

MODULE FOUR FOR GSP 2204

FOUNDATION OF NIGERIAN CULTURE, GOVERNMENT AND ECONOMY (FNCGE)

By

Surajo Yahaya Muhammad

Department of Social Science and Administration

School of Continuing Education (SCE)

Bayero University, Kano

08067041918

mjsuraj09@gmail.com

and

Hafsat Yahaya Yakasai

Department of Political Science

Bayero University, Kano

07030486501

Contents

1. An overview of pre-colonial administration
2. An overview of colonial administration
3. Nigerian nationalism
4. Politics during post-colonial period
5. First Republic
6. Military rule and civil War in Nigeria
7. Return of democracy in Nigeria 1999-date

AN OVERVIEW OF PRECOLONIAL ADMINISTRATION IN NIGERIA

1.1 Introduction

This chapter familiarizes students with the nature of government and administration in Nigeria before, during and after colonialism. Prior to colonial administration, Nigeria was inhabited by various people, speaking different languages and with varied customs, values and tradition. The people were under the administration of large and small kingdoms and empires. Although, the people relate with one another long time before colonial administration but they were never control by one political leadership. Historically, there were trade relationship wars, peace treaties among the large, small empires and kingdoms. These empires

and kingdoms consisted of different people and religions played a significant role in the political and economic life of the people.

According to Gibbs (1965), there are three different entities found within the area of what is today known Nigeria before the coming of colonial administration, and each of these entities had their own different social organization from one another.

1.2 The Political System of Hausa/Fulani Pre-colonial society (Centralized System)

For many years before the sheik Bin Fodio Jihad, the Hausa/Fulani society were organized in to seven different city states and they all had (**Sarauta**) that was hierarchical and centralized in nature.

According to Fagge and Alabi (2017) the pre-Jihad **Sarauta** system was for all intent and purposes, semi-feudal. For one thing the system had a very strong hierarchical, pyramidal and hereditary bureaucracy from where decision trickled down. For another, it had social stratification based on occupation. This shows that, apart from the distinction between the aristocrats and the commoners (**Talakawa**) in the society, there was also social stratification among the commoners based on their occupation.

Apart from the Hausa/Fulani society, there were other societies that were characterized by specialized institutions of government, operated by the state refer

to as the absolute monarchies and the state had hierarchical bureaucracies and hereditary system of succession. For example, the KanemBorno Empire, Benin Kingdom, Nupe, Jukun, Igala among others.

In the Hausa/Fulani Pre-colonial Administration, the Emir (Sarki) being the head, formed an advisory council with their duties as follows;

- Waziri – who act as the Prime Minister
- Madaki – commander of the army
- Galadima – who is in charge of capital territory
- SarkinFada – Who is the head of place workers
- Ma’aji – in charge of treasury
- SarkinFawa – Who is in charge of butcher
- SarkinRuwa – In charge of fishing festival
- SarkinYari – In charge of prison

1.3 A cephalous System (Decentralized System)

These are societies in which power was decentralized and political and administrative system was carried out by different groups, such as descent groups, status or occupational group. Such arrangement could be found in the communities of Igbo, Tiv, Ibibio and Ijaw etc.

The Igbo is the largest and heterogeneous ethnic group in the south-eastern part of region. They had different languages and also living in a far distanced areas and villages that were independent from one another. According to Forde and Jones (1950) cited in Fagge and Alabi (2017) the Igbo have a common culture which is described as “**Ultra-democratic and highly individualistic**” arising from this common culture, all Igbo communities had a traditional political system that was more or less identical. Unlike the Hausa/Fulani, the Igbo has a complex system of administration prior to the coming of colonial administration. There was no central power vested in the hand of one person. Rather, there was a division of political authority into different groups, as follows;

- The village elders: these are group of people found in the Igbo community who handle any matter regarding their traditions and customs.
- The Age grade: who plays the role of maintaining peace, order, sanitations of the community.
- The Ozo title: this is a title given to the rich people due to their spending and contributions during ceremonies.
- The Ofo title: is the title given to the head of family.

Based on these, power is not centralized in the Igbo pre-colonial administration. Hence, the factors that unite the Igbo community are;

- Common language, despite some variation in the language but they understand themselves.
- Oracle – is a strong believe in the Igbo community
- Supreme God which is called Chineke.

1.4 The Yoruba Political System (Semi-centralized System)

The Yoruba pre-colonial administration had a limited monarchy and a mixture of some elements of Hausa/Fulani and Igbo system of administration which curtailed the powers of the state. The Old Oyo Empire was one of the Empires that existed before the coming of British colonial admiration situated in the south-western part of what is today known as Nigeria. It has a semi centralized system with ***Alafin*** (King) as the Chief executive; there was also a seven (7) men council of King Makers known as ***Oyemesi*** that was headed by ***Bashorun***.

It was the duty of the king Makers to appoint the ***Alafin*** (King) and also to serve as a check to his excesses. This Council had the power to remove King from office. Another council that was very important in the politics, government and administration of the Old Oyo Empire was the Ogboni cult which serves as a check to the activities of both the Alafin and the Oyemesi. In the Old Oyo Empire, there was also the army organization which was headed by the Army general called

Aare-Ona-Kakanfo, and if he is defeated in war he must commit suicide or go to an exile.

According to Fagge and Alabi (2017) other important councils found within the palace of Oyo Empire were:

- a. **Ona-ile Mole** (chief priest of the **Ifa** oracle), the Dundun palace of drummers.
- b. The Eunuchs which was known as the **Ibaafin** (lords of the palace) and the most important among them were:
 - I. The **Ona-efa**(legal personage) who advised the **Alafin** on legal matters. He also heard and decided appeals to be brought to the **Alafin**.
 - II. **Utun Efawho** was more or less like chief priest, He also worshipped on behalf of the Yoruba people in the **Shangoshrine**, He also helped in judging cases brought to the palace.
 - III. **Osiefawho** represented the **Alafin** in all occasion whether civil or military. Sometimes he acted as commander in chief in a war.

The **Alafin** also ruled together with the **Aremo**(Titular prince) who was usually the eldest son of the **Alafin**, the **Aremo** too was regarded as sacred and with the

same power of life and death like the **Alafin**. When the **Alafin** died, the **Aremo** had to go with him; this was a check against an ambitious **Aremo**.

Another important institution found in the administration and politics of the old Oyo was the council of **Ekun** provinces who ruled by **Obas** and they were required to visit the **Alafin** during important ceremonies and also with a gifts to show their continuing loyalty to the kingdom. The activities of the **Obas** provinces were checked by **Ilari** who served as the **Alafin's** ears and eyes in the provinces.

The provinces were divided in to two:

- a. **EkunOsi** or the left hand province
- b. **EkunOtun** or the right hand province

2.1 The process of Colonial Administration in Nigeria

The European societies came to African with the claim of exploring the shores of the continent, they also claimed to be missionaries as well as traders to market their products and to purchase raw materials, but they invariably colonized the people of Africa. and Nigeria was colonized by Britain. According to Timothy (1997) prior to 1807 and indeed as far back as the 15th century, the West and East coast of Africa were not unknown to Portuguese traders. But it was after the abolition of slavery that they in competition with other European power like Britain, Germany, and

French engaged in legitimate trade with the native tribes, particularly along the coast of the Atlantic and Indian oceans, as well as with the coastal towns of navigable rivers emptying into those areas.

The Berlin Conference of 1884 – 1885 was organized and led to the scramble and partition of Africa into different zone. Nigeria falls under the zone of Great Britain. Having discovered that African and Nigeria was endowed with abundant natural resources, the European encourages the extraction of these resources in large quantities for onward shipment to Britain. These resources may include among others, tin, coals, rubber, cotton, coal, goal, zine etc. the extraction and movement of these minerals were under the supervision and control of United African Company (UAC), SCOA, Unilever, etc.

In 1885, Oil Rivers Protectorate was established while the Niger coast protectorate came into being 1893. In 1899 protectorates of Southern and Northern were formed. By 1900 Southern Nigeria came under the control of Britain, while Northern Nigeria came under control in 1906, after the discovery of these areas, they were amalgamated in 1914 and named Nigeria.

Colonialism is defined as a total domination and control which entails political subjugations, economic alienation and social segregation of the colonies. Colonialism is a domination of one geographically area by another for the purpose

of economic and political exploitation aimed at ensuring a constant and free flow of mineral resources from the colonies to the European societies.

2.2 COLONIAL POLICY AND STRUCTURE

The Indirect Rule System

The British government used a political system called *Indirect Rule System* in order to administer the country. The system was one of the techniques of colonialism known as political strategy of colonial administration deployed by Lord Lugard who was said to have introduced it in Uganda and India. The system was a child of necessity because of the need to administer large territory that came under the control of the British colonial government. The system was operated by traditional rulers who serve as intermediaries between the British officials and the natives in order to ensure effective colonial administration.

There are many reasons behind the adoption of indirect rule system. Thus;

- *Inadequate Personnel:* The system was adopted due to the shortage of personnel that would run the affairs of the territory smoothly. Hence, the British officials have no alternative than indirect rule policy.
- *Very Cheap to Operate:* The system do not require huge resource to administer and operate, because both human and material resource were put in place by the traditional rulers; other reason includes;

- *Lack of clear geographical map of the territory*
- *Existence of traditional administration that was in place*
- *Language barrier*

The system was successful in Northern Nigeria (Hausa/Fulani) society because of the existence of centralized system of power that was vested in to the hand of the king (**Sarki**), indirect system partially worked in the Oyo empire because of the existence of check and balances by the council of **Oyo Mesi** (King makers) and failed in the Igbo society because of the heterogeneous nature of Igbo society and also absence of centralized system of administration. These differences happened because of the difference in traditional administrations that was obtainable in the three regions as discussed earlier.

Impacts of Colonialism in Nigeria

There are different impact of colonial administration in Nigeria, these include, political, economic, social and even religious. The impacts are negative, according to scholars like, Rodney (1974), Muzrui (1986), colonial rule had some negative consequences on the politics, economy and society of Nigeria.

a. Economic Subjugation: Colonial administration was characterized by exploitation of resources from Nigeria. The colonial administration encourages production of cash crops like cocoa, coffee, cotton and

groundnut at the expense of food crops. (Rodney, 1979). This led to over dependence of the indigenous economy on the European's because of the commercial policy which targeted towards promoting export trade by encouraging Nigerians to sell their agricultural product as well as mineral resources to the Europeans at a very fixed price so wished by the Europeans. This commercial policy by the British government was meant of their own interest not for the interest of Nigerians. This process helped greatly in turning Nigeria to heavily rely on importation of finished goods by British government at a high exorbitant price. There was also restriction on the products produced by Nigerians that was only needed in the European market which include coal mining located at Enugu in 1911, and Tin mining that was also located at Jos in 1904, these was followed by rail ways constructions to facilitate adequately the movement of those materials to Europeans market rather than for indigenous use. The integration and incorporation of Nigerian economy in to the world capitalist system had impacted negatively, this is because of the neglects of industries and destructions existing handcrafts industries found in the regions and hence the present modern technological backwardness was attributed to this integration of Nigeria in to the world capitalist system and also the over dependence of exportation of goods and technology.

b. Social segregation, the British policy of indirect rule tactics was a clear testimony of how the indigenous people were divided and ruled separately and thereby inculcating in to the minds of people of the different regions to consider themselves as enemies of one another. The introduction of western education was intended not for the benefit of Nigerians but for benefit of the British government, because of the language barrier and hence they need to teach the indigenous people on how to read and write in English language. In 1840 many Mission schools were opened in the Southern Nigeria for sole aim of converting children to Christianity. Apparently, the establishment of schools by the British government did not yielded positively up to 1882. The first primary school was established in Lagos in 1899 and in 1909 kind's Collage was established as among the first secondary schools, in 1909 first elementary school was established in Kano and since then, little was done to promote education in the northern Protectorate of Nigeria, and this was the beginning of social segregation and educational imbalance between the regions in Nigeria which brought and continue to bring suspension of exploitation and domination by one region over the other. Furthermore, The attitudes of colonial masters was that of deception, selfishness, arrogance, individualism and continuing accumulation of wealth as the expense of the poor which in indigenous people were not to the habit.

c. Destabilization and destruction of existing traditional political system: The colonial government forcefully removed many traditional rulers and replaced them with British official and other indigenous rulers who were loyal to the British government. Other impacts of colonial administration may include;

- Establishment of a strong administrative system: The administrative system of colonialist emphasized direct and strong control, as it required that all personnel remain unquestionably subordinate to the top colonial authority, personified by the high commissioner, resident, divisional and district officers, warrant chiefs etc.
- Colonial administration has created a unique class of wealthy people who served as agents for the purchase of mineral resources and other valuables thereby implanting the nexus of *comprador-bourgeoisies*.
- Finally, trading activities during colonial administration further enslaved the native people.

Even though, there are positive impacts of colonial government over Nigeria like emphasizing great effort by all indigenous people to work hard and become self-reliant and providing certain social facilities in the urban cities yet the negative consequences had over shadowed the positive ones because of the situation Nigeria found itself as a result of colonial government.

3.1 NATIONALISM IN NIGERIA

Nationalism is a feeling of national conscious of group of people living in a geographical location who shared common interest and destiny to gain independence because of the ruthless, exploitative, oppressive and suppressive nature of colonial government.

According to Bugh (1970) Nationalism suggest a strong love for one's father land.

Various conceptions has been offered by different scholars, like (Deutsch, 1953; Hodgkin, 1956; Coleman, 1958). According to Fagge and Alabi (2017) Nationalist activities was limited to Europe and North America where various political and Cultural reforms were witnessed between the 17th and the 19th centuries. Later the concept became crucial to political and academic discourse in the third world countries as a result of European domination and control and their desire to impose new political system and western culture.

The Early Nationalist Resistance

In Nigeria, during the periods of colonial government, it witnessed resistance by group of people called the nationalist, to mention a few are people like, King Jaja of Opobo, Nana of Itsekeri, Attahiru of Sokoto, these were Nigerian nationalist leaders who resisted European control over their empires and kingdoms. These groups of people formed the early resistance of British imperialism, during

colonial government in Nigeria, many traditional rulers were dethroned and exiled from their natives people.

According to Fagge and Alabi (2017) King Jaja was exiled to West Indies for being recalcitrant and unbending towards the imperialist overtures. King Kosoko of Lagos was deposed and exiled (after substantial part of his town had been burnt) to Lekki and replaced by a willing tool, Akitiye, who was prepared to dance to the tune of the British Government. Fagge and Alabi(2017) further stress that, the Sokoto, Kano and Yola emirates were overrun by Lugard forces in 1903, thereby putting an end to their initial resistance. A number of uprisings were recorded as a result of British imperialist power over land of Nigeria. These may include the Akassa Massacre in 1895. This massacre was the outcome of the violent attack of the Brass middlemen who protested their displacement by the Royal Niger Company. In the attack, some 1,500 Brass men destroyed the company's property at Akassa. In response, the British sent a punitive expedition to redress the effrontery and vandalism of the Brass men (Fagge and Alabi, 2017).

Another uprising that widely publicized was the Aba Riot of 1929 as a result of the exploitive nature of the British government, this riot resulted in the killings fifty women and a number of them were wounded as a result of the rumors that women were about to taxed and the unsatisfactory abuses of the native members and the warrant chiefs, the women rose in oneness to attack the conniving chiefs,

Europeans and their goods and properties (especially those of the trading companies) were widely destroyed (Perham, 1937) (cited in, Fagge and Alabi, 2017).

Commissions of inquiry were set to investigate the causes of the 1929 riots. The first, purely official and pro-establishment returned a verdict of not guilty to the officials, but the second which included two important Nigerian lawyers, but highly critical of the administrative ineptitude which precipitated the riots. While accepting report of the second commission, the secretary of state colonies fell short of criticizing the official except to observe that the fundamental cause of uprising was serious negligence arising from the fact that, the government had insufficient knowledge of the indigenous institutions and life of the people (Ibid). Although political activities was not factor arising from the uprising during colonial era, according to Fagge and Alabi (2017) the activities was further extended to religious domain where many religious groups seceded from white-dominated Christian churches in the country. Much of these were witnessed in the Anglican Church. The first to secede in 1891 was the United Native African Churches (UNAC). They resolved to secede on August 14, 1891 and it was documented as follows:

That this meeting in humble dependence upon almighty God is of the opinion that Africa is to be evangelized, and that foreign agencies at work at the present moment, taking into

consideration climatic and other influences, cannot grasp the situation; Resolved that a purely Native African Church be founded, for the evangelization and amelioration of our race, to be governed by African (Fagge and Alabi, 2017:62).

So there are many factors that necessitated nationalism in Nigeria, which scholars classified them as internal and external factors. These include:

Formation of political parties: the activities of political parties created awareness and become among the vanguard of Nationalist movement for instance, Nigeria National democratic party (NNDP) by Harbert Macauley, the Action Group (AG)

The role of press: constitutes immensely towards exposing the exploitation of colonial government like *Lagos weekly record, daily news, the comet and the Daily Times*.

The activities of British labor party.

The independence of other countries like ; India and Pakistan in 1947.

The Atlantic Charter of 1941 which brought about Universal Human Rights as well as the advocates for free environment.

Other factors that promoted nationalism in Nigeria were;

The West African Students Union,

The defeat of Britain by Japan,

World economic depression of 1930 among others,

These struggles combined with other factors culminated in producing independence Nigeria on 1st October, 1960.

4.1 POST COLONIAL PERIOD

Nigeria gained her independence on 1st October 1960. From 1960-1966 the country practiced a parliamentary system government which was modeled on the British tradition. However, the practice was not sustained for long as the period witnessed much political turmoil causing its short life span.

The First Republic

As mentioned earlier, Nigeria operated a multi-party system in the First Republic 1960 – 1966 organized in the context of parliamentary system. Nigeria has a ceremonial President representing the Queen of England until the country attained a republic status in 196, when the Queen of England ceased to be the Head of State of Nigeria. During that period, the political parties that dominated the political space are: The Northern People's Congress (NPC), the National Council of Nigeria Citizen (NCNC), the Action group (AG) and the Northern Elements Progressive Union (NEPU).

The NPC which was formed since 1951 from the *Jam'iyyar Mutanen Arewa a Yau*, was operated largely in the Northern region of Nigeria. It formed the government of the Northern region and also it has the majority of seats in the federal parliaments and thereby paved the way by the party to form the government at the federal level in coalition with the NCNC. The NCNC was formed in 1944 and had

people like Herbert Macculey and Nnamdi Azikwe as its leaders. The Eastern regional government was controlled by the party. The coalition between the NCNC and the NPC ensured the emergence of Nnamdi Azikwe as Governor General and later President of Nigeria. The partner of NCNC in the federal government (NPC) produced the Prime Minister in the person of Chief Tafawa Balewa, who served as the chief executive of the federation.

The A.G emerged from socio-cultural group known as the “Omo Ogbe Oduduwa”. The activities of the party were largely restricted to the Western region. While the NPC dominated and controlled the politics of the Northern region, the NCNC dominated the East and the AG controlled the Western region.

Although, there were other small political parties during that period like Midwest democratic front (MDF), the United Middle Belt Congress (UMBC) etc, Politics in the Nigerian First Republic was manipulated under ethnic and regional umbrella as the then leaders’ deployed regional sentiments to gain popularity and acceptance. These trends continued up to the time when military intervened into the Nigerian politics for the first time. The First Republic collapsed in 1966.

5.1 MILITARY RULE IN NIGERIA AND ITS IMPACT ON THE SOCIETY

This section of the chapter focuses on military intervention in Nigerian politics and the reasons behind the intervention and its impact on the polity.

The Nigerian Military as an Institution

It is well documented that the Nigerian Military is an off-shoot of the colonial army known as the West African Frontier Forces. It is composed of the Army, Navy and the air Force. The military is a hierarchical and authoritative structure, where its members find their ways to different positions through years of training and experience. It is a body of professionals highly trained to handle the usage of sophisticated weapons with high degree of centralization, discipline, and obedience to higher commands, rapid communications and esprit de corps among its members. The military as an institution is one measure of the power of a state determined through its organizational strength alongside her control of arms and trained personnel which makes it a powerful public institution in all states. Traditionally, the Military are essentially meant to perform some basic functions as follows:

- (1) Defend Nigeria from external aggression;
- (2) Maintenance of its territorial and security borders from violation,

(3) Suppressing insurrection and acting in aid of civil authorities to restore order when called upon to do so by the president and

(4) Perfecting such other functions as may be prescribed by an Act of the National Assembly. These functions are discussed extensively under Section 197(1) of the 1999 constitution of the federal republic of Nigeria.

However, the above signified that the Military could be deployed by governmental authorities, in serious cases of breakdown of law and order, intense riots, internal insurrection, civil rebellion and secession to restore order. It should also play a role in the protection of the state from within or maintenance of internal stability. The military therefore is not trained to rule but to defend the territorial integrity of a nation. In Nigeria and even across other African countries however, the military had always taken over the reign of government through coercive means known as coup d'état. According to Edwin Madunagu (2008), a coup d'état is "a violent and unexpected reformation of state policy" or "unexpected and sudden measure of state often involving force or threat of force". Politically, it means a "sudden and decisive action, especially one affecting a change of government illegally or by force". Thus, a coup d'état signifies a political act especially within the context of armed politics. The first military coup in Nigeria was that of January 15th 1966, followed by July 1966 in the same year, the third was July 1975 when general Murtala became the Head of State. In 1983 Major General Buhari overthrew the

government and became the Head of State, in 1985 Babangida toppled the government of Buhari, in 1993 Late General Sani Abacha emerged as the Head of State, Abacha died in June 1998 and General Abdulsalam took over. After a prolonged period of military rule, the country returned to civilian government in 1999.

Reasons for Military Intervention in Nigerian Politics

As asserted by Finer (1962), Military intervention is an attempt by Military officers to get involved in the political process of a state so as to improve on the conditions of some problems identified which are politics related. He further argued that the military is likely to intervene in countries with low political culture than those with high political culture. This because in the former political structures are not well institutionalized and the dominant political norms and the rules of the game have not been sufficiently internalized. In a similar submission by Samuel Huntington, elucidated that the most important causes of military interventions in politics are political. Huntington contends that military interventions in developing countries is only one specific manifestation of the general politicization of social forces and institutions, Military intervention is likely in societies where most social forces and institutions are highly politicized such that we have political universities, political labor unions, political bureaucracies and political armed forces. Both scholars converge on the perception that military interventions in states lacking generally

institutional political culture and those suffering economic hardships and social division.

According to Lukham (1971), military intervention anywhere has its basis on the need for the military to perform its guardian role as the custodian of national interest. This implies the military is seen as the last resort and only institution that could be leaned upon for the restoration of law and order in the emergence of any crisis which threatens the national unity and cohesion (cited in Jiddere, 2005). In the views of Morris (1962), that military intervention can be explained by reference to the internal structure of the military, the social background of the officers, still structure and career lines, internal social cohesion and cleavages. He added that professionalism and political ideology within the military are important factors explaining military intervention in politics (Toyin, 2015). The contending views of these scholars help in understanding better the specific reasons attributed to military incursion in Nigerian government and politics as envisaged by other scholars as the Nigerian social and political milieu as well as each of the coups have cleavages with one or more of the factors identified earlier. However, Ibenegbu (undated) identified five theories that can help explain the reasons for Military intervention in Nigeria, some of the remote and immediate causes are stated alongside these theories below.

The colonial legacy

Onuorah (2005) observed that the British policy of divide and rule led to the regionalization of politics during the colonial era which provided basis for the post independence politics of First and Second Republics. This practice divided the country into three regions deliberately drew the political map of the country which made the emergence of a nationally accepted leadership difficult as emerging political parties never had a cross national outlook rather, they were formed on the basis of ethnic identity of each region (cited in Edigin, 2010) The consequence was ethnic and religious tensions over economic and educational development especially between the Northern and Western regions thereby accentuating National rivalries and ethnic sentiments in the First Republic which warranted Military intervention and also led to the eruption of the Nigerian civil war in 1966. This corroborates with one of the theorization on **Regional differences** as a cause to military intervention. It is believed that Nigeria, existing with more than 400 ethnic groups forcefully brought to peacefully co-exist through colonialism, must surely witness upheavals and political instability as these differences are not easy to blend.

Electoral Crisis

Among the important cardinal principles of democracy is to hold free and fair election so that the emerging government could be accepted and gain wider popularity. Nigeria, however, is characterized by poor culture visible in the citizens and politicians attitudes of intolerance to opposition, corruption in electoral acts, nepotism, violence and other negative political behaviors. This has formed the genesis for post electoral violence at different historical periods in Nigeria, thereby serving as fertile grounds for the Military to intervene. The assertion also corresponds to the second theory which postulated that **conflicts based on specific issues in the society** are reasons for military incursion in developing nations like Nigeria. The idea is that the occurrence and reoccurrences of different kinds of conflicts either on ethnic, religious, electoral and other basis necessitates military intervention so as to restore law and order in the society. It is a known fact that the Western regional crisis of 1962 was a cause of the January 1966 military coup and right from the first 1959 election to 1964, 1979 and 1993 none has not been associated with crisis and the eventual takeover by the Military.

Corporate interest of the Military and its undue politicization

In a submission by Ikekegbe (1995), it was enunciated that the reasons for Military intervention in politics is the desire to protect their corporate interest from threats

through reduced resource allocation, interferences and poor welfare (cited in Edigin, 2010). He added that whatever the political background of a coup d'etat, may be, when the army acts it does so for some reasons. Therefore vested interest and personal ambitions of some officers cannot be eliminated in the occurrences of coups. The Military counter Coup masterminded by General Ibrahim Babangida in August 27, 1985 against his colleague; General Muhammadu Buhari serves as a good example. Similarly, the politicization of the Nigerian armed forces took its root from 1960 when they were been called upon by civilian leaders to perform national duties. For instance, they were used in Congo and Tanzania crisis in 1960 and 1964 respectively. Also, they were called upon to maintain essential services during the 1964 general strike, to maintain peace during the period of emergency in the western region in 1962, and also to check the Tiv Riots of 1963. With the reliance of the political leaders on the military to provide these services, it began to dawn on the Military that the survival of the country depended on them to a very large extent. It is reasonable to argue that one of the factors responsible for the 1966 coup in Nigeria was the exposure of the Military to politics. At different occasions in Nigerian politics, the Nigerian army is politicized in such a way that sometimes, promotion, recruitment and dismissal of the army were politically motivated and at the same time favoring one region against another. The assertions here are also closely related to the third theorization on the Centrality of the

Military for its professionalism. It is believed that the greater the resources and power of the Military the greater the chances for Coups. Since the instrument of the usage of force is within the reach of the Military, they would do whatever possible to ensure that their corporate interests are protected by toppling the government to ensure control.

Political Decay and Incompetence of Democratically elected Leaders

There is often claim by the military for their involvement in politics as a result of decay in the political system. It is based on the assumption that whenever the political system is about to collapse, the military is likely to intervene and this has been the Nigerian situation. Political schisms are believed to impede national integration, economic development and social progress. The military therefore claimed that their involvement is to create a climate for national unity, reconciliation and progress. These notions also correspond to the forth theorization which postulated that ***Corruption and political crisis*** in most cases weaken the government thereby creating high chances of military Coups. Nigeria being one of the most corrupt countries makes military intervention inevitable especially under weak and corrupt leaders. The military intervention of December 1983 of Buhari and Idiagbon was based on these reasons among others.

Economic Mismanagement

The fifth theory revolves around ***Socio-economic development***. It maintains that military intervention only happen due to disbelief in the socio-economic development of the country so military intervention only take place in low income status countries while socially and economically developed countries are prone. The Nigerian experience is embedded in such problems as social and economic crises, inflation and economic mismanagement. Finally, other reasons are tribalism and nepotism especially in the recruitments, appointments and promotions within the civil service, failure of the administrations to deliver basic services, wide spread poverty among others.

Nature and character of the Military Administration

The Military is known to be an authoritative or dictatorial government that negates popular participation in decision making processes. When the regime assumes power, the first action is suspension of the constitution and its replacement with decrees. This gives the legal backing for the dictation of affairs as there is no room for negotiation. It also suspends all elective and politically appointed office holders as well as representative institutions. The administration also negates all forms of political activities as it bans the formation and operation of political parties and other mass gatherings. The idea is that it does not support any form of opposition

as well as criticisms. It also characterized by series of reformation within the civil service in order to pave way for the execution of its policies.

5.2 IMPACT OF MILITARY INTERVENTION IN NIGERIAN POLITICS

Military regimes in Nigeria even though have contributed reasonably to the development of the society through the creation of some institutional frame works and the implementation of certain policies and programs such as The National Youth Service Corps (NYSC), The Federal Character Commission, massive State and Local Government creations, Poverty Alleviation Programs, numerous Infrastructural projects among others as measures to enhance social cohesion and unity, promote equality and increase the level of welfare among Nigerians, yet the administrations have far reaching socio-economic and political consequences in the society. The decay and gross indiscipline evident in the Military has cost it's lost of professionalism and has succeeded in killing the esprit de corps among members thereby promoting fractionalization and sectionalism of the Military. They in many cases showcase the very social maladies such as tribalism, nepotism, and class privilege found in the larger society. The Nigerian experience therefore, has proved that the Military rulers as they identified themselves with one social group or the other, rather than promoting inter-ethnic harmony, they only encourage the existence of cleavages and compound the problem of social

integration more than their civilian counter parts, therefore becoming culprits of their own accusations.

From the economic point of view, Mismanagement, corruption and economic depression are usually some of the orchestrated claims for Military intervention in Nigeria; unfortunately managing the economy under the Military has been the greatest disaster ever in Nigeria's history. Even though they often present economic blueprints for development, the Structural Adjustment Program (SAP) of the Babangida regime is sufficient to explain the odds. The constant romance between the Military and Power has intoxicated and sustained their desire for massive accumulation of wealth and private properties creating a new class of bourgeois among some of the opportune officers who extensively engage in all forms of corrupt practices to maintain their luxurious life styles and keep their foreign bank accounts loaded. This corrupt nature of the Military rulers together with a corrupt bureaucracy, have succeeded in siphoning the country's resources, bastardizing the economy and implementing economic policies that usually leave the people in unbearable hardship and absolute poverty and underdevelopment. The military had always claimed the determination to eradicate corruption, but has only institutionalized it. In addition recurrent Military interventions in Nigeria have made possible the elevation of income of the Military personnel above their

peers and other professional occupations deepening income inequalities, between given occupational groups.

The political consequences of Military regimes in Nigeria have their roots partly from the role expansion of post-colonial administrations which ended up creating role confusion in the Military. The for long military rule has created the diffusion and assimilation of some military ethos and norms into the larger civil society. As rightly noted by Toyin (2015), that in even in democratic administration, politicians had adapted to the command and dictatorial system of the Military, consequently leading to militarized political culture, manifested in the political behaviors of the *dramatis personae* in a democratic arena. With the adulteration of democratic principles and values, the rule of operation had become that of order, combat rather than dialogue, disregard to court orders and violation of human rights became the tenets of militarized civic culture under a democratic dispensation. Democracy is rooted in several key values, or norms which provide its moral content and give its institutions and procedures their normative purpose, these values include freedom, inclusion, equality, equity, welfare, negotiation and compromise. However, the base of these detriments could be traced as part of the consequences for suspension of the constitution and its outward replacement with decrees. The laws which grant such values as rights and which help shape the actions of rulers and the ruled are now abandoned leaving the discharge of the

governmental affairs to the whims and caprices of politicians. Contemporary, the consequences are too enormous to bear as such acts are responsible for the total disregard for the rule of law, bad governance, and heightened insecurity, gross indiscipline, pervasive level of corruption, indiscriminate use of force and increased military spending at the expense of other basic social amenities and infrastructural societal development. These impacts have caused immeasurable damages to Nigeria's democratic experience and the citizens at large.

5.3 THE NIGERIAN CIVIL WAR

Civil war is a conflict that emerges within a particular society or state, it is an internal crisis of a state, which may lead to loss of lives and properties.

Most African societies faced problems of war within their societies; there was in Sierra-leone, Liberia, and even in Europe for example the Spanish Civil War.

The most tragic political conflict that occurred in the Nigerian political history was the civil war, which was also known as the **Biafran war**, 6 July 1967-15 January 1970 was a war that was fought to counter the secession of Biafra from Nigeria. Biafra represented nationalist aspiration of the Igbo people, whose leadership felt deeply that they could no longer coexist with Nigerian federal government. The

war resulted from political, economic and socio-cultural agitation of the Igbo people.

The Nature and the Character of the Nigerian Civil War

Following a number of political events that happened in the independence of Nigeria as at 1960, there were several hopes and aspirations among the Nigerian citizens as the future of the country will be determined and control by Nigerian citizens. According to Anikeze (2015) The fact that colonial government and its negative impacts has come to an end in determining who gets what when and how under an environment devoid of exploitations and intimidation, all these hopes could not happened. He added that, the civil war undoubtedly, caused by the actions, inactions and reactions among the military political leaders of post Ironsi administration. Ademoyega (1981), in (Anikeze 2015) noted that, suddenly, Ironsi was swept off the stage and the Northern officers refused the authority of Brigadier Ogundipe, who was the next in rank to Ironsi. Anikeze (2015) also opined that they refused to accept Colonel Adebayo who was next to Ogundipe instead they insisted on having Lieutenant-Colonel Gowon, because he was a Northerner and Ojukwu perceived that they could continue to coexist in unity with Nigeria and hence, declared the secession of Biafra. Ojukwu wanted a confederation as was agreed on Aburi in Ghana involving the then leadership of Ghana, Gowon and Ojukwu, which the Head of State general Yakubu Gowon declined. Ojukwu was of the

opinion that since the death of Ironsi has not been announced, consequently, the post of the Head of State and supreme commander of the Armed forces has not been vacant. He argued that even if the seat is vacant, going by the military procedure, Gowon is not in the position to ascend the mantle of leadership of the entity called Nigeria. This is because, according to Ojukwu, Gowon was not the next in rank to late Ironsi. On the 13 January 1970, a peace treaty was signed which brought to an end the war which tore many Nigerians apart, consequently, the federal government under General Gowon embarked on social mobilization programs that will facilitate peace and development of post-civil war period, the policy named “3R” which stands for Rehabilitation, Reconstruction and Reconciliation.

Causes of Nigerian civil war

For the purpose of better understanding, the causes of Nigerian civil war are classified into two, remote causes and immediate causes.

The remote causes were:

1. British divide and rule tactics

The British policy of indirect rule, the creation of regions, and separation of these regions prevented the development of national consciousness among Nigerians. Furthermore these policies increased the awareness in the various

ethnics groups of their differences. This, along with colonial capitalism laid the bases for ethnic hostility and conflict between the regions, the separation of North and South created suspicion and lack of understanding between the Nigerians living in north, and south. Hence, is among the remote causes of the war.

2. Unequal development between the regions:-

There was unequal development between the regions in terms of western education, industrialization, availability of social amenities and these created intense competition between the regions, the north and east wants to catch-up with the west, the west wanted to maintain its leads, politicians in each of the region struggle to control the center.

3. The crises of 1965 western regional election:-

This is one of the remote causes of the war; the result of this election was absolutely rejected as there was mass rigging and manipulation of the conduct of the elections.

4. Politicization of the Nigerian army e.g:- the recruitment, promotion and dismissal of military were politically influenced rather than based on merit.

5. Economic exploitation:- the First Republic political elites were accused of been mismanagement of resources and corruption which of course brought

about injustice, and tribalism in the distribution of the resources. Other reasons are:

- Census crisis of 1962 and 1963
- Lack of commitment to bring to book the plotters of the 1966 coup

The immediate causes of the war were as follows:-

1. The January 15th 1966 coup led by Igbo army officers which resulted in the death of prominent Northern and Western political leaders and senior military officers. This brought a series of accusations by the Northerners that Igbo wanted to dominate the country.
2. The July 29th 1966 counter coup which clearly resulted to the death of Ironsi and other Igbo military officers. The counter coup was done in order to stop the Igbo from dominating the country and avenge the death of northern political leaders and the military officers.
3. The imposition of Gowon as the Head of State after the counter coup of 1966 instead of Brigadier Ogundipe, hence,
4. The refusal of Ojukwu to recognize Gowon as his leader, this created a crisis where the Igbo break away from the country was unacceptable to the rest of Nigerians, as a result of which series of conference were held in search for solution in form of compromise, dialogue and negotiation.

5. The creation of twelve states and the declaration of state of emergency by Gowon on 27th May, 1967.
6. The declaration of total war on Nigeria by Ojukwu, the Governor of Eastern Nigeria.
7. The discovery of oil in the Eastern Nigeria.
8. The federal government determination to crash the rebellion and maintain the territorial integrity of Nigeria.

The Effects of Nigerian Civil War

The effects of Nigerian civil/Biafran War are positive and negative in nature:

The positive Effects include among others:

1. The civil war crisis led to the creation of more states in the country.
2. The civil/Biafran war kept the country united as one entity.
3. The Biafran/civil war made Nigerian Federal Government became more powerful against the States.
4. The civil war helped Nigeria to adjust and readjust its foreign policy and made her to know its true friends in the international system.
5. The civil war led to the preparation and adoption of new constitution
6. Also the Biafran war led to the introduction of new formula for revenue sharing and allocation.

While the negative effects also :

1. The Biafran/civil war crisis led to lost of lives and properties in Nigeria.
2. The civil war crisis disunited the Nigerian Army as it became divided along ethnic sentiment, which invariably recruitment, promotion and punishment become politicized.
3. It led to stagnation of economic activities in the country as many industries collapsed.
4. The civil war led to academic setback in the country as many institutions of learning were destroyed while some were closed.
5. A number of families, groups, clans were displaced from their villages.

6.1 RETURN OF DEMOCRACY IN NIGERIA 1999

The Nigerian state assumed a new governance status in 1999 following the demise of authoritarian regime in the country. Military dictatorship was replaced by representative democracy with the hopes and aspirations of good governance, much higher than what the seemingly collapsible democratic institutions could fulfill. The source and nature of transition in 1999 was later found to constitute a serious threat to the foundation of democracy and its consolidation. The reality of the attempts to subvert the concept of democracy to serve the interests of a few,

rather than a greater majority, still looms high. The emerging democracy was artificial and reflexive of external imposition.

With the inauguration of the Fourth Republic on May 29, 1999, Nigeria began a democratic journey that has lasted twenty (20) uninterrupted years. Great hope and expectations greeted Nigeria's return to multi-party politics and civil rule in 1999. However, despite the conduct of five consecutive general elections (1999, 2003, 2007, 2011 and 2015), there are still great doubts over the health status of democracy in Nigeria simply because it is yet to achieve the desired ends which prompted heightened expectations in 1999. The hope expressed by the people in the democratization process is gradually faltering, while the expectations are becoming dashed. Political liberalization and not genuine democratic transition can best describe Nigeria's political landscape since 1999 because of the failure of the process to manifest profound evidence of a growing democracy.

6.2 PARTY SYSTEMS AND POLITICAL ALLIANCES

Empirical evidences show that Nigeria represents one of the most complex plural societies. These complexities and nature of pluralism has necessitated the adoption of multi-party system since independence inevitable. The essence is to represent the interests and views of the divergent cleavages so as to ensure cohesion of the entire political system. However, rather than accruing the benefits of what such

party system offers, politics in both First and Second Republics was devoid of any harmony, co-operation, sanity, and orderliness it they were rather characterized by hatred, divisions, disunity and rascality which affected the lifespan of the two republics. The formation of these parties was largely based on ethnic and regional affiliations rather than on cross national basis. The return to democratic rule in 1999 to date has only witnessed slight changes in terms of party formations, alliances and the manner politics is being played from what was obtained in the past. With the multi-party system in existence, political parties especially during the 1999, 2003 and 2007 elections were formed along ethno-religious lines. The number of politicians from other regions in some political parties was very insignificant because only PDP exhibited the character of Cross-Nationalism in its outlook. Until recently during the 2015 elections, never in the history of Nigerian politics have Alliance yielded victory since independence. However, all alliances since independence to date have been engulfed by inter and intra party conflicts, weakening their strength and limiting their chances of successes during elections. Similarly, from 2015 to 2019, there has been a tremendous change in the composition of party membership in both APC and PDP as both parties struggle to strike a balance in their National presence and dominance across all the 36 States of the federation.

6.3 ELECTORAL PROCESS AND POLITICAL CULTURE

Since in a democracy the ideal is seeking the consent and mandate of the citizens for any leader to be accepted as legitimate, citizen participation in the choice of their leaders is important. Elections as the means of filling public offices by competitive struggle for the peoples vote has become synonymous with democracy as it empowers the common citizens with the right to choose their leaders. As a result, elections have become one of the yardsticks for measuring how democratic a country is. As such, participation in the decision-making process and the conduct of free and fair elections are some of the major principles of democracy, to the extent that one of the political responsibilities of every citizen is to vote for responsible leadership in their community or country. Other elements may include; Rule of Law, Human Rights and Individual Freedoms, Civil Society and Civic Action.

The conduct of elections in Nigeria since return to democratic rule has been engulfed in much controversies just like other national issues. Most of the elections conducted during these periods are not free from allegations of manipulations and rigging thereby affecting their popular acceptance and authenticity. This has been the trend since independence and such allegations affect negatively the political stability and level of development in the country as most end up violently. This is to say that Nigeria's political culture has not changed from what it had always been

since independence with features ranging from political corruption, money politics, intolerance for opposition and criticisms, rivalry, rigging, violence among others. What is also visible is the emerging dominance of god fatherism and massive decamping among politicians. Thus, in Nigeria the attempt to build democracy and the citizens to benefit from its dividends has not yielded positive results, hence there is need to strengthen the system in order to provide effective and efficient service delivery to the people.

In this chapter, an attempt was made to examine Nigeria in pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial periods. It is evident that, the country had undergone several changes, in post-colonial Nigeria, the prolong military rule in the country had affected negatively the political development of the society.

References

- Aristotle, A. (1885) *The Politics*. In B. Jawett *Trans Oxford*, London: Clarendon Press.
- Anikeze, N.H (2015) *Fundamentals of Nigerian Government and Politics II*, Enugu, Academic Publishing Press.
- Coleman, J.S (1971) *Nigerian Background to Nationalism*, los Angeles, University of California Press.
- Deutsch, M. (1973) *Conflicts: Productive and Destructive in conflicts Resolution through Communication* Jandt, F.E (ed), New york, Harper and Row.
- Evans, P. (1940) *African Political Systems*, London, Oxford Press.
- Edigin, U. L “Military Interventions in the Nigerian Political Administration: The Recurrent Factors”; *International Journal of Communication*, NO. 12, December, 2010
- Fagge K.S and Alabi, D.O (2003) *Political and Constitutional development in Nigeria: from Pre-colonial to post-colonial era*, Kano, Northern Printers Ltd, Nigeria.
- Fagge K.S and Alabi, D.O (2017) *Nigerian Government and Politics*, Abuja, Basfaj Global Concept Ltd.
- Finer, E. (1962) *The Man on Horseback*, London, Paff Mall Press

Gibbs, J. (1965) *People of Africa*, New York Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.

Igbenegbu, G. (Undated) Top 5 Reasons for Military Intervention in Nigerian Politics, electronic version, retrieved on 10/03/2020 from <https://www.legit.ng/1134539-five-reason...>

Jiddere, J. A. (2005) “*The Military in Nigerian Government*” in, *The Nigerian Government and Economy Booklet*, General Studies Unit, Bayero University, Kano

Mazrui, A.A (1986) *The Africa: A Triple Heritage*, London, Little Brown.

Mill, J. (1946). *An essay on government*. Blackwell, Oxford University Press. New York.

Mill, J.S., (1963). Of the Proper Functions of Representative Bodies, in H. Eckstein and D. Apter, (eds.), *Comparative Politics: A Reader*. New York: The Free Press, 104.

Rousseau, J.J. (1913) *The social contract*. New York, NY: Cosimo Books.

Rodney, W. (1974) *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, Washington DC, Howard University Press.

Toyin, O.S (2015) The Impact of Military Coup D'etat on Political Development in Nigeria, Interventional Journal of Business and Social Sciences, Vol. 6 No. 10.