obey others? What makes others issue commands, instructions and threats to others and demand response from them? It is power. It is on this score that Dowse and Hughes (1972) defines politics as power. Once there is a power differentiation, politics takes place. Power is the ability to make and enforce decisions by way of threat, diplomacy, sanction or manipulation (Dahl, 1963). People comply with instructions given to them based on their perception of possible consequences in case of non-compliance. In a social setting, politics takes place when a teacher issues instructions to the students, management issues instructions or commands

to the employees or parents instruct their children to do chores (Haralambos and Holborn, 1995).

Therefore, it is not in doubt that politics does not only take place in the public sphere but also takes place in the private sphere including family, workplace, schools and other private spheres (Leftwich, 1984; Lasswell and Kaplan, 1950).

From these arrays of definitions, it could be deduced that scholars have their different conceptualizations on politics depending on their worldview. Indeed, politics takes place at every place and corner of human existence. However, for the sake of this study which is basically concerned with politics, governance and development, politics is defined as the process of making binding decisions, resolving conflicts and providing quality of life to the citizens and all these revolve around governance.

2.3 The Concept of Governance

As have been explained above, politics is not only within the jurisdiction of government to play. Rather, it is a game played by all and sundry, bet it private or public, family or any social unit. In the same vein, governance is not restricted to the government alone. Governance is an old word enjoying renewed popularity. Governance refers to the activity, process or quality of governing (Ghosh and Siddique, 2015). The term directs our attention away from the institutions and powers of government towards the task of public regulation, a function which government may share with other actors.

Much like politics, the concept of governance is a contested concept (Pierre and Peters, 2000: 7). However, the concept of governance directs our mind to those actors whose duty is to provide governance. These actors are not only government actors, but also include actors in the family setting, employers, teachers, civil society and media (Rhodes, 1996).

The concept of governance became popular during the last decades of the 20th century when the Western world was experiencing economic crisis due to the inability of their leaders to properly manage the economy and welfare provisions (Hague and Harrop, 2013). The leaders saw themselves as more of providers of infrastructures rather than as regulators. However, with the events of economic decline and the animosity from the members of the public that followed, leaders were made to understand that they were also regulators.

Governance has been described as what the government does and how effective it does it (Hague and Harrop, 2013). Therefore, government can provide incentives for businesses to thrive, how the policies are made and regulated to ensure effectiveness is also part of the governance system. It is for this reason that the World Bank (1997:1) opined that state is central to socio-economic development, not as a provider but as a catalyst and facilitator.

Governance is not just the body, but the framework for human regulation. For instance, in international relations,, there is no world government that regulates the activities of states

in the global system. Yet, relations are regulated by set of agreements and informal rules (Rosenau, 1992). In the world of internet, there is no one government that regulated the multiple connections to computers (Hall and Biersteker, 2002). It is in the same vein that international institutions such as the International Monetary Fund, World Bank and World Trade Organization have emerged to regulate trade activities between and among states globally. However, these bodies are no governments and without any police to regulate their activities. Yet, agreements are reached by consensus that can be cumbersome though (Hague and Harrop, 2013). Thus, the contemporary international governance system entails a situation where there are rules without rulers, governing without government and order without orders (Rosenau, 1992).

In today's world, the narratives of good governance and bad governance have dominated development discourse. The classification of the world as developed or underdeveloped; North or South; primitive or civilized; first world or third world; haves and have nots and other ascriptions are based on the difference between good governance and bad governance. Perhaps uninterestingly, the developed West are regarded as good templates to measure good governance while countries in Africa, Asia and South America are often seen as still grappling with good governance, hence, their lack of development. Thus, the measure of governance can be achieved through whether a particular governance system is bad or good.

2.4 The Concept of Development

The concept of development is a complex, ambiguous one. In contemporary times, it has assumed a common practice used by development agencies to measure poverty level and the achievement of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (Thomas, 2004). Historically, development was concerned with the quest for the liberation of people that was animated in the 1950s and 1960s. In this modern period, this had morphed from liberation of people to liberation of economies. The post-modernists have contended that poverty and development are socially constructed (Gore, 2000: 794–5) and therefore requires an alternative value system that can account for the place of the poor in the world and preserve their spiritual and cultural assets (Hickey and Mohan, 2003: 38).

There is also confusion in the development literature about whether development is integral, natural and unintentional, or an intentional activity (Cowen and Shenton, 1998:50). If development is conceived as a good change, what sort of good? What sort of change matters? It therefore means that any development agenda is value-ridden, depending on the narrow conception of the concerned individual, group or development agency. The right thing is to accept the ideas of everyone as sacrosanct and accept the ideas as fallible (Chambers, 2004: iii, 1–2). Thus, given that development is value-ridden, it therefore means that a search for a universal answer to what development stands for may be somewhat elusive (Kanbur, 2006: 5).

Thomas identified three perspectives in the development discourse. The first is historical and value-free. The second is based on the value judgements of development agencies

and short-medium term. The third is based on the Western construction of development which raises concerns for an alternative definition.

2.4.1 Development' as a Long-Term Process of Structural Societal Transformation

The first perspective to the concept of development is that it is a process of structural societal transformation. To Thomas (2000), it is a process of historical change. In the 1950s and 1960s, this perspective dominated development discourse with more emphasis on the academic and research aspect of development than in the practitioner aspect (Gore, 2000). The remarkable features of this perspective are that it is long term, historical and focuses on the process of societal transformation (Thomas, 2004). Thus, for instance, a society could transform from agrarian-based to modern-based society with radical information in the use of technology, inter-group and in-group relationships and relationships between owners and suppliers of labour (Thomas, 2000; Gore, 2000). Consequently, this perspective sees development in the light of changes in the mode of production, production processes, and ownership of production, technological advancement and laws.

Societies experience changes over time and it takes a long-term process for that to take place. It is not prescriptive of any mode of development. Neither does it conclude that all societies must pass through similar mode of development. It is concerned with the society's diverse economic changes that could transform it from traditional system to modern system (Haddad, 2006). This view is related to the views expressed by

modernization theorists which was widespread during the 1950s and 1960s (Thomas, 2004).

The modernization theory emphasizes the need to transform agrarian traditional societies to modern societies through skills and technology transfer from urban to rural, developed to underdeveloped societies. In line with the perspective of structural change and societal transformation, they were concerned with the socio-economic conditions of the newly independent states and how they could attain the same development like the developed societies (Gore, 2000). While this perspective resonated during the time, its explanatory power waned in the late 1980s as socio-economic crisis continued to engulf the newly independent states despite some skills and technology transfer from the industrialized nations (Thomas, 2004). These are different perspectives which, generally, sought to prescribe their own one common pathway to an industrial society for newly independent countries. Although these meta-narratives have a strong resonance with the definition of development as structural societal change, they were deemed to be unsatisfactory in explanatory power in the late 1980s (Thomas, 2004; Hickey and Mohan, 2003: 4).

2.4.2 Development as a Short- To Medium-Term Outcome of Desirable Targets

This second perspective to development is an attempt to correct the shortcomings of the first perspective to development. Thus, while the first perspective was historical and long term, the second is short-medium term and modern. According to Thomas (2000, 2004), this second perspective is aimed at measuring the extent of progression of states in terms

of development. To Gore (2000), the perspective is aimed at assessing the performance level of states. It is concerned with measuring performances against targets such as changes in the levels of poverty and income (Mehta, Haug, and Haddad, 2006). This appears to be the perspective that drives development agencies as they create targets in the forms of MDGs and implemented through some international development agencies such as the World Bank, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

2.4.3 Development' as a Dominant 'Discourse' of Western Modernity

This third perspective appears to be a comparison of the first two perspectives with the intention of drawing their strengths and weaknesses. As noted above, the first two perspectives were concerned with vision of development and outcomes. The third perspective argues that the both the vision and outcomes have been bad due to the Western imposition of development model that mirrors their vision and interests to the developing societies. This eventual perspective has been given different appellations by scholars like post-colonial, post-structuralism, post-modernist development perspectives (Gore, 2000).

The third perspective therefore was a reaction to the various moves made at development since World War II. To the proponents of this perspective, including post-modernists, poverty and development are social constructs that do not really exist outside of the discourse. What is termed reality is constructed and what is termed 'development' is

western construction to show case their level of superiority against the developing worlds. From these viewpoints on development, it can be summarized that though ‘development’ can be Eurocentric and constructed as have been argued above, it should be noted that the world undergoes profound changes based on the influence of globalization. Thus, it is easy to measure countries’ level of development based on some critical indices of poverty, environmental crisis, disease, security, unemployment and others. This is the basis of measurement that states subscribe to and aspire to attain, particularly in the developing countries. Thus, the differentiation between pre-colonial and post-colonial levels of development should be based on quality of lives and the impacts of the state on the people.

2.5 The Nexus between Politics, Governance and Development

In the discourse of development, until recently, more often than not, development has been viewed as other-centered, i.e., development is more of a concern that pertains to the developing world. Historically, in the development field, societies were viewed from a deficit perspective as opposed to from a strength perspective. Societies were classified as developed, underdeveloped, and least developed; or first world, second world, and third world. As suggested by Ramanathan and Link (1999, 2004), language is power. There is a definite need to rethink categorizing nation-states in value-laden terms that devalue a whole group of people. Development can only be sustainable when it caters for the present generation and accounts for the future generations yet unborn (World Bank,

1994). This suggests that economic, environment, migration policies, international law, and health must be systematically coordinated for sustainable economic, social, and political development (Ramanathan and Link, 2004, 1999).

The present era of globalization creates a differential impact and poses a critical dilemma for both the developing countries or emerging economies and advanced economies (Joseph, 2007). On the one hand, the emerging forces of market economy are striving to adapt some of the traditional powers and responsibilities of the state even in basic sectors in the name of structural adjustment (Iyer, 2004). On the other hand the failure of governmental initiative to foster people-oriented development has led to the mushrooming of NGOs and people's movement impinging critically on the agenda of development both within and outside the national borders (Iyer, 2004). All this prompts questioning of the state's responsibility in the development process. But neither the market, nor for that matter any other non-governmental agency, can substitute for the non-state which at least in the foreseeable future looks to be the hub of all policy actions in the process of social development (Khan, 2006).

In a global economy, governance has become a resonating concept (Hyden, 2001). It is within the context of accounting for reasons why development is still elusive for developing countries of the world in spite of committed efforts by the development agencies and various neo-liberal structural adjustment policies that the concept governance was birthed (Camdessus, 1998). Therefore, governance is the basic tool for

attaining growth and development (Hyden, Court and Mease, 2003). Generally, governance is about purposeful, effective and efficient mobilization of capacity, resources and skills to actualize the needs of a society. It also entails conscious formulation and implementation of policies that are geared towards providing the needed socio-economic infrastructures for the people (Hyden, 2001). To that extent, governance can be good or bad.

Good governance is vital to sustainable development. Good governance can be actualized in a democratic framework only when the society believes in it. It involves an open political process with a workable central and state power sharing relationship and arrangements (Jayal and Pai, 2001).. Societies have continued to experience various socio-economic crises due to poor governance system, poor decision-making, poor leadership and close system that threaten trade and investment (Camdessus, 1998).

2.6 Theoretical Framework

Modernization Theory

This theory dominated Social Sciences in the 1950s and 1960s (Rostow, 1956; Pye, 1965). The theory seeks to explain the processes of development within societies. It prescribes a mode of development that can account for the movement from traditional society to modern society (Mbah and Ojukwu, 2019). To that extent, the proponents of

the theory suggests that a society develops when they imbibe modern practices. Therefore, there is need to adopt modern techniques in transport, production and communication in order to attain development (Chaudhary, 2013).

Modernization theorists believe that development takes place in stages and therefore requires that the internal dynamics of the society be fashioned towards progressive use of every stage. They also suggest that traditional practices usually inhibit the process of change required for meaningful development to take place in developing societies (Ojukwu et al, 2016). To that extent, education, political awareness, technological and skill intervention and transfer from the developed societies to these developing societies would gradually pave way for structural and economic change needed to foster growth and development (Mclean and MacMillan, 2009).

Modernization theory was influenced by the writings of scholars such as Watt Rostow, Gabriel Almond, Karl Deutsch, Seymour Lipset, Myron Weiner and others. However, while these scholars made efforts to improve the conditions of developing societies, they failed to take into account the peculiar domestic structures of states (Satyabrata, 2017). They thoughts that every system has similar political structures that could open way for change needed for development. To that extent, by late 1960s, the theory had started attracting criticisms for being overly euro-centric and not accounting for peculiar political and economic bottlenecks that can make development not uniform.

This theory is significant in this study given the transition in terms of political modernization and political development. Nigeria can be said to have three historical trajectories: The pre-colonial period colonial period and post-colonial period. Each of these periods has its own peculiarities which largely depended on the time and space. Modernization is concerned with transition and change from traditional system to modern system. As expected, there should be clear difference in the nature of politics, governance and development that played out in these periods. During the pre-colonial period, the modern state system was not in system and as such, rules and politics at the time were determined by the kings, chiefs and emperors who had unlimited powers. In post-colonial, the existence of state system has thrown power diffusion, decentralization and sovereignty of the people. Thus, this theory will account for critical changes that have taken place since pre-colonial period and help in building foundations upon which such changes can be examined.

CHAPTER THREE

POLITICS, GOVERNANCE AND DEVELOPMENT IN PRE-COLONIAL NIGERIA

Nigeria, the most populous country in the continents in Africa became independent on the 1st of October 1960 from the Colonial British Government. The British conquered Nigeria and began its rule in Lagos in 1861 before extending same to the entire county in 1900. The single entity which is known today as Nigeria was a product of amalgamation of Southern and Northern Protectorate in 1914 under the leadership of Lord Lugard. Thus, pre-colonial Nigeria developed a ‘major epochal development’ (Osaghae, 1997). The administration of the kingdoms at the period revolved around the kings or chiefs. The largely centralized nature of administration of this period showed the unique nature of administration which necessitated the people owing to their rights to be protected by the kings. This chapter examines the patterns of politics, governance system and development in the pre-colonial Nigeria. The next chapter discusses politics, governance and development in Post-colonial Nigeria thereby comparatively placing both periods in context.

3.1 Politics in the Pre-Colonial Nigeria

The nature of politics during the pre-colonial era has been inundated with controversies. Part of the controversies is how the political systems during the pre-colonial period

evolved and which of the pre-colonial states was centralized or decentralized. It can be agreed that state formation during the pre-colonial period involved wide range of diverse cultures, powers, authorities and organizations (Ayodele, 2021). However, questions have been raised concerning the concepts of state and statelessness in the pre-colonial Nigeria (Ayodele, 2021). In attempts to provide answers to these questions, scholars have opted to examine the historical political structure during the pre-colonial period while other scholars have dwelt on categorizing the pre-colonial states into centralized or decentralized (Iweriebor (1982). According to Iweriebor (1982), pre-colonial states in Nigeria can be classified as either centralized or decentralized. While the former was managed by a single ruler who wielded enormous power in the society, the latter had his power diffused.

In a decentralized society, the ruler's authority and power was whittled by the strict principle of checks and balances. Power was not centralized but instead shared among other holding individuals. Thus, it was practically difficult to pinpoint the holder of authority in a decentralized pre-colonial state (Horton, 1976). It is on this basis that Obayemi (1976) regarded pre-colonial decentralized states as settlements without force of power, capitals and dynasties. They were small in territory and population (Edo, 2019). These decentralized states existed as clans, villages and towns (Osadolor and Otoide, 2005).

Human history has been full of evolution. Change is part of human existence and accounts for various transformations that have taken place from the Stone Age to the modern era. In the same vein, the political systems of the pre-colonial Nigerian states evolved transformation from family system to village/clan system to central states. In each of these stages, there was a form of authority that directed the affairs of the people. However, it should be noted that not all pre-colonial states evolved at the same time just as not all of them completed the evolution stages. While some evolved and stopped at the village or clan stage, others made it through to the centralized state (Edo, 2019).

Edo (2019) examined the historical aspect of the pre-colonial states in Nigeria. He found that the political structure of the pre-colonial states started at the family stage that metamorphosed into an extended family system and changed to lineage system. The lineage system orchestrated a form of migration, settlement and leadership. The conglomeration of family system birthed a village system where blood ties and language became factors that bound and bonded the people together. Furthermore, with the effective leadership at the village level, the clan system was birthed which was more complex and cosmopolitan than the village system. The village system thus expanded into a clan system and even more through economic growth and military conquest. This historical transformation and expansion heralded a political centralized authority needed to manage the complex and expanding human spread. Therefore, leadership was both political and religious.

There have arguments among scholars regarding the nature of political institutions in pre-colonial Nigeria. Western scholars contend that pre-colonial African states had loose and autocratic political institutions. African scholars have since debunked the claim and argue instead that African traditional societies were collective and consensual (Ayodele, 2021).

Before 1900, the states, kingdoms and empires in Nigeria assumed central authority, serving as both political and religious authorities and uncertain cases becoming despotic (Atanda, 2006). The argument has been whether this notion of despotism cut across all pre-colonial states and whether the opinions and interests of the people were not given due regards in the administration. In the same vein, the question still arises as to whether in a decentralized states, the kings or chiefs took absolute decisions without due consultation with the people. Therefore, given that a centralized system would not necessarily translate into absolutism as well as a decentralized system would not automatically translate into diffusion of powers, it is pertinent to ask to what extent were the leaders in centralized and decentralized pre-colonial states in Nigeria able to make decisions with or without consultation with the people (Ikime, 1980).

The pre-colonial states in the North were regarded as centralized system with the Emirs administering the system. These Emirs were regarded as absolute rulers as they served as both political and religious leaders. In other climes such as Igbo political system, the powers of the chiefs were regarded as decentralized. They served as decision makers. While this differentiation is apt, it might well be pertinent to examine h extent to which

an authority was centralized or decentralized given that in both forms of administration, the people determine the socio-political functionalities in a given state (Brown, 2011). Drawing from Thomas Hobbes Social Contract Theory, the people decided to surrender their individual powers and rights to a Leviathan in return for security, safety and protection. Consequently, it can be argued that the change from a family system as already argued above can be likened to the Hobbes Social Contract Theory whereby power and authority was derived from the people based on their consents and wills (Ayodele, 2021).

However, there were cases in which rulers in centralized states exercise absolute powers without the consent of people and the people either rejected the ruler or withdrew their socio-political obligations to the ruler (Fagbadebo and Ruffin, 2017). For instance, Alaafin Owole in Old Oyo Empire who ordered the destruction of a town called Iwere was rejected by his chiefs and the people through their withdrawal of support and obligation to the government. This led to the death of the ruler as he was made to commit suicide through poisoning (Oguntomisin, 1981). In decentralized societies, a despotic leader or chief would face rejection from his people. In certain cases, his title would be stripped from him and this dictated the governance system in the states, kingdoms and empires at the time.

3.2 The Governance System in Pre-Colonial Nigeria

As discussed in the study, governance is not only performed by the rulers, but also shared by some other actors in the society. Governance connotes diffusion of power and checks and balances. A major remarkable feature of the pre-colonial states in Nigeria was the existence of checks and balances in the governance system. The chiefs, kings, Obas and Emirs were meant to discharge their duties but under adequate effective and adequate checks against abuse of powers. The political system understood the importance of the wills, rights and freedoms of the people and therefore created mechanisms to check violations. These checks mechanisms were carried out through division of powers and proper accountability of functions (Ayittey, 2010).

Predominantly, three core functions were evident in pre-colonial states. The executive, legislative and judicial functions. However, these functions often overlap with one individual performing two or more functions, the individual, body or group responsible for performing the assigned functions would be accountable to the people (Ayodele, 2021). Some chiefs and kings performed both executive and judicial functions, the latter being in the form of religious functions. In other states, the functions were conferred on a group of people.

The existence checks and balances during the pre-colonial administration has been confirmed by some Nigerian historians such as Ikime (1980) and Atanda (2006). They confirmed that checks and balances existed in both centralized and decentralized states,

thereby preventing possible abuse of political power. In centralized states, the chiefs often checked the powers of the kings and vice versa while the masses checked the powers of both the chiefs and kings. In a decentralized states, the masses checked the activities of the council or representatives.

Furthermore, in the pre-colonial societies, there were various accountability measures that checkmated the exercise of political power. In other words, there were multiple sources of political legitimacy that enforce accountability (Wiredu, 1997; Eze, 1997; Matolino, 2009). The pre-colonial Nigerian societies operated upon different political institutions (Ekeh, 1975; Wiredu, 1997; Ayittey, 2010). The central focus of the governing systems in the pre-colonial Nigerian societies was the promotion of the public good. The societies were guided by the customary rules of life with the absence of absolute rulership (Wiredu, 1997; Eze, 1997; Oelofsen, 2015). The concept of constitutionalism in the Nigerian context embodied the respect for the rules and customs commonly known by the people and any violation was met with the community reprisal (Williams, 1974; Wiredu, 1997).

The lineage/kinship and age grade systems were the two prominent institutional structures upon which these constitutional principles operated (Williams, 1974; Chabal, 1992). Every society then was a network of kinsmen who descended from the same ancestors and everyone in the society belonged to a particular age grade at every point in time. These organised institutional structures functioned effectively as meeting points for

decision making and avenues for leadership training and recruitment. Chancellor Williams (1974) identifies these institutions as functional political structures that characterised stability in the Nigerian societies.

Williams (1974: 179) notes that the saying that ‘the king is supreme or has absolute power’ meant that ‘he has absolute power to carry out the will of the people’. Rulers could not exercise power in a manner contrary to the popular customary rules and norms. This was the basic principle that made it possible for the people to inflict punishment on any leader found to have abused his power. The pre-colonial Nigerian society was not characterised by corruption and abuse of power without a check. It was a near perfect society that upholds the principle of accountability (Igboin, 2016). The spirit of communality encouraged a passionate mode of interaction as every member of the community would not want to behave in a manner that would adversely affect the interest of the others. The indigenous religious beliefs and tradition served as the moral compass determining the behaviour of the people as well as the leaders. Traditional African religion expressed the beliefs in the potency of the guardianship of the ancestors in terms of the composition of the government as well as the administration of the activities of the society (Igboin, 2016). The palpable fear of regrettable repercussions of uncharitable behaviour served as the template for moral conduct among the citizens which unleashed growth and development in the states, kingdoms and empires.

3.3 Development in the Pre-Colonial Nigeria

Development is a process of creating quality of life for the people. It is the provision of infrastructures in the areas of health, security, education and environment (Thomas, 2004). It thus means that development cuts across economic, political, social, environmental, geographical and cultural dimensions (Thomas, 2000) As discussed above, in contemporary times, development is measured against the Millennium Development Goals championed by international development agencies against developing societies in order to assist the poor and other vulnerable groups. Although, it is difficult to measure the extent of development of pre-colonial societies given the change of metrics in the contemporary measurement, it is nevertheless in doubt that development components of health, economy, security and education were rapidly attained no matter how rudimentary they might be termed.

It must be noted that against the contradictory European narratives that they brought development to Africa and indeed Nigeria, the same Europeans (Portuguese) described the extent to which Benin City was developed at the time. The Portuguese cherished the ancient Benin Kingdom and marvelled at its level of development in 1485. The neatness of the cities, villages made the Portuguese to christen Benin as “Great City of Benin” even when the Portuguese hardly recognized any other place in Africa as a city (The Sun, 2019).

The description by the Portuguese laid bare the status of some of the cities in Europe at the time. The commendation from the Portuguese was coming at a period when a professor of English in the University of Virginia, Bruce Holsinger described London as a city of many crimes such as theft, prostitution, robbery, murder, bribery and other forms of financial crimes (van Zeijl, 2016). However, despite this developmental accolade, the widespread of such development in the entire pre-colonial societies in Nigeria has not been accounted for. Instead, what is readily accounted for is the ubiquity of economic development that flourished with the aid of agriculture and commerce. The availability of uncultivated lands and proximity of rivers for trade unleashed large volume of trade between the indigenous people and most times, the Europeans.

The two major rivers: River Niger and Benue fostered good trade relations among the people. These two rivers provide veritable meeting points for people of diverse ethnic leanings for commerce. The rivers sustained those whose business depended on waters such as importers and exporters and fishermen (Ota and Ecoma, 2021). These importers and exporters were traders that brought goods from other communities and shipped goods from their communities to other communities. Thus, the rivers did not only provide a source for sustained livelihoods, it also bridged communication gap as canoes were used to ferry goods in and out of communities as well as send messages across the communications (Ota and Ecoma, 2021). As time progressed, trading centres were

constructed to serve as both meeting points for commercial purposes and building of inter-relationship across cultural divides.

The inter-cultural relationship fostered peace and harmony and limited the possibility for inter-communal wars. As peace and harmony festered, growth and development ensued. The people of Ibo, Igala, Ijaw and Nupe extractions traded at the bank of River Niger. Furthermore, the networks of roads that linked almost all communities together provided easy access to trading centres and fostered easy communication (Archibong, 2015). The people traded in different goods regardless of ethnic differences. The leaders in each trading community ensured that there was peace and harmony and that no trader was involved in any sharp practices that would undermine the reputation of the leader and his kingdom or community. This, adequate checks were provided to ensure security and free trading (Okpoko and Olukoju, 2009).

Agriculture was the major occupation of the people. Though, the modern agricultural practices such as crop rotation, irrigation and shifting cultivation were not so much known by the people, they, however observed when to plant which crop and how. They utilized farm implements which tended to limit the huge exploitation of the agricultural opportunity (Ota and Ecoma, 2021). In the East, the people had cultivated the real habit of trading which took the form of post-post transportation based on trust until it got the final destination.

As part of agricultural practices, craftsmanship fostered during the period. People engaged in cloth weaving, pottery, jewellery and leather working. Textile production involved cotton growing, spinning, weaving, sewing, dyeing, and embroidery; although the last two were optional (Osaghae, 1997). Cultivation of cotton and dyeing leaves were part and parcel of farming. Perhaps, Kano was the most important centre of cloth, weaving, dyeing and distribution up to the 19th century (Atanda, 1973). Kano cloth was such of a high quality that there was demand for it as far away as Morocco (Osagie, 1997). Cloth manufacturing was also common in Igboland, Nupeland, in Yorubaland and in Benin (Archibong, 2015). The use of woven cloth in Yorubaland is of considerable antiquity. This is indicated by the terracotta figures in Ife which have been dated to the 12th century. It is also known that the Ijebus were not only among the earliest Yoruba cloth weavers but were also great exporters of cloth (Osaghae, 1997). In the 17th century, European merchants carried Ijebu cloths to Benin, the Gold Coast, Gabon, and Angola and by the 18th century, Ijebu cloths were being exported to Brazil. Because Ijebu cloths were relatively cheap and durable, they were sought for from far and near (Archibong, 2015).

Pottery is another important craft industry of a considerable antiquity in Nigeria. Jewellery was probably of less importance in Nigeria. The most notable centres for casting masks, heads and statutes from copper, bronze and brass were Igbo-Ukwu, Ife and Benin (van Zeijl, 2016). Excavation at Igbo-Ukwu, which had been radio-carbon

dated to the 9th century, showed a considerable amount of beads and some glasses (Atanda, 1973). Both Ife terracotta and the Nok sculptures portrayed lovely jewellery and ornament ((Archibong, 2015). Bead production was another indigenous industry and the Nupe were and still are the most popular producers in Nigeria (Archibong, 2015).

Furthermore, in the North, as far back as 18th and 19th centuries, people had developed a good tax system that brought more revenue to the government even though the region did not develop at equal pace with other regions due its conservative practices perpetuated by Islamic religion (Ota and Ecoma, 2021). Therefore, though a case can be made that the pre-colonial Nigeria cannot be compared with post-colonial period in terms of development, it can however be argued that within the context of the development measure at the period, pre-colonial societies can be said to have developed even though it was not uniform. Whether this level of development compares with that of post-colonial Nigeria would be seen in the next chapter as it is a subject of controversy in the academic discourse.

3.4 The Link between Politics, Governance and Development in Pre-colonial Nigeria

The pre-colonial Nigeria had mixed political and governance system centered on the traditional ruler and his cabinet members. In some societies such as in Hausa/Fulani and Yoruba, the centralized political system that was deeply rooted in strict checks and balances fostered the needed harmony and communal ownership ((Okpoko and Olukoju, 2009). This in turn led to development at the period. The King or Emir or whatever name

the traditional ruler bore, the central political and governance objective was to safeguard the territory of its society and built and nurture inter-communal relationship with the rulers or leaders of neighbouring communities or cities. This form of mutual respect also tricked down to the relationship the people built with their neighbours.

Furthermore, in societies that were egalitarian such as the Igbo societies, the political and governance system were more consultative and consensual. Though, chiefs and Obis existed to direct the affairs of their respective kingdoms or communities, they however ensured that major decisions were reached by the people through family consultations (Archibong, 2015). This fostered a sense of belonging among the people and participatory governance system where the unity and peace was sustained.

Given the strict adherence to traditional rules and customs, the people maintained the inter-communal relationship with caution knowing the potential consequences for crimes such as theft, arson or treason. Also, as rivers and seas determined the trade system at the period, it was easy for the people to make contacts with neighbours, exchange ideas and communicate. This exchange fostered entrepreneurship skills, socialization of norms and values and modification of laws and traditions (van Zeijl, 2016). The dominance of various forms of agricultural practices and arts work such as bead making and sculptural skills showed the extent to which skills were transferred and learnt by the people (Atanda, 1973). The development in commerce therefore consolidated peace and harmony needed for further development. While it cannot be denied that there pockets of inter-tribal and

inter-communal conflicts, most of these conflicts were land-centered because land was the central factor of production as well as imbued with ancestral history and prestige. Therefore, any invasion into lands were seen as derogation of ancestral history, prestige and bequeaths.

CHAPTER FOUR

POLITICS, GOVERNANCE AND DEVELOPMENT IN POST-COLONIAL NIGERIA

4.1 Introduction

The triune concepts of politics, governance and development are intertwined and cannot be separated in the discourse of human existence. Politics explains the emergence of government around the world and the government emerges solely for the development of a society or to create an enabling environment for the development of the people. This has been the case since human history as discussed and found in the chapter three. The organization of people into communities explains their resolve to provide themselves mutual peace and harmony and development. However, in achieving this, there is a need to strike a balance between the authority of government and the liberty of the people so as to create and maintain peace, harmony and stability in the society. In this sense, the people become equal partners with the government in ensuring growth and development. This partnership would have to be properly managed so that the government does not unnecessarily lord its authority over the people thereby shrinking peoples' fundamental human rights. In contemporary times, this has been the top policy of every government: ensuring that the welfare, happiness and satisfaction of the people are crucial factors in measuring the development of any society.

This chapter explains the Nigerian politics and governance structure in the post-colonial era. The delicate balance between the liberty of the people and authority of government seems not to exist. The government wields so much power and appears detached from the people. By this, the people can no longer hold the government accountable. The implication for this is increased suppression, domination and oppression of the Nigerian people. The Nigerian state therefore has become predatory and parasitic, and consequently an instrument of underdevelopment given that the elites have impoverished the state and used it to dominate the people (Maiangwa, 2016). The level of disconnect between the government and people is responsible for the various seeds of discord sown that have grown into monstrous trees of conflicts which undermine the accomplishment of goals and objectives. This chapter therefore gives a brief exposition into colonial impacts on post-colonial Nigeria is done bearing in mind that a comprehensive explanation of post-colonial Nigerian politics, governance and development may be elusive without concrete attempts aimed at demystifying the vestiges of colonialism in Nigeria political landscape.

4.2 Colonialism and the Construction of Nigerian State

Much has been discussed about the impacts of colonialism in the Nigerian state construction. It has been argued by scholars that colonialism created a system in which post-colonial Nigeria has found difficult to disentangle itself from (Eke, 2015). The economic system, political system and legal system as practised in post-colonial Nigeria

bear the footprint of British system. To that extent, there is a dichotomy and lack of synergy between local peculiarities and the adopted British style of politics and governance (Maiangwa, 2016).

The British government, following the 1884/1885 Berlin Conference inherited a Nigerian State out of its other West African states. However, while the British maintained its presence in its other West African colonies, Nigeria was much appealing to her given its abundance of natural resources. Therefore, it can be argued that the colonial masters never came for the development of the region, but to achieve their economic interest (Osaghae, 2003). The period of colonialism had coincided with the industrial revolution era where industries in Europe were scouting for raw materials for their various industries to meet the growing demands of their populations. The activities of slave trading and gunboat diplomacy of the British during the period in Nigeria and most of its colonies in Africa were geared towards establishing their economic dynasty which incidentally has defined the economic relationship between her and her erstwhile colonies in this post-colonial era (Ukiwo, 2005).

One major tool the British colonial masters used to achieve their economic success in Nigeria was divide and rule system. This system was used to divide the once peaceful regions or ethnic groups in Nigeria among themselves and planted a discord, suspicion and division among them (Osinubi and Osinubi, 2006). The implication of this move was that the British was able to establish their presence in Nigeria concretely as the people no

longer spoke with one mind.. The Emirs in the North became an instrument of domination against their own people to the advancement of the British interest (Onapanjo, 2012). The Obas, chiefs, warrant chiefs and other similar traditional appellations were used as instruments to suppress the people in the South to the gains of the British (Onapanjo, 2012). Though it has been argued that the system, which was christened ‘indirect rule’, was to preserve the existing traditions of the people, it was however not hidden how the British government struck a deal with some of these traditional institutions and used them to forcefully extract allegiance from the people (Agbiboa, 2013). Traditional rulers that were reluctant to accede to the deal made by the British government were either exiled or killed (Obi, 2008).

This divide and rule later became mainstreamed into the colonial central administration. The foremost nationalists who were once united in their nationalist struggle to rid Nigerian of colonialism and its vestiges became divided along ethnic, religious and educational lines. The task of independence changed to a task for personal glorification and achievement (Attoh and Soyombo, 2011). The subsequent attack on the delegation of the Southern delegation to the North over the movement of motion for self-independence by Anthony Enahoro laid testament to the deep ethnic and religious discord that defined the political landscape of the country in the period (Suleiman and Maiangwa, 2017). The political parties formed within the period also took this ethnic colouration as Action Group was seen as Yoruba party, Northern People’s Congress was seen as Northern party

while National Convention for Nigeria and Cameroon was seen as Ibo party (Nnoli, 2003).

Apart from ethnicity and religion, the British took advantage of the less-educational background of the Northern elites to manipulate the entire country. The British observed that the highly literate elites in the South would pose a serious challenge to her interest and therefore sought a form of rebellion from below which the Northern elites including the Emirs provided (Suleiman and Maiangwa, 2017). However, the alliance between the North and the British colonial government did not come without a price. The British had promised the Northern elites of ensuring their dominance in the political structure of Nigeria as their only guarantee for survival (Ukiwo, 2003). Indeed, this sort of deal would have appealed to the Northern elites who felt that the South would dominate them if independence was achieved. Unfortunately, this deal was kept in the immediate post-independent Nigeria with the NPC's Tafawa Balewa emerging as the Prime Minister in a disputed election. Since then till today, the North has dominated the political landscape in Nigeria, embellishing governance with ethnicity and religion to suit the perpetuation of the interest of the Northern elites as promised during colonial period (Sulemana, 2014; Osghae, 1995)

4.3 Politics and Governance in Post-colonial Nigeria

In post-colonial Nigeria, politics is about the struggle for the acquisition of scarce resources. Put differently, politics in Nigeria is about the struggle for economic power, which can only be secured through the control of political power. It is on this basis that Robert Ola (1995:1) asserts that:

Politics deals with power. It is the management of power within an existing set-up. This set-up may be the Nation State, a component of it such as State government or Region, a Province a Canton government or a Local government.

The introduction of elective principle by the administration of Sir Hugh Clifford in 1922 ushered in the development of party politics in Nigeria. The first party to have emerged, the Nigerian National Democratic Party in 1923 dominated politics in Lagos under the establishment of limited adult suffrage where only males who earned a gross annual income of 100 pounds were eligible to vote in Lagos and Calabar. Richard Joseph (1991:1) captured it thus:

Politics is fundamentally about the struggle over scarce resources and the Nigerian state has increasingly become a magnet for all facet of political and economic life; consuming the attention of traders contractors, builders, farmers traditional rulers, teachers, as well as that of politicians.

With independence, party politics and political parties have often charged the governance atmosphere of the country, often dictating the pace of development, nation and state building efforts in Nigeria. In the immediate post-independence period, the three dominant parties of Action Group (AG), the Northern Peoples Party (NPC) and the National Council for Nigeria and Cameroon (NCNC) were locked in a struggle for power and control of government (Sulemana, 2014). The character of party politics that was riddled with do-or die atmosphere at the period and ever since shows that politics in post independent Nigeria has not been geared towards national development (Onwuzuruigbo, 2010). It emerged as a means of exploiting the people and the state economically and instrument for advancing the selfish interests of the Nigerian elites, political parties and other party loyalties (Agbiboa, 2013). The products of bad politicians have therefore unleashed bad governance in Nigeria.

This brings to the fore the question of governance and development in Nigeria. As Uma Eleazu (1988:14) asserts, “it is one thing to gain independence, it is quite another to hold it together in a framework of law and order.” A society survives only by credible and purposeful leadership. As Claude Ejiuwu (1997:37) opines, power is exercised by a person or group for the benefit of the entire people. However, since independence in Nigeria, it appears that the leaders have lost the consciousness to the fact that they hold the power in trust for the people and as such, need to create a balance between the liberty of the people and the authority of government in order to create harmony and

development in the society. The government sees itself as a Leviathan that should use force to hold the people together. It feeds on the collective destiny of the people without replenishing what has been consumed (Mamdani, 2014).

Consequently, the rising indices of poverty and unemployment rates in Nigeria since 1960 have been astonishing. This is because the way people are, government determines, to a very large extent, the quality of lives they have (Nnoli, 2003). When the government becomes exclusionary, oppressive and overly domineering, it affects the collective psyche of the people and their general contribution to the development of the society. It is for this reason that the people must be interested in what goes in government to the capricious leaders whose aim is to acquire power to advance their personal interests. Thus, the greatest change facing post-colonial Nigeria is how to produce credible, visionary and determined leaders who can turn the misfortune of the country around (Eke, 2015). It needs leaders who can articulate and cohere the different ethnic nationalities and produce a national democratic template that would unleash patriotism and national belongingness in the people.

4.3 Development in Post-Colonial Nigeria

Nigeria is blessed with both human and material resources. To that extent, she does not need to experience any form of developmental backwardness that manifests as poverty, insecurity, unemployment and infrastructural decay. Since independence, Nigeria has exhibited some development efforts with mixed results. Despite increased oil revenue and

natural endowment, Nigeria still experiences quandary of poverty and other socio-economic crisis (UNDP, 2018). More so, despite plethora of economic policies and programmes, the state is ravaged by developmental backwardness. According to the National Bureau of Statistics [NBS], 63 percent of (133 million) people are multidimensionally poor (NBS, 2022).

Development in Nigeria can be categorized under three periods: pre-oil boom period, oil boom period and post-oil boom period. In the pre-oil boom period, what determined the economy were exports and commercial activities (Makinde, 2005). There were no real industries. Even after independence, agriculture continued to play a big part as Nigeria's highest revenue contributor such that even with global economic crisis, agriculture continued to contribute about 65 percent to the nations GDP and 70 percent of local exports (Ugochukwu, 2015). The peasants produced enough for domestic consumption and made good returns from their productions. Marketing Boards made a lot of revenue from the local production and the surpluses were used to develop basic infrastructures in the state (Makinde, 2005). Though, local industries were less competitive compared to their foreign counterparts, their produces were in high demands in Nigeria. As a result, jobs were created and investment into agriculture and other agricultural-based sectors were blossoming. Though inflation and unemployment rates were visible, they however remained manageable (UNDP, 2018).

The First National Development Plan of 1962-1968 ensured that states participated in the economic policies and development of Nigeria directly or indirectly (Ugochukwu, 2015). Government provided funds for reinvestment that accelerated growth. However, private investment in Nigeria in the period remained abysmally low (UNDP, 2018). Therefore, the class of traders, commission agents and contractors began to appear. The wide gulf between the rich and poor began to manifest. Most private businesses were foreign business with no sign of Nigerianization of the industries until in the mid-1960s when Nigerian began to occupy the top echelon of the foreign companies (Olanrewaju, 2015). Agriculture, though the mainstay of the country's economy, was largely subsistence, lacking sophisticated technology and crude policies that stifled needed agricultural revolution and development (UNDP, 2018).

The second period was the oil-boom period of 1971 until 1977. This period marked the era of argument for critical intervention in rural communities in order to stimulate growth (Orukpe, 2016). There were thoughts of income redistribution, reduction in inequality, poverty, unemployment and economic disarticulation. The World Bank launched poverty reduction strategy aimed at stimulating rural development and agricultural modernization through state intervention in the lives of smallholder farmers (UNDP, 2018). Prices of agricultural produces were made to be uniform so as to ensure price stability and reduce uncertainties for smallholder farming.

From the period of 1986 to 1993, the dominant policy was structural adjustment amid rising inflation, corruption, enlarged civil service and poverty (Orukpe, 2016). The World Bank as well as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) recommended Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAP) aimed at establishing and supporting formal institutions and included devaluation of currency, producer price reform, subsidy removal, liberalization of trade, privatization, contraction and restructuring of government institutions (UNDP, 2018). The first casualty suffered by SAP was the dissolution of marketing boards without due recourse to how their functions would continue to be performed (Ukiwo, 2003). This led farmers to be disarticulated and shielded away from world market. As a result, poverty and hunger grew despite the SAP reforms.

Scholars have accounted for various challenges bedeviling Nigeria's development in modern times. The first is poor leadership. The importance of leadership in unleashing stable development cannot be overemphasized. Scholars have discovered that poor leadership has been responsible for poor economic growth and development in developing countries (Glaeser, et al, 2004). Other authors have also found that national leaders, particularly in autocratic settings matter in explaining shifts in economic growth. They do so either by influencing the policy environment or indirectly through shaping institutions (Jones and Olken, 2004). In Nigeria, the growth trends show that quality leadership has been elusive since independence. Traditional core values have been battered. There has been a suppression of emergence of quality leadership and

glorification of sub-standard leadership (Dike, 2011). It has been shown that different leaders come up with different economic objectives and programmes. In Nigeria, since 1970, Nigeria has been experimenting between mediocrity and military dictatorship.

The Second challenge is political cultism. This concept refers to lack of accountability and willful misuse of power to suppress the collective will of the people so as to remain in power by all cost (Dike, 2011). The leaders only want power for personal accumulation and aggrandizement and not necessarily to serve the people. Elections are based on selection and not by voting the right leaders. The entry into the political sector has been barricaded with corruption, nepotism, tribalism, patron-clientelist network and undemocratic tendencies (Lawal and Oluwatoyin, 2011). The implications are that poverty, unemployment, rapid infrastructural decay and underdevelopment continues to dictate the pattern of livelihoods of Nigerians on daily basis (UNDP, 2018).

The third is pervasive corruption. Nigeria is notorious for pervasive looting and sharing of government treasury. There is widespread suspension of merit system for mediocrity (Itah, 2012). Lack of clear cut operational procedure, weak institutions, immunity of public officials, weak judicial system, poor conditions of service, pervasive poverty, greed and societal tolerance for corruption, bad leadership, excessive materialism, insufficient education for public officials, and pressures on certain individuals to do the bidding of the elites are some of the factors inducing corruption in Nigeria (Dike, 2011).

The fourth is dominant external influence. The economy of Nigeria has been shattered over the years by the suggestions of international donor agencies and other international institutions that perpetuate dependency (Adeyeri and Adejuwon, 2012). Most often, the suggestions of these foreign people are Eurocentric, lacking environmental contexts and adaptations. The suggestion of SAP was responsible for high disarticulation of Nigeria's economic model and set the country at the stage of economic obliteration (Dirk, 2004).

The fifth is high cost of governance. The adoption of presidential system of government has come with a huge financial burden on Nigerian political system. This type of system comes with large civil service that gulps huge emoluments at the end of the year (Mamdani, 2001). Some scholars have suggested a return to parliamentary system or confederal system where the legislatures can function as members of the executive to save cost. The presidential system, with the over bloated personnel, becomes a huge channel through which government funds are diverted by politicians to the detriment of national building and development (Yunusa, 2009).

4.4 The Link Between Politics, Governance and Development in Pre-Colonial and Post-Colonial Nigeria

The study examined the politics, governance and development in pre-colonial and post-colonial Nigeria. In pre-colonial period, the political system was varied, reflecting patterns of checks and balances in a rigid centralization and loose federal republicanism. In the North, the overly centralized executive performed both executive and judicial

functions which sustained the system. The authority of the traditional ruler was almost unquestionable but still checked by the powers granted to other bodies to check the activities of the traditional ruler (Ayodele, 2021). In most parts of the South, power was more decentralized particularly in the Eastern Nigeria. People collectively made their decisions without any form of lordship of authority (Atanda, 2006).

In post-colonial Nigeria, the import of democracy has made decentralization expedient at least in theory. Even with that, the post-colonial Nigeria has experimented both autocratic and democratic political system. While the former stratifies opinions so as to check for opposing views, the latter has laid down certain rights and principles for people's participation in their political process (Ukiwo, 2003). However, argument has been made as to whether the democratic regimes have unleashed the needed participation of people given that leaders have used all military strategies to stifle people's opinion to remain in power. Therefore, while it may be argued that in pre-colonial times, the boundary of politics was not as expansive as it is today, the provision of laid down procedures for selecting rulers, checkmating their activities and replacing them when their tenure elapsed or removed from office during pre-colonial period was more democratic than today\ Nigeria (Orukpe, 2016).

Furthermore, the character of the political structure largely determined the governance system in both pre-colonial and post-colonial Nigeria. During pre-colonial period, there was a clear-cut responsibility from the top to the community members. Each pre-colonial

settlement developed at its own pace just as they produced enough for their consumption and exports (Osadolor and Otoide, 2005). Though inter-tribal wars and communal wars were prevalent as each community or settlement sought dominance over the other, there were settlement mechanisms through which conflict was resolved and peace returned to the communities (Obayemi, 1976). Explosive pervasive corruption as witnessed in post-colonial Nigeria largely unnoticed given the rigid checks and balances instituted to check for corrupt tendencies.

In post-colonial Nigeria, governance system has been riddled with pervasive corruption, elite accumulation, economic crisis and exclusion (Dike, 2011). Governance is usually aimed at making policies to advance the interest of the people. The choice of leaders in post-colonial Nigerian is largely determined by the interest of the elites who often times pressure the election management bodies to tilt result to their favour (Dirk, 2004). Since 1999, and part of military's justification for taking over government, Nigeria's elections have been marred with high irregularities, malpractices, ballot box snatching, killing, forced disappearances. Intimidation, bribery and voters inducement (Itah, 2012). The effect has been the emergence of unpopular candidates that are bereft of good ideas and therefore seek to perpetuate their position through force and illegal practices. While it must be acknowledged that post-colonial Nigeria is a very complex system to run in the face of globalization, external interests and integration of economy into the global economy, which all were not obtained in pre-colonial period, the negative outcomes that accrue

from these systemic structures would have been avoided with good and purposeful leadership (Itah, 2012; Dike, 2011).

Developmentally, the pre-colonial period witnessed rapid development in the areas of food security, life expectancy and general quality of life (Ota and Ecoma, 2021). Agriculture played a major role in developing rural communities as people farmed and sold agricultural produces for earnings (Archibong, 2015). Inter-communal buying and selling flourished with the help of rivers that made inter-communal contacts possible. With lands and rivers available, farming, fishing and other agricultural practices flourished and ensured that relative peace was enjoyed (Archibong, 2015).

In post-colonial Nigeria, development has been mixed with prosperity and stagnation. The pre-oil boom period was the concentration of people in agricultural activities much like what was obtained during the pre-colonial era. However, farmers remained at the subsistence level without proper integration into the economic system of the world so as to earn huge foreign exchange (Orukpe, 2016). Though government intervened to minimize farmers' uncertainties, these farmers were had to manage their current and future earnings based on produces. The oil boom period unleashed a disarticulated economy as agriculture was largely jettisoned (Olanrewaju, 2015). The activities of multinational companies further compounded the woes of farmers as the environment were polluted through oil exploitation and exploration activities of the companies. As farmers abandoned their lands due to various environmental pollution, civil service in the

public sector grew (Orukpe, 2016). The later reality unleashed on the public sector a financial pressure that left the country in huge debt, quandary and squalor (UNDP, 2018).

The various structural adjustment policies that were aimed at reviving the over bloated economy were futile. Corruption, embezzlement and financial diversion characterized the process of structural adjustment just as many Nigerian workers were laid off (Lawal and Oluwatoyin, 2011). Today, poverty, unemployment, internal and external migration, displacements as a result of insecurity and health related issues have become synonymous with Nigeria. The implications have been rising agitations in every parts of Nigeria including the rise of terrorist groups, secessionist agitations and agitations by the Niger Delta people (Suleiman and Maiangwa, 2017).

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.4 Summary

This study set out to comparatively examine the politics, governance and development in pre-colonial and post-colonial Nigeria. The study sought to answer four basic research questions. They were: Is there any difference between political systems in both pre-colonial and post-colonial Nigeria? Is there any difference between governance systems in both pre-colonial and post-colonial Nigeria? Is there any difference between the process of development in both pre-colonial and post-colonial Nigeria? Are there insightful recommendations that be derived from the findings made in the study? This study attempted to answer these questions.

According to Iweriebor (1982), pre-colonial states in Nigeria can be classified as either centralized or decentralized. While the former was managed by a single ruler who wielded enormous power in the society, the latter had his power diffused. In a decentralized society, the ruler's authority and power was whittled by the strict principle of checks and balances. Power was not centralized but instead shared among other holding individuals. Thus, it was practically difficult to pinpoint the holder of authority in a decentralized pre-colonial state (Horton, 1976). It is on this basis that Obayemi (1976) regarded pre-colonial decentralized states as settlements without force of power, capitals

and dynasties. They were small in territory and population (Edo, 2019). These decentralized states existed as clans, villages and towns (Osadolor and Otoide, 2005).

Whereas in postcolonial Nigeria, politics is about the struggle for the acquisition of scarce resources. Put differently, politics in Nigeria is about the struggle for economic power, which can only be secured through the control of political power (Dike, 2011). With independence, party politics and political parties have often charged the governance atmosphere of the country, often dictating the pace of development, nation and state building efforts in Nigeria. In the immediate post-independence period, the three dominant parties of Action Group (AG), the Northern Peoples Party (NPC) and the National Council for Nigeria and Cameroon (NCNC) were locked in a struggle for power and control of government (Nnoli, 2003). The character of party politics that was riddled with do-or die atmosphere at the period and ever since shows that politics in post independent Nigeria has not been geared towards national development. It emerged as a means of exploiting the people and the state economically and instrument for advancing the selfish interests of the Nigerian elites, political parties and other party loyalties (Orukpe, 2016). The products of bad politicians have therefore unleashed bad.

Furthermore, a major remarkable feature of the governance in pre-colonial states in Nigeria was the existence of checks and balances in the governance system. The chiefs, kings, Obas and Emirs were meant to discharge their duties but under adequate effective and adequate checks against abuse of powers. The political system understood the

importance of the wills, rights and freedoms of the people and therefore created mechanisms to check violations. These checks mechanisms were carried out through division of powers and proper accountability of functions (Ayittey, 2010). Predominantly, three core functions were evident in pre-colonial states. The executive, legislative and judicial functions. However, these functions often overlap with one individual performing two or more functions, the individual, body or group responsible for performing the assigned functions would be accountable to the people (Ayodele, 2021). Some chiefs and kings performed both executive and judicial functions, the latter being in the form of religious functions. In other states, the functions were conferred on a group of people.

Whereas in post-colonial Nigeria, the governance system has been riddled with pervasive corruption, elite accumulation, economic crisis and exclusion (Osaghae, 2003). Governance is usually aimed at making policies to advance the interest of the people. The choice of leaders in post-colonial Nigerian is largely determined by the interest of the elites who often times pressure the election management bodies to tilt result to their favour (Obi, 2008). Since 1999, and part of military's justification for taking over government, Nigeria's elections have been marred with high irregularities, malpractices, ballot box snatching, killing, forced disappearances. Intimidation, bribery and voters inducement (Mamdami, 2001). The effect has been the emergence of unpopular candidates that are bereft of good ideas and therefore seek to perpetuate their position through force and illegal practices. While it must acknowledged that post-colonial

Nigeria is a very complex system to run in the face of globalization, external interests and integration of economy into the global economy, which all were not obtained in pre-colonial period, the negative outcomes that accrue from these systemic structures would have been avoided with good and purposeful leadership (Itah, 2012).

Development in pre-colonial period was necessitated by rapid economic growth that flourished with the aid of agriculture and commerce. The availability of uncultivated lands and proximity of rivers for trade unleashed large volume of trade between the indigenous people and most times, the Europeans. The two major rivers: River Niger and Benue fostered good trade relations among the people. These two rivers provide veritable meeting points for people of diverse ethnic leanings for commerce. The rivers sustained those whose business depended on waters such as importers and exporters and fishermen (Ota and Ecoma, 2021).

These importers and exporters were traders that brought goods from other communities and shipped goods from their communities to other communities. Thus, the rivers did not only provide a source for sustained livelihoods, it also bridged communication gap as canoes were used to ferry goods in and out of communities as well as send messages across the communications (Ota and Ecoma, 2021). As time progressed, trading centres were constructed to serve as both meeting points for commercial purposes and building of inter-relationship across cultural divides. The inter-cultural relationship fostered peace

and harmony and limited the possibility for inter-communal wars. As peace and harmony festered, growth and development ensued.

Whereas in post-colonial Nigeria, development has been mixed with prosperity and stagnation. The pre-oil boom period was the concentration of people in agricultural activities much like what was obtained during the pre-colonial era (Obi, 2008). However, farmers remained at the subsistence level without proper integration into the economic system of the world so as to earn huge foreign exchange (Orukpe, 2016). Though government intervened to minimize farmers' uncertainties, these farmers were had to manage their current and future earnings based on produces. The oil boom period unleashed a disarticulated economy as agriculture was largely jettisoned (Obi, 2008). The activities of multinational companies further compounded the woes of farmers as the environment were polluted through oil exploitation and exploration activities of the companies (Orukpe, 2016). As farmers abandoned their lands due to various environmental pollution, civil service in the public sector grew. The later reality unleashed on the public sector a financial pressure that left the country in huge debt, quandary and squalor (UNDP, 2018).

The various structural adjustment policies that were aimed at reviving the over bloated economy were futile. Corruption, embezzlement and financial diversion characterized the process of structural adjustment just as many Nigerian workers were laid off (UNDP, 2018). Today, poverty, unemployment, internal and external migration, displacements as

a result of insecurity and health related issues have become synonymous with Nigeria. The implications have been rising agitations in every parts of Nigeria including the rise of terrorist groups, secessionist agitations and agitations by the Niger Delta people (Obi, 2008).

5.5 Conclusion

Based on the findings above, it can be concluded that politics in pre-colonial and post-colonial Nigeria are significantly different. While both can boast of operating under checks and balances, the principle was more entrenched and respected in the pre-colonial period than in this contemporary post-colonial period. In post-colonial Nigeria, various institutions appear to be serving the interest of the executive headed by a president who wields so much power. Secondly, it can also be concluded that governance in pre-colonial Nigeria and post-colonial Nigeria are difference in that in pre-colonial period, governance was based on decentralized and centralized system. The exigency of power depended on the region or community. The various institutions at the time undertook their responsibilities in a strictly observed separation of powers. In post-colonial Nigeria, though governance system has become more varied and complex, the governance system is characterized by high corruption, foreign domination, exclusion and socio-economic crisis. Leadership is a very big challenge since independence orchestrating agitations from the people. Lastly, it is concluded that development in pre-colonial Nigeria and post-colonial Nigeria are difference in that in pre-colonial period, governance was based

on decentralized and centralized system. While the measurement for development during pre-colonial period cannot be compared with nuanced indices for development measurement in post-colonial Nigeria, given the existing measurements in both periods, pre-colonial period flourished in commerce and trade which provided the needed harmony and peace for communal living. Whereas in post-colonial Nigeria, though there have been mixes of growth and fluctuations, there have been preponderance of poverty, malnutrition, insecurity, health-related issues, rapid inflation and poor infrastructure.

5.6 Recommendations

Based on the findings above, the following recommendations are therefore made. First, there is need for the current post-colonial Nigerian government to revert to the era of agriculture-based economy. This would foster food security, foreign exchange earnings and address poverty and inequality issues.

Second, the current Nigerian government needs to entrench the principle of checks and balances that would address tyranny and entrench accountability and transparency in the public dealing.

Last, the political system of Nigeria should reflect the ethnic, religious and socio-economic background of the people. The idea of presidential system of government has long been criticized as being too expensive to run as well as conceding too much power to the president. The parliamentary system or the confederal system in which the regions

determined the developmental patterns of Nigeria with little contribution to the centre should be reverted to for meaningful progress and development in Nigeria.

References

- Abutudu, M. (Ed) (2014). *Political Parties and Elections in Nigeria's Fourth Republics*. Jos: Vintage Art Gallery Ltd.
- Agbiboa, D. E. (2013). Why Boko Haram exists: The relative deprivation perspective. *African Conflict & Peacebuilding Review*, 3, 144–157
- Aghedo, I. (2012). Winning the War, Losing the Peace: Amnesty and the Challenges of Post-Conflict Peace-Building in the Niger Delta, Nigeria. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 48(3), 267–280.
- Almond, G. (1960). *The Politics of the Developing Areas*. Princeton University Press.
- Archibong, B. (2015). Where Local Kings Rule: Long-Term Impacts of Precolonial Institutions and Geography on Access to Public Infrastructure Services in Nigeria (Working Paper, October 22).
- Atanda, J.A. (1973). *The New Oyo Empire: Indirect Rule and Change in Western Nigeria 1894-1934*. London: Longman.
- Atanda, J.A. (2006). *Political Systems of Nigerian Peoples Up to 1900*. Oguntomisin G.O. (Ed), Ibadan, John Archers (Publishers) Limited.
- Attoh, F., and Soyombo, O. (2011). The politics of ethnic balancing in Nigeria. *International journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, 3, 40–44
- Ayittey G.B.N. (2010). Traditional Institutions and the State of Accountability in Africa. *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, 77(4): 1183-1210.
- Ayodele, M. (2021). Evolution of Political Institutions and Government in Pre-Colonial Nigeria, *Academia Letters*, Article 709. <https://doi.org/10.20935/AL709>.
- Bentley, R. Do; Grant, A; and David, M.R. (1995), *British Politics in Focus*. Ormskirk: Causeway Press,
- Booth, D. (ed.) (2004) *Fighting Poverty in Africa: Are PRSPs Making a Difference?* London: ODI.
- Brown, R. (2011). Transition to Modernity: Political, Economic, and Religious Change Among the Ibo of Nigeria, 1900-1930. Available at: <https://ida.mtholyoke.edu/xmlui/handle/10166/890?show=full>.

- Camdessus, M. (1998). *Navigating Stormy, Uncharted Waters: Five Addresses*. Washington, DC: IMF
- Chambers, R. (2004) *Ideas for Development*. IDS Working Paper 238. Sussex: IDS.
- Chaudhary, A. (2013). Modernization: Impact, Theory, Advantages and Disadvantages, *International Journal for Research in Education*, 2(2): 34-38
- Cowen, M., and Shenton, R. (1998) *Doctrines of Development*. London: Routledge.
- Crick, B. (2000), *In Defence of Politics*, 5th edn, London, Continuum International
- Dike, V.E. (2011). *Revising Instrumental Leadership Problem in Nigeria*. Ibadan; Ibadan University Press.
- Dirk, N. (2004) Colonial and Postcolonial Histories: Comparative Reflections on the Legacies of Empire. In *Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World*, Global Background Paper for United Nations Development Program, Human Development Report, <http://www.undp.org/publications/papers.com>
- Ebonine, V.C. (2022). Classical Conditioning and ‘Amnestication’ of Terrorists in Northern Nigeria: The Need for Critical Re-evaluation, *African Journal of Terrorism and Insurgency Research (AJOTIR)*, 3(2): 57-85
- Ebonine, V.C. and Akinyetun, T.S.(2022). From “There Was A Country” To A “Nation Under Siege”: Explaining The Oxygenation Of Insecurity In South East, Nigeria, *RISR*, 28: 35-65
- Edo, V.O. (2019). *Political Institutions and Governments in Pre-colonial Nigeria*. Unpublished manuscript: University of Ibadan, Postgraduate Department of History.
- Ejituwu, C.N. (1997). “Election Process and Governance: Election Process and Governance: Election Rigging in the USA and Nigeria” in Oyin Ogunba (ed.), *Governance and the Electoral Process: Nigeria and the United States of America*, Lagos: American studies association of Nigeria (A.S.A.N).
- Eke, S. J. (2015). ‘Good Policy’ Gone Bad: Institutionalised Ranking of Citizens and Identity Conflicts in Nigeria. *India Quarterly: A Journal of International Affairs*, 71:318–334
- Ekeh, P. (1975). Colonialism and the Two Publics in Africa: A Theoretical Statement. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 17(1): 91-112.

- Eleazu, U. (1988). "History and Geography of Nigeria" in Eleazu,U. (Ed.), *Nigeria, The first 25 Years*. Ibadan: Heinemann Books Ltd
- Esteva, G. (1992) 'Development', in Sachs, W. (ed.), *The Development Dictionary*, London: Zed.
- Eze, E.C. (1997). Democracy or Consensus? A Response to Wiredu. In Eze, C. (ed) *Postcolonial African Philosophy: A Critical Reader*, 313-323. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Fagbadebo, O. and Ruffin, F. (2017). Between the Old and the New: Comparing the Effectiveness of the Pre-And Post-Colonial Administrations in the Promotion of Governance and Accountability in Nigeria,
- Ferguson, J. (1994) *The Anti-politics Machine: 'Development', Depoliticisation and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1966) *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. Paris: Gallimard. Foucault, M. (1969) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Ghosh, R.N and Siddique, M.A.B. (Eds.). (2015). Corruption, Good Governance and Economic Development: Contemporary Analysis and Case Studies. Singapore/Hackensack/London: World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd.
- Gore, C. (2000) 'The rise and fall of the Washington consensus as a paradigm for developing countries', *World Development*, 28 (5): 789–804
- Haddad, L. (2006) *Reinventing Development Research: Listening to the IDS40 Roundtables*. Paper prepared for IDS40 Conference, 'Reinventing Development Research', 20–22 September, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton, UK.
- Hague, R and Harrop, M. (2013). Comparative Government and Politics: An Introduction. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Hall, B. and Biersteker, T. (2002) (eds) *The Emergence of Private Authority in Global Governance* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Haralambos, C and Holborn, A.A. (1995). Sociology, Themes and Perspectives. London: Collins Educational

- Harriss, J. (2006) *Why Understanding of Social Relations Matters More for Policy on Chronic Poverty than Measurement*. UK: Chronic Poverty Research Centre.
- Heywood A.(1997), *Politics*. London: Macmillan Press LTD
- Hickey, S. and Mohan, G. (2003) *Relocating Participation within a Radical Politics of Development: Citizenship and Critical Modernism*. Draft working paper prepared for conference on ‘Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation? Exploring new approaches to participation in development’, 27–28 February 2003, University of Manchester, Manchester
- Horton, R. (1976). *Stateless Societies in the History of West Africa*. In Ajayi, J.F & Crowder, M (eds), *History of West Africa*, London: Longman Group Limited.
- Hyden, G. (2001). Operationalising Governance for Sustainable Development. *Journal of Developing Societies*, XVII (November), 13–31.
- Hyden, G., Court, J., and Mease, K. (2003). *Making Sense of Governance: The Need for Involving Local Stakeholders*. ODI Discussion Paper. London: ODI
- Igboin, B. (2016). Traditional Leadership and Corruption in Pre-colonial Africa: How the Past affects the Present. *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, 42(3): 142-160. Available at: DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17159/2412-4265/2016/228>.
- Ikelegbe A (2010) *Oil, Resource Conflicts and the Post Conflict Transition in the Niger Delta Region: Beyond the Amnesty*. Benin City: Centre for Population and Environmental Development (CPED) Monograph Series, No. 3
- Ikime O. (1980). *The Peoples and Kingdoms of the Delta Province*. Groundwork of Nigeria History. In Obaro Ikime (Ed.). Ibadan: Heinemann Educational Books (Nigeria) plc.
- Itah, J. O. (2012). Democracy and Good Governance: Nigeria’s Dilemma. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*. 4 (6).
- Iwereibor, E.G. (1982). State Systems in Precolonial, Colonial and Postcolonial Nigeria: an Overview. *Africa: Rivista trimestrale di studi e l’Oriente*, Anno 37(4):507-513
- Iyer, R.R. (2004). The Meaning of Governance. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, L(1), 45–49.

- Jayal, N.G., and Pai, S. (Eds.). (2001). *Democratic Governance in India: Challenges of Poverty, Development, and Identity*. New Delhi: Sage
- Joseph, R.A. (1991). *Democracy and Prebendal Politics in Nigeria*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd
- Joseph, S.E. (2007, January 1). Promise of Globalisation. *The Economic Times*, p. 3.
- Kanbur, R. (2006) *What's Social Policy got to do with Economic Growth?* Available at <http://www.arts.cornell.edu/poverty/kanbur/> Accessed July 14, 2023.
- Khan, M.H. (2006). *Governance and Development*. Paper presented at the Workshop on Governance and Development, World Bank and DFID, Dhaka, November 11–12.
- Lasswell, H. and Kaplan, A. (1950). *Power and Society: A Framework for Political Inquiry*. New Haven: Yale University Press
- Lawal, T. and Oluwatoyin, A. (2011). National development in Nigeria: Issues, challenges and prospects. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research* Vol. 3(9). pp. 237241, November
- Leftwich, A. (1984), *What is Politics? The Activity and its Study*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Link, R.J., & Ramanathan, C.S. (2011). *Human Behavior in a just World: Reaching for Common Ground*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Maiangwa, B. (2016). *Revisiting the Nigeria-Biafra war: The intangibles of post-war reconstruction*. *International Journal on World Peace*, XXXIII, 39–68
- Makinde, T. (2005). Problems of Policy Implementation in developing nations: The Nigerian Experience, *Journal of Social Science*, 11 (1): 63-69,
- Mamdani, M. (2001). Beyond settler and native as political identities: Overcoming the political legacy of colonialism. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 43, 651–664.
- Mamdani, M. (2014). *When victims become killers: Colonialism, nativism, and the genocide in Rwanda*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Matolino, B. (2009). A Response to Eze's Critique of Wiredu's Consensual Democracy. *South African Journal of Philosophy*, 28(1): 34-42.

- Mbah, C.C. and Ojukwu, U.G. (2019). Modernization Theories and the Study of Development Today: A Critical Analysis, *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research (IJAMR)*, 3(4): 17-21
- Mclean, I. and McMillan, A. (2009). Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Mehta, L., Haug, R. and Haddad, L. (2006) 'Reinventing development research', *Forum for Development Studies*, 33 (1): 1–6.
- Modebadze, V. (2010). The Term Politics Reconsidered in the Light of Recent Theoretical Developments, *IBSU Scientific Journal (IBSUSJ), International Black Sea University, Tbilisi*, 4(1):39-44
- National Bureau of Statistics [NBS] (2022). Nigeria Multidimensional Poverty Index (2022). Abuja: NBS
- Nnoli, O. (2003). Ethnic violence in Nigeria: A historical perspective. In O. Nnoli (Ed.), *Communal conflict and population displacement in Nigeria* (pp. 13–45). Enugu: Pan African Centre for Research on Peace and Conflict Resolution (PACREP)
- Obayemi, A. (1976). The Yoruba and Edo Speaking Peoples and their Neighbors before 1800. In Ajayi, J.F & Crowder, M (eds), *History of West Africa*, vol.1. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Obi, C. I. (2008). *Nigeria's Niger delta: Understanding the complex drivers of conflict*. Uppsala: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet. Retrieved from <http://nai.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A610679&dswid=-140>
- OECD (Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development). (2001) *Development Assistance Committee Poverty Guidelines*. Paris: OECD.
- Oelofsen, R. (2015). Decolonisation of the African Mind and Intellectual Landscape. *Phronimon*, 16(2): 130-146
- Oguntomisin, G.O. (1981). Political Change and Adaptation in Yorubaland in the Nineteenth Century, *Canadian Journal of African Studies / Revue Canadienne des Études Africaines*, 15(2). Published by: Canadian Association of African Studies,
- Ojukwu, U.G., Ukatu, C.N., Ohuoha, M.I and Nnakwue, N.B. (2016). *Fundamentals of Political Sociology*. Enugu-Nigeria: Rhyce Kerex Publishers

- Okpoko, O. and, Olukoju, A. (2009). Precolonial Nigeria: Essays in honor of Toyin Falola, edited by Akinwumi Ogundiran. *African Affairs*, 108(430), 154-155.
- Ola, R.F. (1995). "The Nature and Scope of Political Science" in Ola, R.F. (ed.), *Nigerian Political System, Inputs, Outputs and the Environment*, Benin City: Ambik Press.
- Olanrewaju, J. S. (2015). Understanding Nigerian Development Crisis. *Afro Asian Journal of Social Sciences*, VI(1): 22-48
- Onapajo, H. (2012). Politics for god: Religion, politics and conflict in democratic Nigeria. *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, 4, 42–66.
- Onwuzuruigbo, I. (2010). Researching ethnic conflicts in Nigeria: The missing link. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33, 1797–1813.
- Orukpe, W.E. (2016). Politics, Governance and Development in Post-Colonial Nigeria. *Kaduna: Kaduna State University*
- Osadolor, O.B and Otoide, L.E. 2005. State Formation in Precolonial Nigeria: A Historiographic Assessment. In Akinwunmi, O (ed)., Precolonial Nigeria: Essays in Honour of Toyin Falola. Asmara, Eritrea: Africa World Press.
- Osaghae, E. (1998). Crippled Giant: Nigeria Since Independence. The University of Michigan: Hurst and Company
- Osaghae, E. E. (1995). *Structural adjustment and ethnicity in Nigeria* (9171063730). Uppsala: Nordiska Afrikainstitute
- Osaghae, E. E. (2003). Explaining the changing patterns of ethnic politics in Nigeria. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 9, 54–73
- Osagie, J.I. (1997). Nigerian History in Pre-Colonial Times – Southern Nigerian,” In Nzemeke, A.D and Erhegbe, E. (Eds.). Nigerian Peoples and Culture. London: Longman.
- Osinubi, T. S., and Osinubi, O. S. (2006). Ethnic conflicts in contemporary Africa: The Nigerian experience. *Journal of Social Science*, 12, 101–114
- Ota, E.N. and Ecoma, C.S.(2021). The Presentness of the Past: Pre-Colonial Inter-Ethnic Relations and the Challenges of National Integration in Contemporary Nigeria, *Saudi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6(8): 277-284
- Parfitt, T. (2002). *The End of Development: Modernity, Post-Modernity and Development*. London: Zed.

- Pierre, J. and Peters, B. Guy (2000) *Governance, Politics and the State*. Basingstoke: Macmillan and New York: St Martin's Press.
- Pye, L.W. (1965). The Concept of Political Development, *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 358(1):1-13.
- Ramanathan, C.S., and Link, R.J. (1999). *All our futures: Principles and Resources for Social Work Practice in a Global Era*. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole.
- Ramanathan, C.S., and Link, R.J. (2004). *All our futures: Principles and Resources for Social Work Practice in a Global Era*. Florence:KY: Brooks/Cole.
- Rhodes, R. (1996). The New Governance: Governing without Government', *Political Studies* (44) 652–67
- Rosenau, J. (1992) 'Governance, Order and Change in World Politics', in *Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics*, ed. J. Rosenau and E.-O. Czempiel (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press)
- Rostow, W.W. (1956). Take-off into Self-Sustained Growth. *Economic Journal*, 66 (261): 25-48.
- Satayabrata, C. (2017). (ed.). *Political Sociology*. India: Trinity Press.
- Schattschneider*, E. E. (1950). *The Semi- sovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston
- Schmitt, C. (1979). *The Concept of the Political*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press
- Seers, D. (1972, Pub.2007). What are we trying to Measure? *Journal of Development Studies*, 8(3):21-36
- Suleiman, M.D. and Maiangwa, B. (2017) Nigeria and the 'making' of combative identities, *African Identities*, 15:3, 260-277, DOI: 10.1080/14725843.2017.1291324
- Sulemana, M. (2014). Centenary of failure? Boko Haram, Jihad and the Nigerian reality. *Australasian Review of African Studies*, 35, 69–87
- Tansey, S.D. and Jackson, N. (2008). *Politics: The Basics*. Oxon & New York: Routledge

- The Punch, March 2 (2017). Swear with Deities, Bible and Koran too Merciful Okorochoa. Available at: <http://punchng.com/swear-with-deities-bible-andkoran-too-merciful-okorochoa/>. Accessed on: 14 July. 2023.
- The Sun (2019). Kingdom of Benin: Quintessential reminder of the importance of history (6). August 14. Available at <https://sunnewsonline.com/kingdom-of-benin-quintessentialreminder-of-the-importance-of-history-6/>
- Thomas, A. (2000) 'Development as practice in a liberal capitalist world', *Journal of International Development*, 12 (6): 773–787
- Thomas, A. (2004) *The Study of Development*. Paper prepared for DSA Annual Conference, 6 November, Church House, London.
- Ukiwo, U. (2003). Politics, ethno-religious conflicts and democratic consolidation in Nigeria. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 41, 115–138.
- Ukiwo, U. (2005). The study of ethnicity in Nigeria. *Oxford Development Studies*, 33, 7–23
- UNDP (2018) Human Development Indices and Indicators: 2018 Statistical Update. Briefing note for countries on the 2018 Statistical Update, Nigeria,
- UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). (1990) *Human Development Report 1990*. New York: Oxford University Press for the UNDP.
- van Zijl, F. (2016). The Oba of Benin Kingdom: A History of the Monarch, November 12. <https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2016/11/12/the-oba-of-benin-kingdom-a-history-of-the-monarchy>
- Williams, C. (1974). *The Destruction of Black Civilisation: Great Issues of a Race from 4500 BC to 2000 AD*. Chicago, Illinois: Third World Press.
- Wiredu, K. (1997). Democracy and Consensus in Traditional African Politics: A Plea for a Non-Party Polity. In Eze, C. (ed) *Postcolonial African Philosophy: A Critical Reader*, 303–312. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- World Bank (1997) *World Development Report: The State in a Changing World* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press).
- World Bank (2022). Nigeria Poverty Assessment 2022. Washington, D.C: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank

World Bank. (1994). *Development in Practice: Governance—The World Bank Experience*, Washington, DC: World Bank

World Bank. (2000) *World Development Report 2000/1 – Attacking Poverty*. New York: Oxford University Press for the World Bank.

Yunusa, K.S. (2009) “The Political Economy of Nigeria and the Continuing Agenda of Recolonization: A Challenge for Critical Knowledge Production”, *Journal of Pan African Studies*. Vol,3. No.3 September.