

# PROVISIONAL NOTES ON LEADERSHIP AND DEMOCRACY IN NIGERIA

*\*Dr. A.I. Pogoson*

## ***Abstract***

Nigeria is very much a bellwether for the progress of democracy in Africa. The future of Nigeria's democracy has repercussions far beyond its shores. However, for nearly five decades, Nigeria's statehood and democratic practice has been vacillating between military and civil rule. Forty-nine years after independence, Nigeria is still grappling with the problem of democratic consolidation and how to produce the right kind of leadership that will move the country from its present state to one in which the virtues of justice, peace and equity will be firmly entrenched in the society. Moreover, hardly had Nigeria gained political independence and embarked on civil rule than democracy became imperilled by an excessively politicised and ineffective leadership. Successive democratic experiments have either collapsed or have not produced the desired results and many have questioned the workability of democracy in Nigeria as in other African democracies.

Democracy involves the delegation of powers to consenting individuals by the majority essentially through the process of an election. Ideally, the individual is meant to serve the interests of the electorate. The problem with representation is that the representatives often develop ideas and interests which are not necessarily coterminous with those of the electorate. The representatives also often have considerable latitude or freedom of choice.

History is determined by the decisions of political elites. Leaders and the type of leadership they exert shape the way in which policies are made and the subsequent behaviour of states. Leadership failure can be assumed to be responsible for the failure of democracy in Nigeria. Not only have successive leaderships undermined attempts at entrenching an enduring democratic culture, they have also demonstrated an almost uncanny incapacity for governance, resulting in malgovernance.

This article attempts to discuss the travails of democracy in Nigeria and what roles the leadership played or is playing in the struggle for the enthronement of a people-centred democracy. The rationale for this is not far-fetched. Nigeria has never really practiced democracy in the real sense of the word. Apart from symbols of democracy that are usually erected, virtually all the elements of democracy-free elections (equality), sovereignty of the people, respect for human life, the rule of law, and

---

*\* Department of Political Science, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria*

liberty of the individual – have all been absent from Nigeria’s version of democracy. The leadership of the country have always insisted on the forms or symbols of democracy while the substance is denied to the people.

### ***Conceptualizing Democracy and Leadership***

As a prelude to our discourse, we shall begin with a clarification of major concepts that will serve as the building blocks for the paper.

#### ***Democracy***

Democracy enjoys universal appeal and is the dominant practice in contemporary politics. Its popularity stems from the fact that among all systems of rule, it is the only one that claims to be people centred. However, democracy has changed in its meaning several times and in more than one direction. As Gboyega argues, “the concept of democracy does have a meaning, a concrete manifestation that distinguishes democratic countries from non-democratic one in spite of the fact that there are many ways in which the fundamental nature of democracy may be conceptualised.”<sup>1</sup> For instance, Held identified three contending views on democracy which reflect deep rooted disputation about what democracy should mean and how it should be practised. These models are, first, ‘the direct or participatory democracy’ in which citizens are involved as in ancient Athens; second, the ‘liberal or representative democracy’ which sees democracy as a system of rule embracing elected officials who undertake to represent the interest and views of citizens within the framework of ‘rule of law’; and third, ‘the Marxist model’ otherwise known as ‘people’s democracy’ which seeks to extend equality of all citizens from the political to the social and economic spheres of life.<sup>2</sup>

An easier approach to understanding the real meaning of democracy is by looking at its origin. Etymologically, the term has its root in two Greek words, *demos* meaning ‘the people’ and *kratien* meaning ‘to rule.’ Thus in ancient Greece, democracy was understood as direct democracy, that is, rule by the people or the whole body of citizens.<sup>3</sup> This means that in a democracy, political power is in the hands of the entire adult population, and no smaller group has the right to rule. Such was the practice of democracy in the ancient Greek city-states. It is in that light that Aristotle defines it as “the rule of many.”<sup>4</sup> Plato, in his *Republic* equally describes democracy as “a charming form of government, full of

variety and disorder, and dispensing a kind of quality to equals and unequals alike.”<sup>5</sup> It is in this light also that Abraham Lincoln gave what is regarded as the most popular definition of democracy as “government of the people, by the people and for the people.”<sup>6</sup>

However, since the collapse of the Soviet Union and the consequent reversals or setback to the Marxian model of democracy, the western-style liberal/constitutional/neo-liberal democracy has come to dominate discussions on democracy. Indeed, political transition in the form of democratization became manifest in Africa in the 1990’s when transitions to democracy occurred in Cape Verde, Cote d’Ivoire, Gabon, Mauritania, Cameroon, Angola, Togo and Nigeria, to mention a few. The propelling move towards democratization in Africa had been associated with the argument that democratization is synonymous with development.

For democracy to thrive, it also needs state autonomy to ensure effective distribution of wealth to support meaningful participation by those enfranchised and mechanisms for holding elected leaders and bureaucrats accountable. As noted by Heater (1964: 117), “There are, it is suggested, five basic elements without which no community can call itself truly democratic. These elements are equality, sovereignty of the people, respect for human life, the rule of law, and liberty of the individual.”<sup>7</sup> For him, democratic equality implies ‘one man one vote’, irrespective of differences in wealth, religion, intelligence, etc. it also connotes the equal right and opportunity of all citizens to hold political office.<sup>8</sup>

However, to Larry Diamond, democracy entails: “meaningful and extensive competition among individuals and organised groups (especially political parties) either directly or indirectly, for the major positions of governmental power, in addition to popular participation in the electoral process and respect for the civil and political rights of the people.”<sup>9</sup> In sum, Held tries to put together the varied definitions of liberal democracy and a listing of its major elements. According to him, liberal democracy in its contemporary form includes a “cluster of rules and institutions permitting the broader participation of the majority of citizens in the selection of representatives who alone can make political decisions.”<sup>10</sup>

This cluster includes elected government; free and fair elections in which every citizen's vote has an equal weight; a suffrage which embraces all citizens irrespective of distinctions of race, religion, class, sex and so on; freedom of conscience, information and expression on all public matters broadly defined; the right of all adults to oppose their government and stand for office; and associational autonomy-the right to form independent associations including social movements, interest groups and political parties.<sup>11</sup>

The attraction of democracy is usually hinged on the fact that it is based on the will of the people and that is why it is regarded as the best form of government. It is the only system of government that makes rulers and representatives accountable to the people and also provides for a peaceful change of government or rulers without recourse to violence or revolution.

From the above, it is easy to deduce that democracy is people-centred and the way it could be concretely expressed is through regular, free and fair elections where the people have the opportunity to decide those who rule them. When elections are rigged and the people denied their fundamental rights to participate in governance as is the case in Nigeria, the government emanating from such fraudulent process lacks legitimacy and cannot therefore be expected to be answerable to the people or look out for their welfare. Here, Mayo's view that the "purpose of the whole electoral process is to produce a government invested with legitimacy"<sup>12</sup> is quite instructive. Thus, democracy without the people as the ultimate deciders of rulers, policies, and tenure of rulers is like theorising democracy without the *demos*, which is an exercise in fraud and futility and such country, strictly speaking, ceases to be a democracy until the illegitimacy is reversed.<sup>13</sup>

### ***Leadership***

Leadership is a concept with wide application. As Cronin contends, "it is one of the most widely talked about subjects and at the same time one of the most elusive and puzzling."<sup>14</sup> The avalanche of definitions given by scholars has only increased the confusion on what the term actually means. This has led some scholars such as Lippit to argue that "leadership is the worst defined, least understood personal attribute sometimes possessed by human beings." He avers that "even the

conclusions of those who have done extensive research on leadership are contradictory, simplistic or ambiguous.”<sup>15</sup> Similarly, Rost counselled against attempting to define leadership, because previous attempts to define it “have been confusing, varied, disorganised, idiosyncratic, muddled, and according to unconventional wisdom, quite unrewarding.”<sup>16</sup>

The difficulty of defining leadership has led to the suggestion that there should be a deviation from attempts at defining leadership to knowing what good leadership is all about. The import of the adjective ‘good’ is that while leadership is needed in every society for guidance and goal accomplishments, it can also misguide and bring about retardation in the society in question.<sup>17</sup>

A deeper investigation of the various definitions of leadership suggests some commonalities. For instance, Ciulla observes that these definitions perceive “leadership as some kind of process, act, or influence that in some way gets people to do something.”<sup>18</sup> He notes the difference in their connotation i.e. how leaders get people to do things (impress, organise, influence, and inspire) and how what is to be done is decided (forced obedience or involuntary consent, determined by leaders and as a reflection of mutual purposes) have normative implications.<sup>19</sup> Clearly, leadership is a process of motivating and influencing others, even though the means and ends may vary from one society to another.

In general therefore, the quality of leadership can be determined by the extent to which it possesses the following attributes—vision, foresight, knowledge/skill, stamina, integrity,<sup>20</sup> values, sensitivity, decisiveness, discipline, responsiveness, responsibility and its capacity to respond appropriately to challenges.<sup>21</sup>

Evidently, there are different types of leadership: the dictatorial leader, benevolent-autocratic, democratic and the laissez-fair leader.<sup>22</sup> Another typology of leadership include visionary leadership, charismatic leadership, transformational leadership, invitational leadership, servant leadership, and distributed leadership.<sup>23</sup> However, benevolent/autocratic leaders or the so much revered charismatic leaders are at best not reliable and can turn out to be a burden on the people. The preferred form of leadership is the political democratic leadership which is democratically elected and is expected to be subject to the constitution of the state. Political/democratic leaders are therefore public servants who are supposed to serve the people they lead and all their actions are also

supposed to reflect the wishes of, and promote the welfare of the people. We now turn to analysing how the problem of bad leadership has hampered the entrenchment of a sound democratic polity in Nigeria.

***Travail of Democracy Nigeria: The Leadership Conundrum***

Until the Fourth Republic, Nigeria has been unable to experiment with enduring democracy or transit from one democratically elected government to another. Because of this, many analysts have expressed the view that democracy (at least, the liberal/western model) has failed in Nigeria and other systems of government should be tried.<sup>24</sup>

One of the main reasons for the collapse of the two previous democratic experiments of the First and Second Republics were the inability to conduct peaceful, transparent, free and fair elections in Nigeria. Indeed, on all the occasions the military had sacked civilian governments, it has been on the heels of serious crises and chaos created as a result of failed elections.<sup>25</sup> The winner-take all attitude of Nigerian politicians turned periods of election to periods when Nigerians worry about the continued survival of the country as a result of the attendant violence and chaos that characterised elections. This is against the widely accepted norm that regular and credible elections is one of the concrete manifestations of democracy. Indeed for some, democracy exists in the “sovereignty of the vote.”<sup>26</sup> Consequently, the military cashed in on this situation and terminated the two previous democratic administrations, often to great applause and approval of the people.

However, the military administrations that replaced the civilians did not perform better and only added to the anguish of ordinary Nigerians by their penchants for tyranny, authoritarianism and abridgement of citizen’s rights. Nigerians again demonstrated their faith in democracy when they overwhelmingly participated in the elections organised under the watch of the military to usher in new democratic leaders in 1993. Unfortunately, the elections which were adjudged by both local and international observers to be relatively free, fair and transparent were annulled by the Ibrahim Babangida military regime.<sup>27</sup> The following eight years were one of the worst in Nigeria’s history. The General Abacha junta turned the country into a vast personal estate, converted most of the state’s resources to personal use and visited a reign of terror on the people and anyone who dared oppose his rule.<sup>28</sup> Needless to say that during that time, poverty deepened, social infrastructures and the

economy collapsed, the education sector sharply declined and, because of the government's brutish style of rule, was isolated and the country treated as a pariah state.

This experience ended all arguments and academic disputations on the desirability of military rule. Nigerians were fed up with military and loudly clamoured/waged struggles for a speedy return to democratic rule and the total banishment of the military to the barracks where they rightly belonged. Cashing in on the feelings at that time, the newly democratically elected president, Chief Olusegun Obasanjo – a former military General and Head of State who is reputed to be the first Nigerian military ruler to voluntarily relinquish power to an elected civilian government – promised to heal the wounds of the nation and deliver the “dividends of democracy” to ordinary citizens thus raising expectations about democracy. But as observed; “even without his prompting, there would have been high expectations anyhow”<sup>29</sup> because of the harrowing experiences the citizens had to endure for the sixteen years that the third phase of military rule lasted.

However, as was the case during the First and Second Republics, by the end of the first tenure of the regime, the high hopes and enthusiasm had started to wane and was replaced by deep scepticism with many wondering aloud whether democracy was workable in Nigeria and whether the citizens would ever enjoy the “dividends of democracy.” Quite a number of commentators even compared the administration to that of General Sani Abacha with some scoring the later higher. More concretely, a series of surveys were conducted by Afrobarometer on public attitudes to democracy, market and civil society in Nigeria and the result showed, among others, the disillusionment with the workings of democracy. Satisfaction with the working of democracy plummeted from 81 percent in 2000 to 25 percent in 2005. Support for democracy also declined from 84 to 65 percent.<sup>30</sup>

Despite wide dissatisfaction with the government and the Nigerian brand of democracy, the people, accepting the counsel that the only way to change a bad government or to correct a rigged elections is not through another coup, but through another election,<sup>31</sup> waited patiently for the next round of elections to exercise their rights to choose those they wish to govern them. Assessment of the elections by both local and external observers rated the elections as far below democratic

standards<sup>32</sup>. Virtually all the parties were not prepared for the elections and selected their flag bearers through undemocratic means. As INEC later explained, the body had to contend with a very chaotic situation where political parties substituted, “*re-substituted* and *un-substituted*” their candidates even when the deadline for submission of parties’ list had elapsed.<sup>33</sup>

The new government has carried on with a heavy legitimacy burden and, as a relief to the nation’s bruised psyche, have promised to reform the electoral process and ensure respect for the rule of law – which is also a hallmark of democracy.

Most politicians and stakeholders now see the tenuous “successful transition” from one civilian government to another as a major success for democracy in Nigeria. Some even argue that Nigeria has moved beyond democratic transition and the main task before it is that of democratic consolidation. This reasoning is defective. The fact that democracy or more appropriately, its form has survived for up to ten years is not the result of any positive change of behaviour on the part of the political elite or astuteness in governance or crisis management. Rather, it can be said to be the result of both external and internal circumstances and factors that have made it virtually impossible for the military to contemplate seizing power. For one, following from the post-Cold War triumph of liberal democracy as a global ideology, the international community, as against past practices, is no longer willing to accept military rule under any guise. Following the trend, the African Union (AU) also decided against recognising any unconstitutional change of government in Africa. Most importantly, however, is that the military in Nigeria has been so discredited that they would be extremely reluctant to contemplate a comeback at least for the main time.<sup>34</sup>

The reasons for the failure of democracy or the inability of Nigeria to successfully percolate and internalise the nuances of democratic governance have engaged scholars for a long time now. In the periods immediately after independence to the late 1980s the arguments centred on the colonial heritage, unsuitability of the western style of democracy in Africa and Nigeria especially, and the debilitating influence and stranglehold of former colonial masters on former colonies.<sup>35</sup> These arguments have now run their full course and while they may have provided some reprieve, they cannot explain Nigeria’s political and



economic woes.<sup>36</sup> After observing the profligacy and wanton corruption that characterised Nigeria's post-oil boom era and the Second Republic, some analysts became convinced that while not discountenancing external factors, Africa, and indeed, Nigeria's problems are internal and can be traced to bad, weak or ineffective leadership.<sup>37</sup> Over the years, this assertion has become true and even the politicians themselves have accepted that leadership is the greatest obstacle to democratic sustenance and economic development. Indeed, Nigeria has always been under a "coalition of bad leadership," whether military or civilian.<sup>38</sup> Robert Rotberg captures the situation and maintained that "Africa has long been saddled with poor, even malevolent, leadership: predatory kleptocrats, military-installed autocrats, economic illiterates, and puffed-up posturers. By far the most egregious examples come from Nigeria, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Zimbabwe, countries that have been run into the ground despite their abundant natural resources..." Rotberg further observes that "such leaders use power as an end in itself, rather than for the public good; they are indifferent to the progress of their citizens (although anxious to receive their adulation); they are unswayed by reason and employ poisonous social and racial ideologies; and they are hypocrites, always shifting blame for their countries' distress".<sup>39</sup>

This position was confirmed by former President Obasanjo when he maintained that the abysmal economic development of Africa is a reflection of the "poor and sometimes outrightly irresponsible leadership".<sup>40</sup>

The history of Nigeria's economic and social misfortunes especially with respect to political leadership has been well documented. But suffice it however to say that the main reasons for the collapse of Nigeria's democracies in the past have been dissatisfactions with the leadership.<sup>41</sup> The ineffective leadership that characterised the First Republic is quite well known.<sup>42</sup> The Government failed to offer the nation the much needed leadership and direction in the onerous task of economic development. Rather the Tafawa Balewa administration was content to leave the management of the economy to foreign concerns.<sup>43</sup> while it busied itself by consolidating its hold on power using every stratagem known to it including destabilising regional government (s) and allowing corruption among cabinet members to the consternation of the whole nation. The Balewa administration was engulfed in widespread

electoral fraud, frequent conflicts and contestations among the parties, violence and instability, political domination, and above all poor governance.<sup>44</sup> The administration lost support and legitimacy and became weak such that the military had to act to bring an end to the “insufferable government.”<sup>45</sup>

The civilian administration of the Second Republic was not any better. It also demonstrated the irresponsibility, arrogance, and incapacity for leadership of the Nigerian political elite. The politicians squandered the nation’s resources, paid little or no attention to basic human needs for the majority and mortgaged the economy. This created a fertile opportunity for the military to hijack the struggles against the corrupt civilians in a military coup.<sup>46</sup>

Whilst, the foregoing assertions are not contentious, those leaders were unable to provide the kind of quality leadership required to transform the country. They also exhibited poor leadership skills as they were unable to check the excesses of their subordinates who acted with impunity. If the common aphorism that the “buck stops at the table of the leader” is true, then they cannot be excused from blame and are therefore culpable and responsible for the failure of their government. From our discussion of leadership, it is apparent that the quality of a leader is not judged by the personal attributes he possessed but by the effectiveness of his/her subordinates. A leader is someone with a vision; who leads and influences those he leads and not the other way round.

### ***Conclusion***

Leadership failure has been responsible for, and is still the greatest challenge to Nigeria’s democracy and development. So far, it has been impossible to produce leaders such as Nelson Mandela, Julius Nyerere, and Festus Mogae, these were statesmen who could see beyond the short term gains and could see to the future and the needs of their respective states and the peoples. They considered the interests of the nation and the continent as paramount and not those of individuals or groups.

Considering the definitions of democracy examined previously, Nigeria cannot be said to be an embodiment of democracy. This is because virtually all the elements of democracy – equality, sovereignty of the people, respect for human life, the rule of law and the rights and freedoms of the individual – are absent in Nigeria. What we have are appearances of democracy. Nigerians had expected that the end of

military dictatorship will usher in an era of prosperity, equality, freedom and peace. But unfortunately, the leaders have hijacked the people's struggle and chosen to disregard their wishes and needs.

Significant progress cannot be achieved without the transformation of state-society relations in ways that generate generalised commitment to the state. This requires producing a fresh type of leadership that is committed to state building. The predominant leadership styles of the post-independence Nigerian elites as indeed, African elites generally, are perceived to be responsible for the dictatorship, spoils politics and economic failures that blotch the country's political and economical history. Nigeria continues to suffer a deficit in leadership by example reflected in the failure to enforce leadership code of conduct/ethics, wanton disregard for procedures and practices of accountability by public managers, rampant corruption and abuse of official power, weak oversight capacity of official accountability agencies such as the legislature, opposition parties, the ombudsman, and the national audit service. This has led to popular mistrust, alienation, and apathy.

Hoping and praying for a better tomorrow cannot and will not change the situation. The people must force the change on the leaders. The people must be determined to have real democracy which alone promises to solve the myriad of problems faced by the people, for as the African Charter for Popular Participation argues, "the absence of democracy is the main cause of the crisis of development in Africa."<sup>47</sup> The insistence on the enthronement of genuine democracy as the solution to Africa's leadership crisis stems from the fact that in a truly democratic society leaders are genuinely representative of and responsible to the people and where development is people-initiated and people-centred. This is the only recipe for solving Nigeria's hydra-headed and multi-dimensional problems. This is not to argue that development or progress is impossible without democracy. Indeed, as the newly industrialised countries of Asia (Asian Tigers) have shown, development is possible without democracy. This could be achieved with focused, visionary and good leadership that is authoritarian or dictatorial in nature. As the case of Asian Tigers have shown, these authoritarianism of these countries possessed certain redeeming features of democracy and good government namely accountability, predictability, the rule of law, and competition.<sup>48</sup>

Democracy however, assures the conditions for and promotes good governance and sustainable development. As Sklar rightly argues, “in democratic systems of government, rulers are the stewards of the common weal, accountable to citizens for the conduct of their stewardship.”<sup>49</sup> The inherent logic in democratic rule is that if it is the people who are ruling themselves, they can only rule themselves well.

How can real democracy be established in Nigeria with the present predatory leadership in place? Leadership must engender in its mechanisms, institutions, and structures, and a system that fosters integrity, authenticity, credibility, visibility, honesty, loyalty and the ultimate ethical value, justice. And abhor the concealing of harmful information, bribes that are proffered, untruthfulness, abuse of authority, and the practice of nepotism. These virtues are only adequately expressed in actions and behaviour, not mere words. Recognition of the rule of law, human rights, and probity in government are also important.

Solutions to the existing problem should thus be within the existing framework. A more realistic approach would be a well co-ordinated campaign and advocacy for greater participation of the people in the political process. The people should demand and ensure that proper electoral reforms are carried out for the conduct of free, fair, and transparent elections that will reflect the true wishes of the people.

Participation in government also entails fulfilment of one’s civic duties, especially payment of tax. There is also the need for a transparent and participative approach in decision making which suggests that leadership must be transparent, accountable and seen to be practicing probity whilst focusing equal attention to “means” as well as “ends”. It further suggests that there must be respect for ethical principles, and the need for a visionary and progressive approach to governance on the part of “transformative leaders”. Participatory democratic practise must therefore. translate into sensitivity to, and benefits for the common man. A “top-down” approach to governance should be replaced with grassroots participation at the local level, which respects the paradigms of transformative leadership and good governance. A transparent and participatory approach in decision making also suggests the need to address shortcomings in the democratic framework by establishing a sound and healthy party system, strengthening democracy within

political parties, inculcating a sense of accountability and transparency and civic and political morality among all sections of the people.

### **References**

1. See Alex Gboyega, *Democracy and Development: The Imperative of Local Good Governance*, An Inaugural Lecture delivered at the University of Ibadan, October 2, 2003, pp. 2-3.
2. Cited in Francis Enemou, "Democracy, Human Rights and the Rule of Law," in R. Anifowose and F. Enemou (eds), *Elements of Politics*. Lagos: Malthouse Press Ltd., 1999, p. 142.
3. Ibid., p. 10.
4. Cited in J.C. Johari, *Principles of Modern Political Science*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Limited, 2005, p. 430.
5. Cited in Wole Olanipekun, *Constitutional Safeguards for a Sustainable Democracy in Nigeria; Being the Text of the 2005 Owolabi Afuye Memorial Lecture Delivered on Thursday, October 27, 2005 at the Faculty of Law, University of Ibadan*, p. 11.
6. Cited in Peter B. Harris, *Foundations of Political Science*. London: Hutchinson & Co., 1979, p. 203.
7. D.B. Heater, *Political Ideas in the Modern World*. George and Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1964, p. 117.
8. Ibid.
9. Cited in Francis Enemou, *Elements of Politics*, p. 145.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. H. Mayo, *An Introduction to Democratic Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.
13. See O.B.C. Nwolise, *Fundamental Imperatives of National Security in a Post-Cold War Democratic Polity: Repositioning the Nigerian Contemporary Experience for 2020 and Beyond*. (forthcoming)
14. T. Cronin, "Thinking and Learning about Leadership" in R.I. Lester and A.G. Morton (eds.), *Concepts for Air Force Leadership*. Alabama Air University, 1990, p. 218.
15. G.L. Lippit, "Leadership: A Performing Art in a Complex Society," in R.T. Lester and A.G. Merton (eds.), *Concepts for Air Force Leadership*. Alabama Air University, 1990, p. 131.

16. Cited in A.G. Adebayo, *Leadership Model of the New Millennium: Implications for Nigeria's next Administration*. Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Lagos Distinguished Lecture, Series No. 11, February 2007, p. 8.
17. Bayo Okunade, *Leadership: The Big Challenge*. An Inaugural Lecture. Ibadan; Ibadan University Press, 2008, p. 15.
18. J.B. Ciulla (ed), *Ethics: The Heart of Leadership*, (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Praeger, 2004.
19. See Okunade, *Leadership*, p. 16.
20. Some have argued that ethics is a key factor in leadership and without it, leadership becomes ineffective. This informs the assertion of Ciulla that "ethics lies at the heart of leadership studies." See Ciulla, *Ethics: The Heart of Leadership*.
21. Many scholars have drawn up a list of essential qualities of leadership. See, for instance, R.M. Stogdill, *A Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research*. New York: Free Press, 1981.
22. For further details see Joseph Massie, *Essentials of Management*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hill, 1987.
23. For further details, see A.G. Adebayo, *Leadership Model*.
24. For instance, Nigeria's First President, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe proposed the adoption of 'diarchy' – a kind of coalition government between the military and civilians. Other called for the adoption of a 'one party state' because according to them, official opposition is un-African and cannot succeed in Nigeria. See Billy Dudley, *Exit, Voice and the Nigerian Political System*. A presidential address delivered at the conference of the Nigerian Political Science Association at the University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Enugu State in 1974. See also, Matthew H. Kukah, *Democracy and Civil Society in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd, 1999.
25. Most works on Nigerian Politics and Government contain account of the collapse of First and Second Republics as a result of the conflicts and instability generated by disputed election results. See Billy J. Dudley, *Instability and Political Order: Politics and Crisis in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press, 1973, *An Introduction to Nigerian Government and Politics*. London & Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1982, Eghosa Osaghae, *Crippled Giant*:

- Nigeria Since Independence*. London: C.Hurst & Co. Publishers Ltd., 1988, and Peter, P. Ekeh et al (eds) *Nigeria Since Independence, The First 25 years, Vol. V Politics and Constitution*, Ibadan: Heinemann Educational Books, 1989.
26. Festus Iyayi, "Elections, INEC and the Problem of Election Mindsets in Nigeria" *The Electoral Journal*, Vol.1. No. 8, 2007, p.1.
  27. See H.N. Nwosu, *Laying the Foundation for Nigeria's Democracy: My Account of June 12, 1993 Presidential Election and Its Annulment*. Lagos: Macmillan Nigeria Publications Ltd., 2008. See also Bayo Okunade, *Independence of an Electoral Commission: Myth or Reality?* 2008, p. 2.
  28. Anthonia Ahonsi-Yakubu, "Political Transitions, Crime and Insecurity in Nigeria," *Africa Development*, Vol. XXVI, Nos. 1 & 2, 2001 and Transparency International, (2004), *Integrity System: Transparency International Country Study Report: Nigeria 2004*. National Integrity Systems, 2004, p. 17.
  29. Alex Gboyega, *Democracy and Development*, p. 7.
  30. *Afrobarometer Briefing Paper* No. 46, "Performance and Legitimacy in Nigeria's New Democracy," July 2006, <http://www.afrobarometer.org/papers/afrobrieffno40revised16nov06.pdf>. cf. Larry Diamond, *Building Trust in Government by Improving Governance*. Paper Presented to the 7<sup>th</sup> Global Forum on Reinventing Government: "Building Trust in Government" Sponsored by the United Nations Session V: Elections, Parliament, and Citizen Trust Vienna, June 27, 2007.
  31. This exhortation was made by the Catholics' Bishop Conference of Nigeria at Akure on 10<sup>th</sup> October, 1993. Cited in Matthew H. Kukah, *Democracy and Civil Society*, p. 14.
  32. See the reports of : International Crises Group, Nigeria: Failed Elections, Failing State?, Africa Report No 126, 30<sup>th</sup> May, *Newswatch* (Lagos), 30 April, p. 20, EU EOM, "Elections fail to meet hopes and expectations of the Nigerian people and fall far short of basic international standards". Abuja: 23 April, 2007, at [www.eueom-ng.org](http://www.eueom-ng.org), and *The Guardian*, (Lagos), April 17, 2007. Indeed, many of these elections have been annulled and re-runs ordered while in some cases such as Edo and Ondo states,

- opposition candidates were declared outright winners by the Elections' Petitions Tribunals.
33. See INEC, *The Official Report of the 2007 General Election*. Abuja: INEC, 2007, p. 46.
  34. For these and other steps taking to subordinate the military establishment under civilian control, see Bayo Adekanye, *Reforming the Character of Civil-Military Relations for Democratic Governance in Nigeria after 1999*. Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Lagos Distinguished Lecture, Series No. 8, May 2005.
  35. There is a number of classical and seminal books on this. See Chinweizu, *The West and The Rest of Us*. London: NOK Publishers, 1978, Walter Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bolge-L'Ouverture Publications, 1972, Claude Ake, *A Political Economy of Africa*. London: Longman, 1981, Toyin Falola and Julius Ihonvbere, *Nigeria and Britain: Development or Exploitation*. London: Zed Books, 1978.
  36. Matthew H. Kukah, *Democracy and Civil Society*, p. 15.
  37. See Richard Joseph, "Class, State and Prebendal Politics in Nigeria," *Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, Vol. xxi, No. 3, 1983, and *Democracy and Prebendal Politics in Nigeria*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. Also the prolific novelist and poet, Chinua Achebe wrote a pamphlet titled *The Trouble with Nigeria* and reduced it simply to leadership.
  38. Okunade, *Leadership*, p. 21.
  39. Cited in A. G. Adebayo, *Leadership Model*, pp. 27-28.
  40. Obasanjo made this assertion in his address to the African Ministerial Forum on Integrated Transport in Africa held in Abuja on March 11, 2003. Cited in *Thisday*, (Lagos) March 12, 2003.
  41. Okanade, *Leadership*.
  42. For details, see Billy Dudley, *Instability and Political Order: Politics and Crisis in Nigeria*, Eghosa Osaghae, *Crippled Giant: Nigeria Since Independence*.
  43. E.E. Osaghae, *Crippled Giant*, p. 47.
  44. Larry Diamond, "The Uncivil Society and the Descent into Praetorianism," in Larry Diamond, J. Linz, and S.M. Lipset (eds.), *Politics in Developing Countries: Comparing Experiences with Democracy*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1995.



- 
45. Billy Dudley, *An Introduction to Nigerian Government*, p. 73.
  46. J.I. Ihonvbere, "A Radical View of Nigeria's Political Development," in Oyeleye Oyediran (ed.) *Governance and Development in Nigeria: Essays in Honour of Professor Billy J. Dudley*, Ibadan: Oyediran Consultancy International, 1996, p. 118.
  47. Claude Ake, *Democracy and Development in Africa*, Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1996, p. 138.
  48. See, *Ibid.*, p. 128.
  49. Cited in Bola Tinubu, "*Good Governance, Democracy and Sustainable Development*. Being the Fifth CEPACS Distinguished Lecture 15<sup>th</sup> December, 2008. Ibadan: CEPACS, 2008, p. 19.