

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

The development of political parties in Nigeria dates back to the days of the struggle for political independent in the late 1940s, when the nationalists were at the pre-independence and post-independence periods. In the pre-independence and the early post independence periods, political parties in Nigeria were not ideologically based. Rather, they were regionally based and woven around individual politicians who they saw as their mentors. In the last ten years, however parties were registered based on the exigencies of the time. This was the scenario until 1998; the need arose for parties that could usher Nigeria into a new era of democracy after over fifteen years of military rule. Historically, political parties in Nigeria have developed and still play a vital role towards the realization of the democratic objectives. Indeed, the last fifty years have seen an evolution of various political parties. From 1991-1993, Nigeria practiced a two-party system, with the government establishing the Social Democratic party (SDP) and National Republican Convention (NRC). The military government later proscribed

the parties after annulling a presidential election in 1993. But Nigeria returned to democratic rule in 1999.

The restoration of democratic government in 1999 led to a new approach to party politics in Nigeria. The procedure for registering political parties was liberalized, thereby, opening up the political space for mass participation in political activities in the country. Today, there are more than fifty registered political parties in Nigeria, even though only few of them have not been able to win any election. The few political parties that have dominated the political space to the point that fears are being expressed that the country was drifting towards a one-party state. Opposition parties are beginning to cross to the ruling party both at the federal and states levels.

Nigeria, like many other African countries, has had its fair share of democratic challenges, but it has also recorded some achievement over the years. There have already been calls across the country for some adjustments and improvements on the way political parties are run and managed, in the years to come. Many have argued that Nigeria must necessarily adopt the methods that will guarantee the rights of its citizens to elect leaders of their choice as provided for in the country's constitution.

As Nigeria consolidates its democratic framework and mechanisms, the multi-parties in Nigeria, need to exemplify a new level of commitment to the yearnings and aspirations of the people for more fundamental and sustainable development.

The recently 2011 general election in Nigeria really had some setbacks and it really brought the world attention towards our political system. It also leads to them in asking some questions concerning our democratic system [voice of Nigeria on Thursday April 18th, 2013].

1.2 Statement of the Problems

In a multi-party system, political parties, being the main tool of political development in every existing and irrespective of their various ideological bends, different political orientations and victory potentials, they are still allowed to partake in political competition for the control of machinery of government and also uniting of the people. In every modern society, political parties are viewed to be an agent of unity, peace and integration etc. in that society, but despite the above conception, multi-party

system still holds some questions that deviate from the above. Therefore, it is to this end that we now ask the following questions.

1. Is there any relationship between multi-party system and political development in Nigeria?
2. What are the political implications of multi-party system in Nigeria?
3. Does multi-party system ensure democratic consolidation in Nigeria?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The broad objectives or aims of this research work are simply to know the meaning and contributions of multi-party system in Nigeria political development. And these specific objectives are as follows:

1. To find out the relationship between multi-party system and political development in Nigeria.
2. To access the political implication of multi-party system in Nigeria.
3. To access whether the existence of multi-party system ensures democratic consolidation in Nigeria.

1.4 Significance of the Study

This research work will be significant in the following ways:

Firstly, it will help decision making organs, institutions to determine the basis for political party formation in Nigeria in order to achieve National integration and political development.

Secondly, invaluable, it will contribute to academic knowledge as regards to function of political parties to political development.

Furthermore, it will create awareness and inspire a sense of responsibility on members of political party on the role expected of them to achieve good governance and political development.

1.5 Literature Review

It will be a very difficult task to complete this research work and arrive at a justifiable conclusion without reviewing works of other scholars in this field of study. Since such a review will provide an insight into various aspects of the problems and similarly provide adequate theoretical background. It is through such reviews that it would help us to critics' previous study and the way in which the present day will help in providing solution to the problems. Multi-party system has been conceptualized in

many ways and views. Clearly speaking, it is one of the political systems found in democratic or federal states of the world. Many scholars had made various efforts to explain the meaning of multi-party system and how it relates to political development.

According to Obikeze (2004), Multi-party system is “a scourge to the political growth of any nation”. To him, multi-party is a reflection of the division that exists within the society and the extent of diversity. This means that once the nation allows a multiple party system to be in operation, that it extends diversity and within the society, the citizens will bring ethnicity in politics. He went further to state that, the voters have the confusion of which party to join and who to vote for, because choice is problematic as there is slim ideological difference among the parties. In this case, we found out that the above problem cause political apathy. Yes! It made groups within the society to be apathetic in the sense that an average political Nigerian man will not interested in the political activities if this choice is not the government. The same scholar ended his argument and analysis with this assertion, multi-party system does not create an avenue for long term planning as a party policy of the co-operating parties must be considered.

According to Rodee et al (1957), it was stated that “the reason of multiple parties is the persistence of deep cleavages in a political society caused by difference in nationality and religion divisive forces are often inflamed by irreconcilable element within the nation or by external revolution any moments”. This means that in most of the democratic states like Nigeria, it is because of the diversity and differences in ideology that engendered the feeling of ethnic politics.

La Palombara and Wemer (1966), claim that “the traditional classification between two party system and multi-partism is not sufficiently meaningful” they maintained that the number of political parties in a political system is not essentially relevant, but competitiveness of parties is very important. This is essentially true about multi-parties in Nigeria. In the fourth republic, one-party, a People’s Democratic Party (PDP) dominated the political seats in the country. Therefore, looking at the result, the People’s Democratic Party (PDP) won majority of the seats. The above authors viewed a multi-party system as one in which over an extended period, the same political or coalition of such parties dominate or hold governmental power.

According to Larry Diamond (2009), in an interview by Zainth Economic Quarterly Magazine, this excerpt reads thus, calling a political system a democratic does not mean it is good or admirable system or that we need not to worry much about imposing it further. It also simply means that if a majority of the people want change in leaders and policies and are able to organize effectively within the rules, they can change. This is just an appraisal of the political system that is practiced in Nigeria, but we should not dwell in this conception of majority participation and promoting political decay instead of development. If people can organize political party as a democratic state (within the rules). It can be granted, but a strong one that will hold water to foster political development and not a weak organization that continued to divide and tearing the nation apart.

According to Okpata (2000), multi-party system is a group system that exist where there are usually several parties with nearly equal strength. Political interest and historical experience play dominant role in adoption of this system. Multi party system in this understanding, means that the ideology, strength, interest, history, experience etc. All these matters a lot in operation of multi-party system. The problem with this practice of multi-party system in Nigeria is that most of political parties that exist in the fourth

republic lack the above attributes mentioned. In fact most of the parties were of non-ideological type and that is not of development in Nigerian politics.

Eme Awa (1993) opined that “the system could be multi-party only in the sacrificial sense of it. In this case, only one party (always the same ones) wins elections, thereby enlarging the famous doctrine of alternating parties that could hold power. Consequently upon this, a nation may be subject to adherence. Multi-party system was also argued by Awa to often establish parties on ethnic grounds.

According to Omo Omomji (2008), in his seminar presentation about parties and politics in Nigeria, he said “I am aware that parties should poses certain characteristics and that they are meant to perform certain functions”. The issue is that the political parties in Nigeria are still in search of a role, hence since 1999, the role of political parties is still fluid. In many cases, this so-called political parties since 1999 have become a major part of the problem in Nigeria. The dispersal of partism support and organization in multi-party may have several others negative implication. For instance, Ferguson and Mc Hery (1967:218) pointed out that:

The disadvantages of having many parties is that, the multi-party system produces

instability, confuses the electorate with a multitude of alternatives, represents local groups and factions and in action. It would make continued functioning of the electoral system (and integration of diverse ethnic and socio-economic group) virtually impossible.

Moreover, there is the genuine fear that any multiplication of separates tribal groups. As Weiner and La Palombara (1966) observed, frequently in heterogeneous societies operating a multi-party system, the political parties re-often asserted with the various fragmented cultures. In such, a case the parties have no intention of facilitation integration but aim instead at reinforcing loyalties to the sub-cultures with which they are identified.

Satori (1996) points out that “multi-party system is the most insecure and less viable option to political development”. He also points out that not only that the multi-party system cannot profit the stimulation of a responsible opposition, but also that, it is often paralyzed by cabinet instability and by the presence of anti-system parties which replace competitive politics with irresponsible outbidding under these condition, according to Satori (1996:175)

The multi-party system is more an agent of disintegration than an instrument of aggregation and integration and the outcome is sheer immobility, mal- integration or

disorderly change, than is an ideologically motivated, unrealistic sequence of abrupt changes that are likely to be successful.

What could be derived in the above assertion is that a developing pluralistic society in search of national integration (as an attribute of political changes and instability, nor can it afford increased polarization of a great number of cleavages that already existed in the society. This was why multi-party system had failed repeatedly in Nigeria as a mechanism for fostering political stability and political development.

According to Daniel Learner (1950), he opined. “The passing of traditional societies, modernization of middle east” equates political development with political modernization.

W.W Rostow (2008) also treated political development as typical phenomenon of the industrial society. He was of the opinion that the industrial societies are the patterns setters of political development for other societies. Edward Shills (1991) opined that political development is a nation state building.

According to Samuel .P. Verma (2009) stated that, the greatest drawback of these studies was that they treated “political development” as

dependent variables, generated by something else, a worldwide wave of modernization, nationalism or democracy and not as an independent or intervening variable which in its own turn could shape things. Henceforth, political scientist sought to devise alternative meaning of political development.

Gabriel Almond (1990) defined political development as “the increased differentiation and specialization of political structures and the increased secularization of political culture”, effectiveness, efficiency and capability were seen a benchmark of political referred by Coleman (1956) as “Development syndrome”.

1.6 Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework that will best suit this study will be group theory. This theory was adopted because of the strong view of scholar such as Bently (1908) who as of the strong opinion that the interactions of groups are the basis of political life and rejected statist abstractions. In his opinion, group activity determined legislation, administration and adjudication. He also went further to opine that institution approach should not be used for political analysis as these institutions are static as against politics which is

dynamic and full of activities. He argued that politics is a group affair and each group is competing against each other for power. He also added that the pattern of process involving mass of activities and not a collection of individuals. The group emerges from frequent interaction among its individual members which is directed by their share interest. The interest leads to the organization of the groups.

Bently's group theory received blessing of scholars like David Truman, Robert Daniel, Grant Mc Connell, Theodora .j. Lewi, Earl Lathans among others. They saw power as diffused among many interest groups competing against each other. Earl Lathan described a society as a simple universe of groups which combine, break and form coalitions and castellation of power in a restless alternation. The adoption of this theory as basis for the examination of the multi-party system and political development in Nigeria is simply as a result of the interplay of forces and struggle for power among various ethnic groups in the Nigerian society which resulted that shortly after independence political parties were formed along ethnic sectional time.

Therefore, the adoption of the group theory, is to examine how the intrigues among the various ethnic groups and the resulting multi-party

system affect generally political activities and in particular development of Nigeria political system.

1.7 Hypotheses

In line with the research question posed for this study, the following hypotheses are hereby proposed.

1. There is no close relationship between multi-partism and political development in Nigeria.
2. Multi-party system has negative and positive implications in Nigerian political development.
3. Multi-party system does not ensure democratic consolidation in Nigeria.

1.8 Methodology

The use of secondary source of data is the main method of data collection adopted in this research work. This method is adopted due to its intrinsic values. The secondary sources adopted in this study includes materials like Newspapers, magazines, textbooks, internet, journals, government publications, official documents etc. which helped us to gain an

insight into the origins and development of political parties and nature of their operational patterns in the country. Content analysis as a method of investigation is adopted in this study. This involves reading meaning into materials that are collected for the purpose of achieving reliable and verifiable conclusion.

1.9 Scope of the study

The scope of this study is strictly centered on the examination of the extent of development made by multi-party system in Nigeria political sphere. It also focuses attention on party system the history of political party in Nigeria and political party affiliations. The limitation of the work is quite enormous, since there is no availability of financial support to aid enough material for this study and the short time given for the study also made it difficult to accumulate enough information as possible for the study

1.10 Definition of Terms

i. Politics:

Politics is endemic in a man's social existence and that is why a Greek philosopher, Aristotle asserted that man is a political animal. Politics was also defined by Prof Okwudiba Nnoli who opined that

politics as the emergence of state power, consolidation of a state power and the use of a state power.

ii. Political party:

A political party is an organized group of individuals, seeking to seize the power of government in order to enjoy the benefits being derived from such control. Furthermore, a political party is a regular and permanent organization of certain number of people concerned with either conquering power or keeping it.

However, a political party is any group, however loosely organized seeking to elect governmental office holders under a given label.

So in other words, a political party can be defined as different individuals or people who want to seize government power in order to put their ideologies parties is the seize governmental power.

ii. A party system:

A party system consists of all the parties in a particular nation and the laws and customs that govern their behavior. It simply

means the formation, structure as well as the organization of political parties.

ii Election:

An election is a process of voting and been voted for, for the qualified citizens of any country, thus, qualification may be educational or based on experience in some cases.

An election is the procedure that allows members of an organization or community to choose representatives who will hold positions of authority within it.

iii. Political development:

Political development can be seen as a process involved in a country's political change. It is an incident that causes a situation to change or progress, a state in which the developing of something is not yet complete.

v Multi-party system:

Multi-party system simply means the presence of three or than three parties in particular state. A country that has up to three or more viable parties is said to be operating a multi-party system of

government. However, a country may have up to three or more parties but will still not be qualified to be termed multi-party system country, it is because, there must be viable strong opposition parties which will lead to formation of coalition government.

iv. Democracy: Democracy is a Greek word ‘demos’ which means “the people” and “kratein” means “to rule”. So it is a system of government of the people, by the people and for the people. Also it a system of government whereby citizens of a country have full rights and obligation to participate in governmental policies and decision making.

v. Power:

This is the ability to make people (or things) to do what they would not otherwise have done. In other words, power is the ability to make someone or others conform to your desire or it the ability to act and secure conforming behavior.

vi. Electoral Commission:

This is the body which has the responsibility for the conduct of election in the country, in Nigeria for example, the Independent

National Electoral Commission (INEC) is typical example of electoral body.

vii. Voting: The exhibition open or secret of one preference for a person or a party or a cause-secret ballot therefore is regarded as the necessary condition for the expression of free choice.

viii. Tyranny:

This is government by a tyrant. A tyranny behaves like a dictator but in majority cases not in the interest of the people. Tyranny is a bad form of dictatorship.

ix. General election:

This is a type of election where all the electorate in a country participate at the same time on a given day, to elect representatives into the government.

Chapter Two: Multi-party System and Political Development in Nigeria.

In the chapter two of this research work, we are posed with a question, which is the relationship that exists between multiparty system and political development in Nigeria context. In our literature view, we explained the two concepts differently and we had some similarities in both concepts, but for proper understanding, let us briefly examine the various concepts before deriving at a conclusion.

Multiparty system is a scourge to the political growth of any society or nation. It is also a reflection of the division that exists within the society and the extent of diversity. This means that once the nation allows a multiparty system to be in operation, it indirectly extends diversity within such society [Obikeze: 2004]. Multiparty system also is a group system that exists where there are usually several parties with nearly, equal strength political interest and historical experience play dominant role in adoption of this system. Multiparty system in this understanding, means that the ideology, strategy,

interest, history experience etc. all these matters a lot in operation of multiparty system. [Okpata: 2000].

According to Ferguson and Mc Hery [1967], they pointed out that:

The disadvantages of having many parties are that, the multiparty produces instability, confuses the electorate with a multitude of alternatives, represents local groups and factions and diffuses responsibility for action and in action. It would make continued functioning of the electoral system and integration of diverse ethnic and socio-economic group virtually impossible.

Moreover, there is the genuine fear that any multiplication of separates tribal groups. Furthermore, another argument concerning multiparty system is that, it is the most insecure and less viable option to political development [Satori: 1996]. He went further to point out that, it not only that multiparty system cannot profit the stimulation of a responsible opposition, but also that, it is often paralyzed by cabinet instability and by the presence of anti-parties which replace competitive politics with irresponsible outbidding under these condition, he also asserted that:

The multiparty system is more an agent of disintegration than an instrument of aggregation and integration and the outcome is sheer immobility, mal-integration or disorderly change, which is an ideologically motivated, unrealistic

sequence of abrupt changes that are likely to be successful [Satori, 1996].

What could be derived in the above assertion is that a developing pluralistic society in search of national integration (as an attribute of political development) cannot afford to experience abrupt political changes and instability, nor can it afford increased polarization of a great number of cleavages that already existed in the society. This was why multiparty system had failed repeatedly in Nigeria as a mechanism for fostering political development and stability. Political development entails increased differentiation and specialization of political structures and the increased secularization of political culture, effectiveness, efficiency and capability were seen a benchmark of political development.

We have succeeded in establishing some conceptual analysis of multiparty system and political development, we will now limit it to Nigeria as it concerns fourth republic.

Multiparty system is most times more accurately than the two-party system in a way in which the popular mind is actually divided. And when parties are numerous, there is likely to be less of the uncritical sentiment of loyalty to party, less probability that their members will regard all questions

habitually and systematically from a party point of view. There are some positive advantages that goes with the multiparty system, because it is tend to democratic in orientation, in such that, it gives rights to citizens of such society that practice it to participate freely in any political activities such as election. According to Okechukwu, Oji and Okafor (2002), they stated some advantages of multiparty system, they includes the following:

- i. Multiparty system promotes democracy.
- ii. It gives legitimacy and sovereignty to the people.
- iii. It eliminates the possibility of tyrants emerging in power.
- iv. It also creates room for responsible government.
- v. It makes possible effective operation of the rules of law and separation of power.

So therefore. Despite the short coming associated with multiparty system in Nigeria, it has a lot of advantages over other party system in general perspectives and more so particularly in a multi-ethnic society like Nigeria. In Nigeria, multiparty system and political development are not really inn good relationship like it is meant to be, because multi-parties in Nigeria especially in fourth republic are all non-ideological type and it is not of development in Nigeria political system [okpata:2002]. The major problem

of multiparty system is that most political parties in Nigeria are still in search of role, hence since 1999, the role of political parties is still fluid. In many cases, this so-called political parties since 1999 have become a major part of Nigeria problem [Omomji: 2008]. Nigeria since pre-independence and post-independence has changing from various political system, from pre-independence (1922) to second republic (1975) was multiparty system but prior the era of third republic, during military regime under Gen. Ibrahim Babangida regime, we had the two dominant parties which are The National Republican Convention (NRC) and Social Democratic Party (SDP). These were two existing parties under Babangida (1985) and Abacha (1993).

So let us access the historical sociology of multiparty system in Nigeria. And also the reason why Nigeria adopted multiparty system.

2.1 Multi-Party System and Historical Development in Nigeria.

The Colonial Experience

The foundational developmental circumstance of party in Nigeria is colonial rule and the opposition to it by the country's nationalist movements, which transmuted into political associations to contest for legislative elections as the country progressed between 1922 and 1960 from non-

representative government (legislative council), through representative government and responsible government to independence under competitive party and electoral politics.

According to Ngou (1989), he estimates that including the three major political parties, a total of fifteen others contested the critical election held in 1959. However, the more prominent of the parties in this emergent multiparty system between 1922 and 1960 were the following:

- i. The Nigerian National Democratic party (1923)
- ii. Union of young Nigerian (1923)
- iii. Nigerian youth movement (1937)
- iv. National council of Nigeria and Cameroon (1944)
- v. Northern Elements progressive union (1950)
- vi. United National independence party (1953)
- vii. United middle belt Congress (1955)
- viii. Bornu youth movement (1956)
- ix. Dynamic party (1955) etc cited by [Azikiwe, 1961:301-334, Hodgkin, 1961:195-197].

Another critical developmental circumstance of the multiparty system in Nigeria is as result of the country's social structure, which can be disaggregated variously into class, religion, language, ethno-communal rural/urban divide, Ideology and educational levels. But the emergent of political parties from the mid-1920s under Clifford's constitution, reflected the dominance of the nationalist movements by a combination of petit-bourgeoisie middle class and proletarian strata of the country's social structure. Yet, the logic of competitive party and electoral politics and the unfolding ethno-federal political structure in the country meant that the emergent political parties had to cultivate the support of traditional rulers and traditional institutions, as part of their electoral strategy. This comes out clearly in the close, sometimes symbolic relationship between ethno-cultural associations or organization and a number of political parties, which like the Action Group (AG) and the Northern People's congress grew out of or became the political wings of these cultural organizations. The problem of multiparty system in pre-independence era was that, the parties were all ethnic based parties. These parties suffered from "ethno-centric syndrome". They lacked political ideology and were ethnic oriented. So this was the nature of the multiparty system in the period. Ethnicity therefore is a major

element of the country's social structure. This has had a profound impact on the origin and developmental trajectory of political parties in Nigeria and on the practice of federalism in the country. This ethno-regionalist orientations of the parties, reflected in the fact that, the national leaders of all the three major parties preferred to stay in the regions, becoming regional premiers, impacted in turn on the country's federal system between 1954 and 1960.

So therefore, the emphasis on regional government had a consequential weakening of the central government. As Watts [1960:340] puts it, "the main effect of the party system between 1954 and 1959 was to provide three powerful organizations intent on maintaining regional rights. So therefore, it was 1959 election that gave birth to three powerful regional parties such as Action Group (AG) for the west, Northern people's congress (NPC) for the North and National Council of Nigeria Citizens (NCNC) for the Eastern region.

2.2 Multiparty System in First Republic [1960-1965]

Just like in pre-independence era, the multiparty system in the first Republic after the independence in 1960 was still under the "ethno-centric syndrome". The parties were deep in ethnic orientation. It is the

contradictions unleashed from 1962 onwards by this federalization of the party system, the declaration of emerging rule in western region in 1962 as a result of ideological intra-party differences, the creation of mid-west region in 1963, the 1962-63 census controversy, the party realignment before the 1964 regional elections and the 1965 federal elections, involving the alliance between the NCNC and AG, on the one hand, and the NPC on the other hand. This party alliance result to political and constitutional crisis and civil unrest of October-December 1965, which precipitated the fall of the first Republic in January 1966. Elsewhere, it has been observed that the bulk of the literature embodying the attempts to explain the character of politics in Nigerian first Republic and the causes of the eventual collapse of that republic has pointed strongly to the factor of ethnic politics and particularly the nature of the political parties [Ibodje and Dode, 2005]. Finally, the observation was correct because the political parties of that era were more or less regional political machines established by the than regional political elites to serve their narrow interests in the Nigeria tripod politics. So therefore, multiparty system in the first republic did not bring about any political development to the country rather it brought political instability and irregularities. And the nature of these multi-parties and their tripod politics

led to the intervention of military into politics in 1966. It is because these parties failed in their responsibility of contributing to the consolidation of democracy in the Nigeria's first Republic.

2.3 Multiparty System in Second Republic [1966-1984].

It was in response to the problems, which led to the collapse of the multiparty system in Nigerian first republic, which led the Murtala/Obasanjo regime to decide to put policies in place that will re-position political parties in Nigeria for national integration rather than disintegration. Hence, the military attempted to solve the problem of ethnicity in the formation and management of political parties. In the electoral provisions contained in the transition programme of that period, most political parties that were to be registered, were required to have "national spread" to be national in out-look and programme, before being eligible for registration and subsequent participation in election [Ibodje and Dode, 2005]. When the ban on partisan parties was lifted, associations came up for registration as political parties. At the end, five political parties, out of about fifty political associations that applied for registration were given the nod to function as political parties in second republic. And these parties included:

- i. Great Nigeria People's Party (GNPP)
- ii. National Party of Nigeria (NPN)
- iii. Nigerian People's Party (NPP)
- iv. People's Redemption Party (PRP)
- v. Unity Party of Nigeria (UPN). Cited [Yaqub, 2002].

The second republic once more collapsed on 31st December 1983, because of the anti-democratic practices of the party leaders (elites). These leaders used their positions to illegally acquire stupendous wealth through government contracts and other deals as well as massively rigging of election especially the 1983 election, while looking down on the people's interests. The multiparty system in second republic, notwithstanding all the efforts to avert or prevent irregularities, still witnessed the most rapid politics of aggrandizement and open robbery of the treasury [Yaqub, 2002].

2.4 Two-party System in Third Republic [1985-1998]

In the third republic of Nigeria (1985-1998), there was a change in the political system from multiparty system to two-party system, which were National Republican Convention (NRC) and Social Democratic Party (SDP). It was General Babangida who ousted the Buhari/Idiagbon regime on

August 27, 1985 inaugurated his administration's forty-six member political bureau on September 7, 1987. Recall that the Buhari/Idiagbon coup terminated the second republic. The 1989 constitution that was promulgated by Babangida merely modified most of the contents of the 1979 constitution. In terms of party formation, the 1989 constitution (which was never operationalized) and electoral laws differed from those of the second republic by making provision for only two political parties. This was after the disqualification of all the political associations that sought for registration as parties for allegedly being unable to meet the requirements spell out. The National Republican Convention (NRC) and Social Democratic Party (SDP) were finally imposed on Nigerians.

True to say, the Babangida regime proved to be what skeptics, had always suspected, he developed a scheme aimed at perpetuating himself in office as president. When things got rough for that regime, Babangida was forced to step aside on August 20th, 1993 after annulling the presidential election of June 12, 1993. The Ernest Shonekan led interim National Government, and was replaced in less than six months by General Sani Abacha [Yaqub, 2002]. General Abacha instituted a national constitutional conference commission, which fashioned new constitution for consideration

by the Abacha junta. This constitution and many other political institutions established by that regime, events were to prove, were tailored towards the achievement of the Abacha self-succession bid “hidden agenda”, like Babangida attempted before him. Under the Abacha’s transition programme, eighteen political associations applied, for registration as political parties, out of which five were registered viz: The Congress for National Consensus (CNC), Democratic Party of Nigeria (DPN), The Grass-roots Democratic Movement (GDM), the National Centre Party of Nigeria (NCPN) and the United Nigeria Congress Party (UNCP) [Yaqub, 2002]. The anti-democratic, self-succession activities of Abacha were to later negatively impact upon the ability of those political institutions to perform their political functions in a democracy consolidation. Infact, one of the parties (UNCP) became the major vanguard through which Abacha’s self-succession bid was to be realized. Report had it that, the election that were conducted from the local government to the national legislature, the (UNCP) which is a dominant party swept more than 80% of the seats. Infact, various analysis of that regime’s activities point to the fact that, Nigeria was gradually moving towards a one-party system especially when all the parties finally adopted Abacha as their “sole” presidential candidate [Yaqub, 2002]. So therefore, a

point to note here is that, without viable democratically managed political parties, it will be impossible to have a lasting democracy. Because parties are supposed to be the strong pillars and instruments through which democracy can be cultivated and entrenched. In other words this was how the two-party system in third republic failed under General Abacha's regime. This regime almost turned Nigeria into one-party state before his untimely death on June 1998, even before completion of his undemocratic electoral process which he set in motion. So while stressing this point, before setting the democratic proceedings that led to the fourth republic gained from footing, General Abdulsalam Abubakar stated that:

In particular, democratization was marred by maneuvering and manipulation of political institutions, structures and actors. In the end, we have only succeeded in creating a defective foundation on which a solid democratic structure can neither be constructed nor sustained. [Gen Abubakar, 1998].

It was in line with the above reasoning that Abubakar regime dissolved the five political parties registered by the Abacha's regime.

2.5 Multi-party System of Fourth Republic 1999-2012.

There was a total failure of the two-party system of the third republic under Gen Abacha's regime, which led to return of the multiparty system in 1999 under Gen. Abdulsalam Abubakar regime [Yaqub, 2002]. The Abubakar's administration announced that it would not stay in office one day more than was necessary, his administration allowed the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) to grant provisional registration to nine political parties, with the conditions that after the local government elections of that year, those that had 10% votes and above in at least 24 states of the federation would qualify to contest the sub-sequent states and federal elections. Eventually, some parties like the Alliance for Democratic (AD), All People's Party (APP), and the People's Democratic Party (PDP) were all registered. Some months into the fourth republic, with Obasanjo as the then President, politicians began to clamors for the registration of more parties. The government refused to register more political parties, hence unregistered associations went to count and won. The court's judgment was in favor of the political associations, thus opened the floodgates for up to 30 parties by the time 2003 elections took place, and also in 2007. But as at 2011 election, the number of parties in Nigeria grew up from to up to fifty

parties [Bello, 2011:2]. So therefore; the implication of these anti-democratic practices of the political parties is that, the likelihood of attaining democratic consolidation in Nigeria looks dim and unattainable. The fragmented party system in the fourth republic, which is made up of a large number of opposition parties that are largely divided. Because of these serious divisions, the power of the incumbent party is reinforced, while other parties offer no real opposition in the legislative. Analysts have also argued variously from the political economy point of view, that this nature of party politics persists in Nigeria because of the economic weakness of the opposition parties (weak economic base). They buttress this argument with the fact that while the ruling PDP can pay generously for her expenses, the opposition parties are economically down casted, hence their members decamp and cross-carpet easily [Bello, 2011:2]. So therefore, the multi-party system in fourth republic failed to deliver democratic consolidation because of the present elites (money bags) and undemocratic activities, lack of ideology, low level of politics of socializations, hangover and lingering effects of military dictatorship, politics of money, corruption and bribery, the under-developed nature of the legislature, foot-dragging by the judiciary, lack of a vibrant civil society (Advocacy) groups, but the one that is of

concern in this work, is the weak fractured and un institutionalized (fragile) political parties especially of the opposition [Omotayo,2011].

Contemporaneously, apart from the ruling PDP, no other party seems to have the prospect of winning elections because; PDP is the dominant party [omotayo, 2011]. Because, judging from the recently concluded election of 2011, although it has been commended by (EOM) as one of the most successful in Nigeria political history, but there were still cases of stuffing of ballot boxes, under age voting and outright falsification of election results have been reported in some states. Infact, with regard to post-election violence, the leadership Newspaper on [Wednesday, April 20th, 2011] had it on their front page:

Post election violence in Nigeria as 121people has been killed and 15,000people have been displaced. Kaduna 50 victims; Kano 30 victims; Bauchi 16 victims; Katsina 8 victims; Gombe 17 victims [cited by omotayo, 2011].

Again, there was another cases relating to the 2011 election that was captured by the same Leadership Newspaper on page 2 on April 20th and it reads:

Post election Riots: 70 youth service corps members escape death in Minna; Post

election crisis as Federal government sends Reinforcement to Kaduna [cited by omotayo, 2011].

So therefore, as we can see, from this survey of the 2011 general election, there was no relationship between multi-party system and political development. The reason is simply that, all these election crises were as result of party clash and rival. And this party conflict affects the country in various ways both socially, economically, politically and otherwise.

So in other words, we can equal see that, all the elections in the fourth republic shared a number of common characteristics and trend. First, they have been particularly characterized by massive frauds, intimidation and even assassination of political opponents, the brazen subversion of the “sovereignty of the vote” and controversy. The governments in power and politicians have their own designs and have generally perpetrated and maintained a culture of electoral violence and warfare. No election has been conducted without a great deal of controversy either before, during or after elections. Secondly, while there has been lack of continuity in violence and warfare, there has been lack of continuity in the political organizations through which both violence and warfare have been conducted. Each period has thus, produced new political formations reflecting not only the penchant

for lack of principle and shifting allegiance among members of the political class but also the total lack of ideology by the members and that is why they are divided into antagonistic camps. So therefore, from the analysis so far, we have seen that, there is no relationship between multi-party system and political development in Nigeria. All that the system has brought us is political disintegration and instabilities.

It is worthy to note that, multi-party system is suppose to be a tool of political development of any country, because it preaches democracy and freedom of participation but in Nigeria context, it failed to deliver these necessities [Odauduodoh,2012:19]. Let us list some of political parties in the fourth republic from 1999-Present date.

- i. People's Democratic Party (PDP)
- ii. Action Congress of Nigeria (ACN)
- iii. All Nigeria People's Party (ANPP)
- iv. Congress for Progressive Change (CPC)
- v. All Progressive Grand Alliance (APGA)
- vi. Advanced Congress of Democrats (ACD)
- vii. Alliance for Democracy (AD)
- viii. Community Party of Nigeria (CPN)

- ix. Democratic People's Party (DPP)
- x. Democratic Alternative (DA)
- xi. United Nigeria People's Party (UNPP)
- xii. People's Redemption Party (PRP)
- xiii. People's Salvation Party (PSP)
- xiv. Progressive People's Alliance (PPA)
- xv. Allied Congress Party of Nigeria (ACPN)
- xvi. Better Nigeria Progressive Change (CPC)
- xvii. Change Advocacy Party (CAP)
- xviii. Democratic People's Alliance (DPA)
- xix. National Action Council (NAC)
- xx. National Unity Party (NUP)
- xxi. New Nigeria People's Party (NNPP)
- xxii. Nigeria People's Congress (NPC)
- xxiii. Social Democratic Mega Party (SDMP)
- xxiv. Republican Party of Nigeria (RPN)
- xxv. People's Mandate Party (PMP)
- xxvi. Progressive Action Congress (PAC) etc [cited by Slizbeat, 2012].

So we can see that, we have over 60 political parties in Nigeria, but it unfortunate that it's only about 10 of them are actively involved and recognized in Nigeria. Even though, some of these parties listed above has been scrapped out by INEC [Slizbeat, 2012].

Chapter Three: The Implication of Multi-party System in Nigeria Political Development

In this chapter, we are to access the implications associated with multi-party system and how it affects Nigerian political development. Categorically speaking, multi-party system has both political and economical implications associated to it, which we shall be discussing fully. The existence of multi-party system is simply a “sine qua non” for democratic consolidation in any polity of any country. In Nigeria, these political parties were regionally based and their activities led to the collapse of these experiments.

A political party is a social group defined by “Herbert Simon” as a system of interdependent activities characterized by a high degree of rational direction of behavior towards end that are objects of common acknowledgement and expectation.

Multi-party system is an instrument for promoting of political development and national integration through political parties. This is by virtue of its diverse social base and organizational arrangement, which link the rulers with the ruled on the one hand and on the other hand, peoples of diverse socio-cultural learning. So taking a cursory look at the Nigerian

state, this paper examines the socio-economic and political implication associated with multi-party system. Because, Nigeria is a nation of extraordinary diversity, indeed scholars are agreed that it is a culturally variegated society characterized by multiplicity of language culture, ethnic and religious groupings whose coming together under various multi-parties owe it colonial experience. In other words, a multi-party system which is “a network of relationships through which many political parties interact and influence the political process” is an aspect of the democratization process whose importance cannot be overemphasized [Agbaje, 1999:198]. Therefore, its well-being of any political parties and their functionality largely determines the outcome of the entire political process.

So remarkably, in Nigeria fourth republic, the multi-party system has witnessed the realization of some tangible goals. These include the evident liberalization of the political space, which culminated in the registration of more fifty to sixty political parties [Slizbeat, 2012]. But, yet, out of fifty to sixty parties in Nigeria, how many of them are recognized. It is just very few of them are recognized in country, while others are just minority groups. There is as results of the nature of politics been played in Nigeria political system. So therefore, multi-parties in Nigeria have seen politics as a matter

of “do-or-die affairs”. And that is why; there have been several cases of electoral violence and crisis in Nigeria. And it has affected Nigeria in various aspects especially in their socio-economic and political system [Nwolise, 2007:153].

3.1 Politics of Electoral Process in Africa.

Within the context of a complete break away from one-party and military dictatorships, African countries divided into competitive multi-party elections since the 1990s. Thus, according to Claude Ake (1991), he puts it “issues of democratization and human rights are increasingly the world’s interest in Africa overcoming a legacy of indifference to the fate of democracy on the continent. The facts is that, many of these African states that allowed elections to be held in them made a mockery of their transition programme. Infact, Naomi Chazan pointed out the less of legitimacy that has now characterized African elections when she pointed out that: “elections in Africa, after the initial euphoria associated with political stability during decolonization quickly came to be viewed as meaningless political rites. [Chazan, 1979:136]. While, not doubting the increasing nature of democratic transitions in African countries.

Also, according to “Lemarchand”, he concluded in this argument that “there are compelling reasons to fear that the movement towards democracy may contain within itself the seed of its own undoing [Lemarchand, 1992:98]. There are eight problems with African politics which are: the weakness of political parties, manipulation of the electoral process, a narrow political field, a constrained civil society, a controlled press, the absence of civility, privatized violence, politicized armies and international support for dictatorship [Monga, 1997:156]. Furthermore, Richard Joseph seemed to have captured African politics when he stated that “of the many factors impeding constitutional democracy in most part of Africa, none appears more significant than the upsurge of political violence [Richard, 1997:3]. So therefore, these scholars are simply explaining the nature of African politics, and how it affects their democratic transition programme. But the aim of this chapter is to examine the politics of electoral process in Nigeria and crisis associated with it with special reference to 2011 general election in Nigeria. And also, to understand the implications of practicing multi-party system. So for proper understanding of this, it is necessary to define the concept Election.

Election:

In its strictest sense, there can never be a democracy without election. Transitions in numerous countries today have continued to reveal that democracy is possible without election. But what type of democracy is this?

Huntington is however quick to point out that, a political system is democratic, “to the extent that its most powerful collective decision-makers are selected through fair, honest and periodic elections in which candidates freely compete for votes, and in which virtually all the adult population is eligible to vote [Huntington,1991:661].

In proper sense, election is a process of selecting the officers or representations of organizations, parties or groups by vote of its qualified members [Nwolise, 2007:155].

3.2 Multi-Political Parties and Electoral Violence in Nigeria.

Since violence can be defined as the illegitimate or unauthorized use of force to effect decisions against the will or desires of others [Kolawole, 1988:125]. Then Nwolise while quoting Albert defined Electoral Violence as all forms of organized acts or threats physical, psychological and structural, aimed at intimidating, harming, blackmailing a political

stakeholder before, during and after an election with a view to determining, delaying or otherwise influencing an electoral process [Nwolise, 2007:159].

Table 1 below best illustrates the three dimensions of Electoral violence.

Table 1: Some components of the three dimensions of Electoral violence in

Nigeria.

Dimension	Components
1. PHYSICAL	Physical assault on individuals during campaign, elections and when elections and when election results are released.
	Assassination of political opponents or people perceived as threat to one's political ambition.
	Burning down of public or opponents houses or cars.
	Shooting, shoot-outs.
	Killing of individuals.
	Partisan harassment by security

	agents, arrests, forceful dispersal of rallies, or shooting, wounding or killing of people.
	Kidnapping and hostage-taking by various party thugs.
	Bombing of infrastructure.
	Forceful disruption by thugs of political and campaign rallies.
	Destruction of ballot boxes and ballots papers by thugs or partisan security agents.
	Armed raids on voting and collation centers, and snatching of ballot boxes and papers from polling agents.
2. PSYCHOLOGICAL	Threats against and harassment by security agents of opponents of the ruling party, which create or lead to political apathy.

	Shooting on sight orders that breed fear in voters.
	Terror inflicted by political assassinations, which makes people scared to participate in politics or elections.
	Publication or broadcast of abusive, insulting or intimidating material or advertorials.
	Threats to life through phone calls, text messages etc.
3. STRUCTURAL	Coercion of citizens by government to register or vote.
	Exclusionary acts and policies.
	Unequal opportunities for political parties and candidates.
	Deliberate changes in dates, venues or times of events to the disadvantage of others.

	Partisan delimitation of electoral constituencies and location of polling booths.
	Excessive fees for collecting party nomination forms.
	Un free campaign.
	Reliance on money and brute force instead of moral integrity and competence.
	Restraints imposed on voters.
	Use of the incumbency factor to give undue advantages to some candidates.
	Announcement of false or fraudulent results.
	Bribing of electoral bodies like Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC).
	Length delays in announcing

	election results.
	Absence of (adequate) voting materials and election results forms.
	Absence of electoral officers from polling booths
	Partisan behavior police and other security agents
	Delay in voting.
	Discriminating acts and policies.

Source: Nwolise, O.B. "Electoral Violence and Nigeria's 2007 Elections" journal of African Elections Vol.6 No.2, pp.155-179.

The urge for democratic consolidation, the suspension of two-party system and military dictatorship have led the formations of multiplicity of parties and since the formation of multiplicity of parties in 1999, elections in Nigeria is characterized by all those defaults that are listed out in the table by Nwolise. In the Nigeria, election has been a controversial issue and it has really affected Nigerian political development in various aspects. But before

we go into that properly, let us trace the origin of this electoral violence in Nigeria.

3.3 The Etymology of Electoral Violence in Nigeria.

Election in terms of origin is colonial in nature. Nothing was heard about elections until the advent of colonial rule because Nigeria though democratic according to their levels of development was devoid of elections and electoral processes. With the existence of Lord Lugard, the British government was opportune to bring Clifford. The Clifford constitution brought the elective principle into Nigerian politics which provided for voting in Lagos and Calabar. Restricted as this elective principle was, it was devoid of violence, but the same thing cannot be said of the subsequent elections. In fact, as the country advanced in her constitutional development, these were some centrifugal forces tending to hinder the much cherished amalgamation of 1914. One of the forces was the colonialists resorted to the manipulation of elections along communal lines. Thus, in 1952 election in Kano, the colonial administration tried very hard to frustrate Northern allies of Southern opposed to the candidates of the emirs. The allies suffered diverse discriminations as they were not allowed to hold public meetings, intimidation and victimization of greater

proportion. So colonial manipulation of elections led to the poisoning of relations between the North and South with the resultant effect of a consequent increase in the social distance between members of their population [Nnoli.1980:122]. Since then, the country became exposed to diverse electoral violence. The manipulation of election proceedings (such as in voters registration), rigging, nullification and outright falsification of election results as cynicism are the most crispy analyzed variable in the scope and aspects of electoral mal-practice and violence in Nigeria. It is however pertinent to note before the fourth republic, Nigeria has been democratizing through a series of transition to civil rule organized and implemented by none democratic regimes. The first transition (1954-1960), which gave birth to first republic (1960-1966), was organized by the British regime (Mackintosh, 1966, post and Vickers, 1973 post 1960) while the subsequent ones which led to the second, third and now fourth republic were carried out by the military regimes (Kurfi, 1983, Oyediran, 1981, Ujo, 2000) and (cited in Bako, 2001). Nevertheless, the 2003, 2007 and 2011 elections were organized and implemented by civilian democratic regimes.

To understand the scope and aspects of the problem of elections, we need to examine the trend of events issues of political violence and electoral,

mal-practices that have taken place in Nigeria's political history. As Odama (2010:1) noted that the history of elections via political violence and electoral mal-practices in Nigeria can be examined in four phases: Elections during the colonial period, elections in the first years of independence 1960-1965, elections during military rule and autocracy and election under civilian regimes in between the military rule and autocracy and today's civilian fourth republic. He observed that the background of electoral mal-practice and violence in Nigeria dates to period before 1960. He stated that when the British colonial masters conducted the first election, the legislative council's election in Lagos and Calabar from 1922 that culminated in the 1958/1959; there was documented evidence that the British took decisive measures to rig each set of elections that they presided over [Odama, 2010:1].

Consequently mention albeit briefly the attendance effect of spilled over from colonialism to successive elections conducted after the colonial era in Nigeria. The problem intensified with the 1964 general elections. Despite all party consensus to ensure a free and fair election at a meeting called by the then prime minister, all agreements to lift bans on public meetings were breached, permits for rallies in the North were denied agents in the north. On accounts, two allies were formed, that is, The Nigerian

National Alliance (NNA) consisting of NPC, NNDP and Midwest Democratic Front (MDF). The second alliance being United Progressive Grand Alliance (UPGA) consisting of parties like NCNC, Action Group (AG), NEPU Members, who were to contest election in the North and West, UPGA leaders directed that their supporters should boycott the election.

Infact, the election was declared as “a election that is so-well orchestrated with violence and so much norm-less that, Nnamdi Azikiwe, the then President of the newly declared republic. Initially refused to call Alhaji Tafawa Belewa, the prime minister, to form a government [Ofeimum, 2011:72]. It was however long when similar occurrence took place in 1965 in the western Nigeria, when election came up in that region. In 1965, the stage was set in the western region for both the Nigeria National Democratic Party (NNDP) and Action Group (AG) to determine which of these two political parties would rule the electorate. Before the commencement of the election, there were all indications that there was not going to be peace in the region. Earlier, the government party agents alone had their own identity discs duly countersigned, the electoral officers were nowhere to be found while large number of ballot papers mysteriously disappeared from the police custody. By September 30th the NNDP announced that 15 of its

candidates had been returned unopposed. The legal action instituted by AG to stop the 15 unopposed candidates failed [Falola and Ihonvbere, 1985:70].

More serious disturbances marred the election. Thus on the eve of the poll, an electoral officer was shot dead in the electoral office at Ibadan. On the polling day, two electoral officers and two polling agents were equally shot dead. And there were other contradictory election results which were heard in the radio and newspapers, at a time Akintola was been announced the winner. At the other hand, Alhaji Adegbenro was announced [Falola and Ihonvbere, 1985:71].

We also had 1979 election controversies, of which one of them was that, the election supervision was not done by civilian, rather the military under the Obasanjo's military regime. There was not much violence given the fact that, the military played mid-wife to the elections and transition. The only outstanding disagreement was the controversial Supreme Court decision on the winner. Earlier, both FEDESCO and the military had 13 as the two-thirds of 19. But after the elections, controversy was raised over the meaning of one quarter of the votes cast in each of at least two-thirds of all states in the federation. The military in collaboration with FEDESCO, decided to appoint Shagari as the president by re-interpreting the meaning of one-

quarter of two-third of 19 [Falola and Ihonvbere,1985:80]. In the 1983 election in Nigeria, the military had quitted the stage and did not supervise these elections. So those who could not demonstrate their acts of vandalism and thuggery during the 1979 elections now had the ample-time to demonstrate during 1983 elections. Infact, the most violent of the mayhem took place at Ondo state where the carnage reached the level of public mayhem similar to those in 1964-1965. The ostensible cause was the popular reactions against rigged gubernatorial elections which followed a National party of Nigeria (NPN) candidate in an overwhelmingly Unity Party of Nigeria (UPN) state [Adele, 2011:210]. In the violent demonstration, the entire families of politician wipe out, and hundreds of houses were set on fire including the state headquarters of FEDESCO. Three months after the 1983 elections were held, the second republic was swept into oblivion. The army struck and the much tottered democratic experiments were jettisoned through the military coup of 31st December 1983 [Adele, 2011:210]. As a result of much vacillation on the path of both Buhari and Idiagbon to commence another transitional programme, they were overthrown in a palace coup and this brought in Gen. Ibrahim Babangida who commenced a fruitless transitional programme [Adele.2011:211]. General Babangida

succeeded in making Nigeria a two-party system, The National Republican Convention (NRC) and Social Democratic Party (SDP). But yet, he succeeded in plunging the nation into a more violent nature when he cancelled the presidential election on 12 June 1993 [Adele, 2011:211]. Gen. Babangida stepped aside in August 1993 which paved way for an interim government led by chief Shonekan which was swept into oblivion following the palace coup led by General Sani Abacha. He was suddenly struck with death while he was planning to transform himself into a civilian president [Adele, 2011:212]. General Abubakar succeeded Abacha and returned back the transitional programme which gave room for registration of more political parties in preparation of 1999 election. The 1999 election had its own controversies, because, local and international observers reported widespread irregularities in the polls with electoral fraud in favour of the one or the other candidates. Olu Falae who was a joint candidate for both the Alliance for Democracy (AD) which is now the Action Congress of Nigeria (ACN) and All People's Party (APP), which is now All Nigeria's People Party (ANPP) showed his displeasure of the elections but did not pursue his appeal against the declaration of Obasanjo as winner of the presidential election to the supreme court [Olukoshi, 2000:25]. In the 2003 general

election was conducted by the Obasanjo's regime during which electoral violence added to the political assassinations. The president himself warned early in 2002 that politicians were raising private militias that could make the 2003 elections bloody and indeed it was bloody [Lewis, 2003:142]. Infact, everything pointed to this, because a spate of violence had already preceded the elections. In November 2002, disturbances broke in Kaduna, several high profiles killing with clear political overtones led to the heightened security concerns. Thus, the actual conduct of the elections brought some welcome surprises as there were few deaths during the 12 April National Assembly elections and the presidential and gubernatorial races a week later. There equally abundant evidence of large scales rigging, fraud and intimidation in many parts of the country [Lewis, 2003:143]. The transition monitoring group (TMG) that monitored the 2003 election reported the irregularities that besmeared the election when it stated that:

Twenty-nine of the registered political parties that either contested or did not contest the elections have variously rejected the results as announced by the INEC, declaring the results a fraudulent. Both domestic and international election observers documented massive irregularities that characterized the elections and refused to endorse the elections as free and fair as results of the activities and politics of

political parties. Some parties and their candidates decided to challenge some of the results before the various elections petition tribunals and have gone ahead to do so while others declared “mass action” to pressurize a government without popular mandate to abdicate power [Iyayi, 2005:11].

So the general observation and conclusion of Nigeria regarding the 2003 election was that no election could be conducted in Nigeria under a civilian government without corruption, electoral mal-practices and violence of highest order. However, as the 2007 election drew near, president Obasanjo told the surprised Nigerians, other Africans and world at large that the 2007 elections would be a do-or-die affair [Nwolise, 2007:165].

The 2007 elections when it actually came were most deadly and frightening in nature. Thus, in River state, a police station was attacked and burnt by unknown assailants a night before the Election Day. Also, the INEC offices in Onitsha North, Onitsha South, Nnewi South and a local government office in Akwa North, Anambra were burnt in protest. In the same vein, violence marred election in other parts of the nation. In Ekiti state, there was a confrontation between the PDP and Action Congress (AC) supporters and election results were blatantly falsified in many areas. Also, violence was equally reported in the northern state of Katsina, where

opposition supporters burnt down government building in protest as the announcement that the People's Democratic Party (PDP) had swept the state's gubernatorial polls. Soldiers clashed with angry voters in Nasarawa state. In Oyo state, PDP thugs beat up opposition party officials and hijacked ballot boxes [Nwolise, 2007:165]. The 2007 election therefore was generally perceived as the worst in the history of election administration in Nigeria. The election brought most fraudulent practices. These illegalities were later settled by the judiciary but before this, those affected had their positions stolen. The international monitors commented that:

The 2007 state and federal elections have fallen short of basic international and regional standards for democratic elections. They were marred by poor organization, lack of essential transparency, widespread procedural irregularities, significant evidence of fraud, particularly during result collation process, voter disenfranchisement at different stages of the process, lack of equal conditions for contestants and numerous incidents of violence. As a result, the elections have not lived up to the hopes and expectations of the Nigerian people and the process cannot be considered to have been credible [Adebayo and Omotola, 2007:207].

In every respect, the 2007 elections (state, local and federal elections) had come and gone but the wounds created and the injustices perpetrated

continue to linger. Apathy increased in leaps and bounds as many were discouraged in taking part in politics. The politics played by multi-political parties in the 2007 election was described as “do-or-die affairs”. It was amidst this uncertain political climate that the nation entered the year 2011 and its election.

3.4 The Politics of Multi-parties in the 2011 General Election in Nigeria and Controversies.

For several scores of years and irrespective of what happened in the past, Nigerians had for long developed a deeper love for democracy. This love had been demonstrated in the time past whenever there is a need for this. Thus, in spite of the ills that followed the 1999, 2003 and 2007. Multi-parties elections, Nigerians still showed willingness to elect their leaders even in the 2011 elections. We shall commence on how violence swept through these six-geo-political zone beginning with South-West zone. The first taste of such electoral violence started with various political campaigns in almost all the states of the federation. Ruinous as violent clashes ensued among supporters of political parties which led to the death of several people and many were injured less than nine days to the general elections. In Ondo

state, three people were shot dead in Obanla area with four people reportedly injured in Iro street in a clash between supporters of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) and the ruling Labour Party (LP). The electoral violence and irregularities that marred the election at Ondo state prompted the Action Congress of Nigeria (ACN) to submit a 47 page petition to the election tribunal in Akure seeking a rerun of the polls. Meanwhile, the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) had already declared the Labour Party (LP) candidate, Rapheal Nomiye as a winner in the National Assembly election. The ACN had claimed in a petition ET/ODS/NAE/HR/2/2011 that the election was marred by violence, unprecedented councils of Ilaji and Ese-odo which made up the constituency [Bello, 2011:7].

In Ado-Ekiti, the Ekiti state capital, two supporters of the PDP identified as Ayo Kehinde Faluyi and Michael Ipindola were killed by assassins dressed in police uniform during a brawl between the supporters of the PDP and ruling Action Congress of Nigeria (ACN). The clash in Ado-Ekiti caused pandemonium as the corpse of one of the casualties; Ayo Kehinde was dropped at the Governor's office by the protesting members of the PDP in the state. Likewise, in Ogun state had before the elections thrown itself

into a confused state by presenting two controversial lists of candidates to Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC), their names were Adetunji Olurin and Gboyega Isiaka. However during the campaign, no fewer than two people died in a clash between supporters of the governorship candidates of the Labour Party (LP) and commercial motorcyclists [Oladoyinbo, Nwoke and Olukoya, 2011:1-4].

In South-south, elections were equally engulfed with electoral violence. Thus, in Akwa-Ibom state, the political campaigns took a destructive dimension when both Ikot-Ekpene and Uyo were turned into theaters of political war by political parties. The face-off was between loyalists of the PDP and ACN. The ACN had its gubernatorial campaign rally at Ikot-Ekpene while the PDP had its own in Mkpato Emin and Abak local councils at Uyo. Different versions of the cases of the quarrel were advanced, but it was certain that the quarrel took place between the supporters of ACN and those of the PDP which resulted into the death of many while several were wounded, even the presidential campaign office of Goodluck Jonathan/Namadi Sambo situated along Abak road was set ablaze. Some 127 Peugeot, 307 salon cars and 157 Keke Napep tri-cycles were all burnt in

ashes. And about 51 suspects were arrested in connection to the political violence at Uyo [Akpan-Nsoh, 2011:22 and 23].

In Edo state, protests came over the way the primaries were conducted. Matthew Uroghide who lost to Elugie Uzamere in Edo south alleged that he won, while Theo Okoh and Oniko Lease Irabor both claimed victory in Edo central as they alleged that the announced winner, Herberta Okonfua rigged the process. There were also protests from House of Representatives and the State House of Assembly aspirants [Aliu, 2011:65].

Although, electoral violence in Cross River state, has been on the low side as there were no reported cases of political motivated killings. However, at Ugep, there was violence and some people were injured and cars destroyed while guns were used freely. The violence led to arrest of one the aspirants to the federal House of Representatives, Mr. Patrick Okomiso and the incumbent member, Chief Bassy Ewa [Aliu, 2011:66].

In the South-East zone, there were series of electoral violence too, in Enugu state; they witnessed attack targeted at opponents of the state government. Such attacks by members ranged from disruption of meetings and gatherings, destruction of posters and billboards of aspirants. The aim

was basically to scuttle the ambition of the new comers by the incumbents so as to retain the hold of government on the political structure. The former aspirants to Enugu West senatorial zone of the PDP, O.A.U Onyema severally had his billboards and posters destroyed by his opponents in a bid to cow him. One of the claimants of the governorship candidates of the PDP, Chief Anayo Onwuegbu also severally had his billboards smashed by alleged opponents on the pretext that he did not secure the approval of the state ministry of Environment before mounting the campaign billboards and posters. In another development, in the buildup of the battle to control the soul of PDP between Sullivan Chime and his opponents, former military administrator of old Imo state, Commodore Anthony Oguguo and former adviser on local government affairs to Chimaroke Nnamani, Chief Sam Ejiofor had their homes invaded by political thugs [Sobechei,2011:15].

In Abia state, the entire campaign process was defined by sheer hostility. Infact, this was described as the battle front [Sobechei, 2011:15]. In Ebonyi state, at Izzi local government of Ebonyi state suspected thugs loyal to a political party unleashed terror on st. Stephen's Catholic Church, Iziogo in the local council. What however, snowballed into the violence was that an ANPP Chieftaincy and the Senatorial candidates for Ebonyi North Senatorial

District, Fidelis Nwankwo went to st. Stephen's catholic church on that Sunday in company of his colleagues, Senator Ucha, the ANPP governorship candidates and Emma Ugwu, the House of Representatives candidates for Izzi/Abakaliki federal constituency. It was after the service and when the people were about going home that the thugs descended on them. The thugs broke into the home of the catechist, burnt his motor cycle, destroyed the yam barn and inflicted cuts on one person. In all, five motor cycles were burnt [Sobechi, 2011:15].

The electoral violence took a very Ugly shape in Northern region zone. There were cases of stuffing of ballot boxes, under age voting and outright falsification of election results have been reported in some Northern states. Infact, with regard to post election violence, the leadership Newspaper on (Wednesday, April 20th.2011) had it on their front page:

Post election violence in Nigeria as 121 people has been killed and 15,000 people have been displaced; Kaduna 50 victims; Katsina 8 victims; Kano 30 victims; Bauchi 16 victims; Gombe 17 victims [cited by Omotayo,2011].

In the same vein, nearly all the states in the North-East also experienced violence. At Gombe state, the 17 people lost their lives during the post-

presidential poll violence in Gombe and 100 suspects arrested. The Acting Head of Clinical services and training of the federal medical centre, Gombe, Dr Ali Shaliza stated that 71 patients of post-election violence were brought to the hospital. The violence also resulted into about 300 casualties to be attended to by the Red Cross [Sabiu et al, 2011:53]. In Bauchi state, 10 youth corps who served as election umpires, a Divisional Crime Office (DOC) and policewoman lost their lives. Over 4,500 people were displaced following the mayhem unleashed on the residents of Bauchi of supporters of the Congress for Progressive Change (CPC). Four INEC offices were equally vandalized in Bauchi, Dambam, Misau and Jama are local government areas while 500 laptops used for the voter registration exercise were looted by the irate youth [Sabiu et al, 2011:53]. The Nigerian experience with general elections has shown that multi-political parties in Nigeria have not fully come to terms with the referents of elections for democratic sustenance and national security. More often than not, the elite have failed to play by the rules of competitive electoral politics which prioritize politics of tolerance, conflict and consensus, bargaining and compromise. They see elections as warfare, characterized by gangsterism and political disorder. Political parties which organize for elections are also,

like armband of men and women going to war, where there must be victors and the vanquished. In Nigeria, because of the nature of party politics, elections have become warfare, where it is sin to lose [Akhakpa, 2011:22]. This dominant pattern of elections and electioneering threatens to tear the nation apart and put its tenuous peace at great risks. The 2011 general elections in Nigeria has come and gone but its aftermath threatens the very existence of the Nigerian State. The Congress of Progressive Change (CPC) has come out openly to reject the results of the presidential elections which it alleged its candidates, retired General Buhari won. While, the case was in court, political jobbers and miscreants seized the opportunity to create a state of insecurity in the country through the spate of bombing and communal violence in several parts of the North. The political uncertainties in the country create avenues for aggrieved groups to revive their hitherto latent agitations for all manner of things. The most violent of them being the spate of bombing by Boko Haram sect [Akhakpa, 2011:22]. In the light of the above, the paper's objective is to analyze the political implications associated with the politics of multi-political parties in Nigeria. The role of this multi-party in the Nigeria's democratic experience since the return of civil rule in 1999 and the insecurity it spawns in the country. The multi-party

system is meant to bring development and stability in such country. In a country where appropriate development paradigm is in place and practiced, the citizenry enjoys high standard of living demonstrated by the willingness of government to provide the basic necessities of life in terms of job, portable water, electricity, affordable housing foods, good roads among others, likewise an enabling ground for a democratic consolidation such as freedom of participation in elections through voting and to be voted for, freedom of speech and so on [Adebayo, 2011].

3.5 The Economic Implications of Multi-party Politics in Nigeria.

Looking at it from economic perspective, to some extent, the politics of multi-party hinders the economic growth of Nigeria, through various issues of insecurity as results of election crisis and violence. The nature of politics been played in Nigeria has been of negative effect on the socio-economic and political system [Akhakpe, 2011:27]. The political correlate of these economic measures in liberal democracy, which is regarded as the inevitable outcome of modernization. Like it economic correlate capitalism, liberal democracy has helped to create political violence, religious strives and ethno-communal cleavages in most countries in Africa [Osaghae, 1999]. Yet, more than three decades of experimenting with liberal democracy in

Nigeria, the expected gains of multi-party elections have failed to be registered in the lives of average Nigerians instead, crisis of underdevelopment still persists nay in greater dimensions. Multi-party elections which are supposed to be the cure for development and insecurity in Nigeria have actually exacerbated them [Adejumobi, 2009]. In Nigeria, election has always been hotly contested under party politics that is intemperate and violence rite-large. The 2011 general elections were no different as the two presidential candidates Goodluck Jonathan of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) and General Mohammad Buhari Rtd of the Congress for Progressive Change (CPC) sloughed it out to the apex court in Nigeria, the Supreme Court. The court in its ruling in the petition filed by the CPC on the presidential elections, declared that president Goodluck Jonathan and vice president Namadi Sambo were validly elected. It noted that the petitions were unable to prove their allegation f violation of the electoral law [Akhakpe, 2011:27].The political unrest and spate of insecurity which have invaded mostly the Northern parts of Nigeria. For the umpteenth time, it has shown that politics of tolerance and accommodation, bargaining and compromise are yet to be enthroned in the fourth republic politics. The aftermath of the general elections of 2011continue tom pose major threat to

the socio-economic and political development of the country. The Boko Haram insurgency has led to the loss of thousands of lives and properties. Also, the economy is seriously threatened due to the insecurity in major flash points of the country [Akhakpe, 2011:27]. As the governor of the central bank of Nigeria has rightly noted:

The current state of bombing across the country by terrorists groups alludes to the fact that, our business environment is becoming more and more threatened and therefore the need to urgently develop a framework that will enable us to effectively respond to any crisis and thus safeguarding lives and properties and equally ensuring stability in our economic system [punch 29th February, 2012].

All over the world, liberal democracy is prioritized because it is assumed to have the magic wand to effectively deal with inter and intra group conflicts arising from the democratic method. But the Nigerian experience with liberal democracy is not very pleasant. The people's votes in most cases have refused to count. While ethno-religious conflicts are rife in the polity, the economy remains on its knees with abject poverty as a recurring decimal among the people. The popular expectations, that democracy will resolve all these challenges have largely been unmet [Akhakpe, 2011:28]. It would seem the behavioral pattern among the political and economic elites is not in

consonance with the core democratic values which conduce for stability and development in polity. Therefore, multi-party system from experience since 1999 to present date has not really shown any sign of positive implication. It has been a product of crisis upon crisis in Nigeria and has not really achieved its core objective, which is democratic consolidation and political development. Because empirical evidence has shown that in multi-party elections conducted by parties, all the contesting parties are involved in one form of electoral mal-practice or the other [Joseph, 1987; Osaghae, 1999; Iwu, 2008]. And in the situation, where the opposing parties fails to win elections, they create one form of electoral crisis or the other, such includes: long litigation in court, political propaganda, use of militant groups, mobilization of religious sentiments, among others. In more extreme cases, violent politics ensues such as, Bombing, kidnapping, political assassination and youth restiveness. All these are manifested in increasing poverty, diseases, unemployment, poor medical care, poor housing facilities, lack of portable water, epileptic power supply, lack of access to power and resources by minority groups and their exclusion from policy making [Onimode, 2007; Ake,2000; Ayeni, 2010].

Chapter Four: Multi-party System and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria 1999-2012.

The global acceptance of ‘liberal democracy’ as a major vehicle in attaining peaceful co-existence in a multi-faceted society, promotion of economic development, individual liberty, human rights restoration, rule of law and freedom of healthy competition in global socio-political activities, necessitated the quest for democratic consolidation especially in society like ours that have experienced dictatorship over the years [Nwafor,2009:20]. Hence, reputed as the ‘makers’ of democracy, political parties are by all standards, one of the most outstanding and distinguishing elements of modern government [Omotola,2010:125]. Indeed, democracy is unthinkable in the absence of viable political parties. Political parties are expected to participate in the political socialization of electorates, contributes to the accumulation of political power, facilitate recruitment of political leadership and equally serve as unifying force in a divided polity. And therefore, political parties can only cope with these pivotal roles, only provided that they are viable, in such that they are well institutionalized, internally democratic, coherent, disciplined and autonomous [Omotola,2010:126].

Now, in this chapter, we tend to access the viability of Nigeria political parties. This chapter engages crucial question in relation to Nigeria's quest for political stability. Since 1999, Nigeria has been operating multi-party system, but after some review of current trends in the previous chapters concerning the party activities under the fourth republic. The chapter tends to conclude that Nigerian multi-parties tended to become more of a democratic liability than an asset in the country's quest for political development. In other words, this chapter equally identifies the limiting dimensions of effective party politics and offers useful recommendations.

4.1. Political Parties as Building Blocks of Democratic Stability.

A political party is a body of men united, for promoting by their joint endeavors the national interest, upon some particular principles which they are all agreed [Edmund,1939:vol.1]. Elaborating on this definition, Lapalombara and Anderson (2007) define a political party as “any political group, in possession of an official label and a formal organization that links center to locality, that presents at elections and is capable of placing through elections (free or non-free), candidates for public offices.

Herbert Simon (1962) defines a party as “a system of interdependent activities characterized by as high degree of rational direction of behavior towards ends that are objects of common acknowledgement and expectations. Elsewhere, Lapalombra also defines a political party as a universally adopted tool for mobilizing large numbers of persons to engage in forms of political participation, voluntary or coerced, that are not indispensable institutions of democracy and democratic societies [Omotola, 2010:125]. Indeed, sustainable democracy is unthinkable without a viable political party system. In a real democratic sense, political parties are expected to serve as a formidable democratization force by articulating and aggregating public opinion and interests, engendering popular participation and promoting political education and national integration [Omotala, 2010:125]. Hence, by promoting these virtues, political parties can contribute overtly to the political stability of the system. Political parties have a responsibility to present candidates for elections, with the primary aim of capturing political power for the furtherance of the common good [Omotala, 2010:127]. This responsibility becomes much more challenging, tugging and arduous in plural societies where it is often difficult to build

societal consensus on critical national questions. As Yolamu Barongo has pointed out:

Pluralist democracy rather than disperse and balance political power in society actually encourages the acquisition and monopoly of power by a few individuals and groups and provides grounds whereby the stronger group of individuals pre-empts and dominates public policy.

In this context, political parties expectedly should provide a formidable platform for consensus-building on crucial national issues, especially in plural societies such as Nigeria. In such settings, “political parties’ democracies, by identifying, politicizing and representing social divisions”, include ethnicities, religious, classes and geographies [Omotala, 2010:128]. It is for this reason that it has contended that perhaps more than any other factor, the success of democratic consolidation in a country is contingent on the effectiveness of political parties in structuring political conflict. Political parties can discharge these roles adequately, provided that they live up to their responsibilities [Omotala, 2010:127]. But this is seldom, the case in some emerging democracies, especially in Africa. From a comparative African perspective, studies have shown that political parties falter in the representation of social groups, becoming instead tools for the promotion of

neo-patrimonialism and violence [Omotala, 2010:127]. The responsibilities of political parties operate on three levels; electorate-related functions, government-related functions and linkage-related functions. In such that, parties electorate-related functions entails political representation, expression of people's demands through interest articulation and aggregation and the simplification and structuring of electoral choice. They also include the integration of voters into the system through political education and mobilization. While the government-related functions include making government accountably by effectively implementing party policies and exercising control over government administration [Omotala, 2010:129]. So in other words, in between the governments and electorates, political parties play a type of mediatory role. They do this by aggregating and channeling public interests and recruiting and equally training political leaders. In the support of the foregoing functions of political parties, Reilly (2008) speaks about what he calls the "deeper, systemic support" of political parties that help make democracy work effectively. According to him:

- i. They mediate between demands of the citizenry on the one hand the actions of the government on the other hand, aggregating the diverse demands of the electorate into coherent public policy.

- ii. They make effective collective action possible within legislatures. Without the predictable voting coalitions that parties provide, there would be chaos as legislative majorities shifted from issue to issue and vote to vote.
- iii. By providing a link between ordinary citizens and their political representatives, parties are also the primary channel of democratic systems for holding governments accountable for their performance.

It should be noted, however that the discharge of these tasks depends much on the degree of institutionalization of the political parties with respect to organization, discipline, internal democracy and cohesion [Reilly, 2008:3]. Thus, when these are lacking, political parties are likely to be reduced to mere formalities just to fulfill the sense of righteousness, but democracy exists in such circumstances without real political competition. When an atmosphere of this nature prevails, parties become deficient and ill-equipped to cope with their responsibilities. In these circumstances, various interest groups may be tempted to devise alternative devices to channel their demands, including grievances, not only within the parties but also throughout the entire system. The end result, if unmitigated in time, will be

an overloading of the system with more than it can shoulder at one time, resulting in the weakness of the political system and possibly the breakdown of the political order and stability [Reilly, 2008:5]. Therefore, this is partly why there is growing worry over political parties as a destabilizing force, or even as a threat to the consolidation of democracy, in transitional democracies [Reilly, 2008:5]. Again, Reilly gives a vivid description of the main features of political parties in such contexts. As he argues, “in many countries, particularly in transitional democracies, multi-parties struggles to play these roles, instead, parties exhibit a range of pathologies that undercut their ability to deliver the kind of system benefits on which representative politics depends. Some of these pathologies include:

- i. They are frequently poorly institutionalized, with limited membership, weak policy capacity and shifting basis of support.
- ii. They are often bound around narrow personnel, regional or ethnic ties, rather than reflecting society as a whole.
- iii. They are typically organizationally thin, coming to life only at election time.
- iv. They may have little in the way of a coherent ideology.

- v. They are frequently unable to ensure a disciplined collective action in parliament with members shifting between parties.
- vi. They often fail to stand for any particular policy agenda.
- vii. Political parties often struggle to manage social conflicts and fail to deliver public goods and thus to promote development.

In other words, the point is that a political party can provide a basis for conflict or consensus, depending on its organization, internal discipline, coherence and understanding of democracy. The higher the level of its institutionalization, the more the system benefits in terms of political stability and vice versa. Yet, whatever their direction, whether as sources of conflict or consensus in society, political parties have crucial role to play as makers of democratic government and modern democracy is unthinkable save in terms of parties.

4.2. The Role of Multi-Political Parties to Democratic Sustenance in Nigeria.

It is commonly held that the survival of the democratic processes is directly linked to the ability of the political party to aggregate freely, articulate, represent and to organize set limits in the quest for the use of

political power. It is equally obvious, however, that for the party system to become capable of discharging these roles efficiently and effectively, certain criteria must be met, including autonomy, complexity and coherence [Ragsdale and Theis, 1977]. In this regard, too Richard Vengroff's (1993) argument becomes especially relevant. Drawing from the experience of Mali, Vengroff asserted that the degree to which a party system is able to meaningfully contribute to the political process is related to the existence of several factors: the development and maintenance of strong party organization with the depth and breadth necessary for their operation and the degree of the institutionalization of the party as indicated by its historical roots, longevity, survival and continuing support. Again, the capacity to meet these conditions is a determinant of their potential contribution to the institutionalization of democratic government [Vengroff, 1993]. Hence, if the above forms the yardstick for the measurement of the state of political parties in Nigeria, it then becomes inescapable to conclude that the key party institutions, to date, have failed to fulfill adequately their functions [Odaudu, 2012:12]. Over the years, what became apparent is the lack of proper organization and perhaps, perception of what a party system should be. Indeed, as records of inter and intra-party squabble show, both in their

methods and practices, multi-parties have contributed immensely to the crisis that engulfed the political system in Nigeria [Odaudu, 2012:12]. The rot necessary gets carried into the electoral arena where elections, in particular have been controversial, often lacking in credibility. To begin with elections, as instruments through which government derives the consent of the governed, are integral part of any democracy [Odaudu, 2012:12]. In spite of its utility for the democratic form of governance, however, the mere fact of election does not make a country democratic. Democratic elections, everywhere, are expected to meet certain minimum of competitiveness and inclusiveness. The former, perhaps is deterministic of how the outcomes of the polls are accepted or not [Sarabjit, 2002]. Equally, this much has been shown by the United States Information Agency (USIA, 1991:16] in arguing that: “Democratic elections are competitive. In other words, it simply means, opposition parties and candidates must enjoy the freedom of speech, assembly and movement necessary to voice their criticisms of the government openly and to bring alternative policies and candidates to the voters. Simply permitting the opposition, access to the ballot is not enough, And more so, an elections in which the oppositions is barred from the airwaves has its rallies harassed or its newspaper censored are not

democratic [Sarabjit, 2002:20]. In most cases, the political party in power may enjoy the advantages of incumbency, otherwise, known as “incumbency factor”. But the role and conduct of the elections must be fair.

It is worthy to note that electoral processes in Nigeria have historically been marred by a lot of difficulties. For instance, during the first republic, it was obvious that among other potent factors, the election crisis of 1964-1965 and the western regional election of October 1965, proved the greatest test for the stability and thus durability of the first republic [Lipset, 1998:38]. The resultant conflict occasioned by these and the high level distrust between the highly ethicized political systems, therefore, facilitated the intervention of the military on January 15, 1966. Thus, one should equally claim that, the elections that ushered in the second republic in 1979 were relatively calm, portending little or no danger to the survival of the new government, the same could not be said of the one held in 1983, that sought to herald the country’s first civilian organized election since 1965. The 1983 election, essentially were held in the atmosphere of heightened fears and tensions [Sarabjit, 2002:21]. In such that, politicians of all inclinations issued threats and counter threats that questioned the continued survival of the ship of state. Not unexpectedly, when the election results were released,

returning the incumbent National Party of Nigeria (NPN) government to power at the centre, all hell broke loose and spates of violence gripped the country [Sarabjit, 2002:21]. Unfortunately, the military struck again which was the second time on December 31, 1983 overthrowing the NPN led government of Shagari in a coup. The 20 months old Buhari regime that succeeded the ousted government never had a transition programme, not until, it was itself toppled in a palace coup which after then, placed Gen. Ibrahim Babangida at the helms as Nigeria's new military ruler, of which, the administration adopted two-party system [Yaqub, 2002:10].

In a nutshell, ample attempts were made by successive military government to install a democratically elected government until 1999, when Gen. Abdusalami Abubakar who took over from a military dictator, Gen. Sani Abacha whose aim was to achieve "self-succession bid" [Yaqub, 2002:10]. The Sani Abacha's military administration failed because of his untimely death. Gen. Abubakar in his attempt to install democracy back handed over power to the democratically elected government of Obasanjo.

The Obasanjo's government, at the completion of the first year tenure, organized the conduct of new elections as the constitution of the country stipulated. The April 2003 elections were meant to subject the incumbent

administration at all levels, to public verdict through free and fair elections. The election at all levels was, no doubt, a showcase of election rigging. The elections were rigged beyond imagination and brought very unpopular candidates to power [Odaudu, 2012:20]. Most cases, party candidates that never campaigned for any election win while popular candidates voted by the people were thrown out. Little wonder that, most Nigerian electorates went berserk on seeing that the election results were not a reflection of the votes cast. It was also glaring that during the electioneering campaign prior to the elections in 2003, political elites under the Umbrella of different political parties, distributed rice, salt, money etc to the people in order to buy their votes and supports. For instance, the former Governor Peter Odili of River State was said to have involved in the distribution of textile materials across the various villages and towns in River state, in order to win the people's mandate for a second term [Odaudu, 2012:20]. Infact, the gubernatorial election in River state was chronically rigged to the extent that the incumbent governor swept over 90% of the total votes [Odaudu, 2012:20]. Clearly speaking, at the run up to 2007 election, thugs were not any better than the previous ones. The obstacles were many and varied. The danger signals included the impeachment debacles in a number of states, the

shoddy preparations by INEC, the Obasanjo/Atiku face-off, the spates of assassinations and attempted assassinations of high profile aspirants, the simmering crisis in the Niger-Delta and the heightened, widely perceived selective indictment of elected officials etc [Odaudu, 2012:21]. Essentially, it is quite obvious, that electoral process in Nigeria therefore did not serve as a peaceful means to bring about change and neither did it offer the people the chance to exercise their choices in a free manner. Notwithstanding, the undemocratic nature of 2007 general election. Yet, not after, 2011 election came up. Although, the 2011 general election was termed to be the most free and fair election Nigeria have ever conducted since the Fourth republic [Omotoyo, 2011]. Yet, there were still cases of stuffing of ballot boxes, underage voting and outright falsification of election results, which was reported to have occurred in some states. Infact, with regard to post election violence in the 2011 election, the leadership Newspaper on Wednesday, April 20th 2011 had it on their front page, which reads: “post election violence in Nigeria as 121people have been killed and 15,000 people have been displaced, Kaduna, 50 victims dead; Kano, 30 victims dead; Bauchi, 16 victims dead; Katsina, 8 victims dead; Gombe, 17 victims dead” [Omotayo, 2011:10]. Again, there was another case relating to the 2011 election that

was captured by the same leadership Newspaper on page 2 on April 20, 2011 and it reads: “Post-election Riots: as 70 youth service corps members escape death in Minna; the Inspector General of police orders state commissioners to be on red alert. And “post-election crisis: federal Government sends reinforcement to Kaduna state” [Omotayo, 2011:10]. Therefore, as we can see from this survey of the 2011 general election, it was just simply like the previous ones. There is no relationship between electoral process and democratic consolidation. The reason is simply based on lack of viable political parties in Nigeria. Up till date, they only thing political parties in Nigeria currently do are merely the provision of candidates to contest for elective offices in various capacities. As a matter of fact, in vibrant and ideal democracies, political parties are not perceived as mere platform for contesting elections or political appointments. Rather, they play plethora of roles like educating their members politically, informing members in administrative offices about public opinion or national issues, as well as maintaining a strong ideological base that would ensure its survival in future elections [Odaudu, 2012:21]. The current Nigerian political parties, seldom and in some cases, do not perform their roles. In other words, multi- political parties have no ideology or philosophy.

Apart from that, they are formed along ethno-cultural, geo-political and religious lines [Sarabjit, 2002:2]. Therefore, this has not helped in the sustenance of democracy as it encourages ethnic chauvinism and parochialism, primordial sentiments, and geo-political exclusivities. These are factors that have inhibited the parties from performing their roles as political parties and politicians in Nigeria do not cooperate to ensure the survival and consolidation of democracy in Nigeria. Political intolerance and lack of intra and inter-party democracy has become the order of the day [Odaudu, 2012:21]. Not only that, politicians and party leaders have abused democracy and have taken democratization in Nigeria to mean insatiable thirst for power, wealth and influence for personal and parochial ends, rather than as a means of consolidating political and economic independence for promoting societal welfare, laying the foundation for national security, socio-economic and technological transformation [Odaudu, 2012:21]. Therefore, it can be said that political parties in Nigeria both the PDP, ANPP, CPC, ACN, APGA and other parties, by sidelining the national interest and the interest of the people, have not served as true representative of the people. They therefore have swayed the masses away from them and have created obstacles in the legitimization process.

So in other words, we can see from the analysis, that all the elections in the fourth republic from (1999-2011), shared a number of common characteristics and trend. First, they have been particularly characterized by massive frauds, intimidation and even assassination of political opponents, the brazen subversion of the “sovereignty of the vote” and controversy. The governments in power and politicians have their own designs and have generally perpetrated and maintained a culture of electoral violence and warfare. No election has been conducted without great deal of controversy before, during or after elections.

Secondly, while there has been continuity in violence and warfare, there has been lack of continuity in the political organizations through which both violence and warfare have been conducted. Each period has thus, produced new political formations, reflecting not only the penchant for lack of principle and shifting allegiance among members of the political class but also the total-de-ideologization of the issues on which members of the class were divided into antagonistic camps.

4.3. Factors Responsible for the Undemocratic Nature of Political Parties in Nigeria.

In Nigeria, there have been some factors hindering the multi- political parties in Nigeria from democratic consolidation.

According to Bamgbose .J. Adele (2012:216), he stated the following:

- i. **Unnecessary Political Ambition:** unlike before, Nigerians have becomes highly politicized. Infact, the demand to participate in politics keeps on increasing in geometrical progression while the absorbing capacity of these participants increases in arithmetic progression. This leads to a very high competition among the participants who are prone to take the most extreme measures in order to win and maintain political power.
- ii. **Ethnic politics:** this has become highly pronounced in Nigerian politics. The colonialists who ruled in the past poisoned the minds of Nigerians against Nigerians. Thus, in 1951 election in Kano, the colonial administration tried hard to frustrate the Northern allies of Southerners opposed to the candidates of the emirs. Similarly, after the election of 2011 that brought Goodluck Jonathan in, some

disgruntled elements rose up in the North chanting “Ba muso” meaning, they do not like the president because he is not from the North.

- iii. **Monetization of politics:** In the time past, political offices did not attract money as it is today. The government had politics more financially attractive that nobody wants to engage in any other profession than politics. Thus as it now, the 109 senators receive #4,066,212,458.00; the 3 had politics more financially attractive that nobody wants to engage in any other profession than politics. Thus as it now, the 109 senators receive #4,066,212,458.00, the 350 members of the House of Representatives receives #11,496,523,333.00. The 36 state House of Assemblies receive the total of #17,129,465,597.00 while about 600 councilors receive #74,766,456,000.00 per annum [Andu,2010:1 and 7]. Seeing these benefits, Nigerians determine to enter into politics through various parties and the political parties’ do anything at all cost to win election.

So therefore, we have seen the nature or factors that make the multi-parties in Nigeria to do what they do, in other to win elections at any cost. However,

with these actions, it is very difficult for political parties to perform their democratic duties. The reason for political existence in a democratic environment like Nigeria is simply to offer alternative platforms to citizens who have the passion to serve their country and have something serious to contribute to serve their country. That is why political parties are ideologically driven. Yet, in Nigeria, these Multi-Political parties seem to have no clear ideology, nor programme.

4.4 The Roles of Political Parties as Enshrined in 1999 Constitution of Nigeria.

The drafters of the 1999 constitution of Nigeria must have envisaged the possibility of adapting political parties as basis of conflict and consensus in a plural society such as Nigeria. The constitution contains provisions that spell out, in an unambiguous manner, the expected roles of Nigerian parties as much as the conditions attached to their existence. The 1999 constitution, in its section 221 provides that:

No association, other than a political party, shall canvass for votes for any candidates at any election or contribute to the funds of any political party or to the election expenses of any candidate at an election.

Section 222 provided that no association by whatever name called shall function as political party, unless:

- a. The names and address of its national officers are registered with the Independent National Electoral Commission.
- b. The membership of the association is open to every citizen of Nigeria irrespective of his place of origin, circumstance of birth, sex, religion or ethnic grouping.

These provisions, no doubt are born out of the intention to differentiate political parties from other organizations such as pressure groups in terms of their roles and to ensure smooth transition or succession in the political system. By conferring on political parties the monopoly of the right to field candidates for elections and to establish the conditions under which they may operate, parties are expected to be a viable basis of consensus-building.

In furtherance of this concern, the constitution forbids any political party from having or operating on its own, any form of quasi-military organization, including the use of thugs.

Thus, section 227 of the 1999 constitution states that:

No association shall retain, organize, train or equip any person or group of persons for purpose of enabling them to be employed for the use of display of physical force or coercion in prompting any objectives or interest or in such manner as to arouse reasonable apprehension that they are organized and trained or equipped for that purpose.

In reality, however, Nigeria parties honor these provisions merely on paper. The manner of origin of Nigerian parties, especially in recent times, tends to limit their capability to sustain political stability.

As Omo Omoruji has rightly observed, what we have since 1999 in Nigeria as political parties has a lot in common with the political parties of the first and second or third republic. Their manner of origin, according to him “does not fit into what we know from literature. Their composition is fluid and unstable. They can be viewed as instruments of transition from military to civilian rule and for the future and with prospect of more parties, they raise more questions than answers to the lingering political problems of Nigeria”. A critical assessment of the performance of Nigerian parties from 1999 till present date reveals that they actually raise more questions than answers to the problems of the country, especially the challenges of maintaining Democratic consolidation and political development. In his own

assessment, Omo Omoruji concluded that since 1999, “the so-called parties are not in competition with one another, rather they are in factions, and these factions are more in competition with themselves than with another party.

Another major issue has to do with, the way in which parties manipulate electoral processes in their spheres of influence. As studies have shown, Nigerian parties are known for massive rigging of election [Omotala, 2010:138]. Therefore, the experience of 2003, 2007 and 2011 general elections remain potent, having precipitated post-election conflicts and instability across several parts of the country. But yet, notwithstanding that, various measures have been taken.

Thus, section 129 of the amended Electoral Act 2011 clearly outlines what constitutes an offence during an election and it provides as follows:

1. No person shall on the date on which an election is held do any of the following acts or things in a polling unit or within a distance of 30metres of the polling units-
 - a. Canvass for votes.
 - b. Solicit for the vote of any voter.
 - c. Persuade any voter not to vote for any particular candidates.

- d. Persuade any voter not to vote at the election.
 - e. Shout slogans concerning the election.
 - f. Be in possession of any offensive weapon or wear any dress or have any facial or other decoration which in any event is calculated to intimidate voters.
 - g. Exhibit, wear or tender any notice, symbol, photograph or party card referring to the election.
 - h. Use any vehicle bearing the colour or symbol of a political party by any means whatsoever.
 - i. Loiter without lawful excuse after voting or after being refused to vote.
 - j. Snatch or destroy any election materials and
 - k. Blare siren.
2. No person shall within the vicinity of a polling unit or collation centre on the day of which an election is held:-
- a. Convene, hold or attend any public meeting during the hours of poll as may be prescribed by the commission.
 - b. Unless appointed under this Act to make official announcements, operate any megaphone, amplifier or public address apparatus.

- c. Wear or carry any badge, poster, banner, flag or symbol relating to a political party or to the election.

The power of arrest under this section will be exercised by the police alongside those provided under section 4 of the police Act.

Chapter Five: Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations.

5.1 Summary of Findings

In summary, this research work which was based on the topic: The Multi-party system and Political development in Nigeria, An Appraisal of fourth Republic from 1999-2012. But before that, the researcher wants to rightly point that, this work was not based on any prejudice or any personal grudges, rather, it was accessed in line with the past and present experience. In other words, the work is categorically divided into chapters.

In the chapter one, the researcher started with a background study, where the topic of the work was introduced briefly. And he started by tapping into the historical background of political parties in Nigeria. In the process, it was discovered that, multi-party system in Nigeria was colonial oriented under the Clifford constitution of 1922. Apart from that, in line with the topic, three troubling questions were posed by the researcher, which including the following: firstly, Is there any relationship between multi-party system and political development in Nigeria? Secondly, does multi-party system have any implications on Nigerian political development? And lastly,

does multi-party system ensure Democratic consolidation in Nigeria? All these were the questions that were asked and the researcher tried to answer the questions. In attending to the statement of problem of the research work, the researcher adopted a theoretical framework suitable for the work, thereby sharing in the ideology of Arthur Bently (1908), in his group theory. Here, the scholar was simply trying to say that, “the interactions of groups are the basis of political life”. Then after that, there was an operational definition of terms that helped in the course of analysis.

In the chapter two, the researcher begins by explaining the relationship between multi-party system and political development. Here, the researcher was forced to access various party system that have ever existed in Nigeria from pre-independent period, down to first republic, second republic, third republic and present fourth republic. In the process of assessment, it was then discovered that, Nigeria practiced multi-party system in first republic (1960-1965), second republic (1966-1984). But in the third republic, the party system changed from multi-party system to two-party system under military rule led by Gen. Ibrahim Babangida. During this military, it was only two parties that were recognized legally, which were National Republican Convention (NRC) and Social Democratic Party (SDP). But

then, it was later in 1999 under Gen. Abdusalami Abubakar decided to hand over the power to a civilian government. And after the 1999 election, Chief Olusegun Obasanjo assumed power as a civilian government. This event marked the return of democratic government in Nigeria and the beginning of fourth republic. Therefore, in the assessment of the entire republic from first republic down to the present fourth republic, it was found out that, all of them shared similar cases of electoral violence, political crisis, rigging of elections, under aged voting, bribing of electoral bodies, assassination of political aspirants and other related cases. So in other words, in answering the first question, which stated that, is there any relationship between multi-party system and political development in Nigeria, therefore, the researcher after assessment, discovered that, there is no relationship between political development and multi-party system in Nigeria context.

In the chapter three, the researcher tried examining the implication of multi-party system in Nigeria political development. So the researcher exhaustively accessed the various controversies associated with elections starting with the first republic elections down to the fourth republic elections, but placed more emphasis on the fourth republic elections from 1999, 2003, 2007 and 2011 elections. In course of analysis, it was

discovered that, all these elections conducted in the our fourth republic so far, have shared some similar characteristics of several cases like electoral manipulation, rigging of elections, assassination of political opponents, gangsterism, stuffing of ballot boxes, under age voting, raising of party militias armies, the outright falsification of election results and many other related cases. Infact, with regard to the 2011 post-election crisis, Nigerian leadership Newspaper on Wednesday, April 20th captured it in their front page: Post election violence in Nigeria: 121 people dead, 15,000 displaced in Northern part of the country; Another post-election violence as some NYSC members escaped death in Minna. And likewise related stories captured in other newspapers. Therefore, from such stories, the researcher came to conclusion, based on the electoral violence experience in Nigeria in 2011 general election, likewise other previous 2007, 2003 and 1999 elections that multi-parties in Nigeria have not fully come to terms with the referents of elections for a proper democratic sustenance and national integration. Furthermore, it was also discovered that the elites in Nigeria, have failed to play by the rules of competitive electoral politics which prioritize politics of tolerance, conflict and consensus, bargaining and compromise. Rather, these elites saw elections in Nigeria as warfare, characterized by gangsterism and

political disorder. Thus, these dominant pattern of elections and electioneering in Nigeria, threatens to tear the country apart and put its tenuous peace at great risks. In line with that, it was equally discovered that, apart from political implications, there were also economic implications attached to the politics of multi-party system in Nigeria, since multi-party elections failed to maintain political stability and development. The nature of insecurity in Nigeria has actually exacerbated them totally. The nature of political unrest and spate of insecurity which have invaded the country, precisely the Northern part of Nigeria, has continued to pose big threat on socio-economic and political development. The activities of Boko Haram sect has unaccountably led to lose of thousands of lives and properties worth of millions. Also, the economy has been seriously threatened due to the level of insecurity in major flash-points of the country. So on this note, the researcher concluded that, multi-party system from experience since 1999 till present date has not exactly shown any sign of positive implications; rather it has been a product of crisis upon crisis and has not really achieved its core objective, which is democratic consolidation and political development in Nigeria.

And finally, in the chapter four, the researcher decided to access multi-party system and democratic consolidation. Here, the assessment was simply based on understanding the viability of multi-parties in Nigeria. The chapter engaged properly in critical question in relation to Nigeria's quest for political stability. Furthermore, in this particular chapter, the researcher explained political parties as building blocks of democratic consolidation. And after that, decided to compare a democratic role of a multi-party system and that of multi-party system of Nigeria, the researcher therefore, found out that multi-political parties in Nigeria have not really discovered their roles in democratic sustenance and integration. Over the years, what became apparent in the Nigeria political parties was simply lack of proper organization and perhaps, clearly the perception of what a multi-party system should be. Indeed, as records of intra and inter-party show both in their methods and practices, that multi-party have contributed immensely to the crisis that engulf the political system in Nigeria. It is worthy to note that, electoral processes in Nigeria have historically been marred by a lot of difficulties, instabilities and irregularities as a result of the nature of multi-party politics, starting from first republic, down to our present fourth republic. Infact, political parties in Nigeria have not yet, come to realize

their objectives and roles in democratic consolidation and political development. There is no need to accuse the party system itself, but rather the people that operate the parties.

In a nutshell, the researcher stated again that, there is no relationship between multi-party system and democratic consolidation in Nigeria. Yet notwithstanding that, there have been various attempts to regulate the nature and activities of multi-parties in Nigeria, especially activities during elections. Under section 129 of amended Electoral Act 2011, it stated clearly what can actually constitute an offence during elections.

5.2 Conclusion

In the final analysis, we are able to see that the problem lies not in the form or type of government, but the style our leaders adopt in governing the masses. The proliferation of political parties in Nigeria is not healthy for the nation's democratic growth. Ordinarily, in a multi-party democracy as Nigeria claims to practice, the number of political parties found in the fray should not be a cause for worry. But a closer observation clearly shows that most of these parties exist only in name and do not qualify to be called political parties at all. It is a cancerous growth that is stifling the democracy

in the country. As political organizations, political parties seek to influence government policy, by nominating their own candidates and trying to seat them in political offices. Parties participate in electioneering campaigns and political mass education. Again, political parties exist to espouse known ideologies and visions bolstered by specific goals and form coalitions among disparate interests where necessary. The big idea is to win an opportunity to steer the ship of governance to a higher level and thus make life more abundant to a greater number of citizens. It then follows that, a political party that cannot participate in elections is improperly so called and a mockery. At best it is a pressure group engaging in protest actions and advancing its own interest. Political parties do not exist for the sole purpose of endorsing and adopting candidates of other political parties as presently the case in Nigeria. By so doing, it makes nonsense of the fundamental reason why political parties exist. It is a development into a sticky situation. It does appear some Nigerians have seized the liberal guidelines for the registration of political parties to engage in it as mere pastime and have no due regard for the serious responsibilities associated with parties as political organizations. For the avoidance of doubt, political parties exist to offer alternative platforms to citizens who have the passion to serve their country

and have something serious to contribute to nation building effort. That is why political parties are ideologically driven. Yet, in Nigeria, the political parties have no clear ideology, nor programme. In the 2011 electioneering, all the electorate could hear was, “I will create millions of jobs”, “I will resolve electricity” and so on, without any clear illumination of the state of things and a plausible road map round it. The implication is that, today, one can hardly say what the over sixty political parties registered by INEC stand for, aside the fact that majority of them do not have capacity to go into elections and have indeed constantly shied away from past elections even after collecting subventions from the electoral commission. In the last presidential election, only a handful of them took part and only for parties like Action Congress of Nigeria (ACN), Congress for Progressive Change (CPC), All Nigeria People’s Party (ANPP) and People’s Democratic Party (PDP), were all in the context. Likewise, in 1999, only three political parties with clear programmes and ideology were registered and participated in presidential elections of that year, namely All People Party (APP), Alliance for Democracy (AD) and People’s Democratic Party (PDP). Then, the political environment was far more meaningful and progressive than what obtains presently. Going by the last presidential election won by President

Goodluck Jonathan, opposition has died a natural death. For me, the irrelevant parties should be proscribed so that viable opposition party can emerge through possible alliance of ACN, ANPP and CPC and this has been latest development. The argument that it is undemocratic to regulate the number of parties is not too healthy also in the face of the growing need to moderate the staccato of political parties to mitigate their negative impacts on the democratic process. One way of doing this is to strike some kind of a balance. Deriving from this, a political party that has not participated in the general elections should be presumed dead and deregistered and those who have consistently failed to win seats both into state and federal assemblies should also be deregistered.

5.3 Recommendations

Some of the recommendations towards achieving a democratic consolidation and political development through political parties include the following:

- a. While Constitutional Right Project (CRP) believes that there is need to strengthen our democratic institutions, a total overhaul of present electoral laws regulating party registration should commence.

- b. Due to lack of philosophy and ideology, political parties go against the dictates of their manifestoes, therefore, our political parties should have a clearly defined philosophy and ideology that will enable them conform with the dictates of their manifestoes.
- c. The linkages between political parties and ethnicity are not in the best interest of the Nigerian people. This is an area where de-linking is appropriate and necessary. This can be made possible if the people have political education. The people should understand their rights, responsibilities and the role of the state. They should be educated to demand accountability on the part of those elected into office. They should be in a position to recall those who have failed to deliver. Because a proper understanding of the various political issues will there to prevent them from being used as pawns by the leaders in the ethnicity.
- d. The way political parties are constituted and legitimized have bearing on both the scope and content of democracy in the country, as well as on the capacity of government to be responsible and accountable to the electorates. The parties need to be internally democratic and

should be interested in deepening the content of democracy in the country.

- e. Two-party system seems to appear good for Nigeria, reminiscent of what nostalgically obtained in the NRC and SDP days in third republic, which produced MKO Abiola's aborted presidency. Two-party system as found in Jamaica and neighboring Ghana should be given a serious thought. Australia, Canada, Pakistan, India, Republic of Ireland, United Kingdom and Norway are example of countries with two strong parties and additional smaller parties that have also obtained representation. Such examples should be emulated by Nigeria for stability and growth.
- f. Political parties should be funded by contributions from party members. Government funding for political parties should therefore be withdrawn, so that only the serious ones can survive and face up to the dictates of their calling and others dying a natural death.
- g. The survival and sustenance of democracy is to a greater extent, dependent on the ability of the electoral body to conduct free and fair elections through a transparent process. For this to be viable, the

existence of an electoral body which is independent in its function is needed.

- h. Finally, it is therefore the fervent hope of many that government should look into the urgent need to reform political parties in Nigeria with a view to sanitizing the democratic process to ensure the survival and growth of hard-earned democracy and political development.

Bibliography

Books

- Achebe, C. (1983). *The Trouble with Nigeria*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.
- Adebayo, A. (1986). *Power in Politics*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- Anifowose, R. (1982). *Violence and Politics in Nigeria: The Tiv Experience*. Enugu-Nigeria and New York: Nok Publishers.
- Ball, A. (1971). *Modern policies and Government*. London: Macmillan Press Limited.
- Bentley, A. F. (1908). *The Process of Government*. Chicago: Chicago University press.
- Burke, E. (1983). *Reflection on the French Revolution*. Auckland: Mc Grew Hills International.
- Dahl, R. (1976). *Democracy in the United States of America*. Chicago: Chicago University press.
- Ibodje, S. (2005). Political Parties, Voting Pattern and National Integration in Nigeria in B. Owu and A. Momoh, *Elections and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria*. Lagos: A triad Association Ltd.
- Lassawell, H. (1936). *Politics: Who Gets What, When and How?*. New York: MaGraw Hills.
- Nnoli, O. (1978). *Ethnic Politics in Nigeria*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.

- Oji, R. (2002). *Political Parties, Pressure Groups and Public Opinion in the Political Process*. Enugu: John Jacob's Publishers Ltd.
- Oji, O. (1999). *Elements of Political Culture: The Nigerian Example*. Enugu: Marydan Publishers.
- Rodee, A. (1983). *Introduction to Political Science (4th edition)*. Auckland: MaGrew Hill Intel.
- Slizbeat, A. (2012). *General Election in Nigeria: The 2011 Experience*. Kano:Friedrich Publisher Ltd.
- Yaqub, N. (2002). Political Parties in the Transition Process in Bob Onuoba and M.M Fadakinte, *Transition Politics in Nigeria: 1970-1999*. Lagos: Malthouse press limited.

Articles and Journals

- Adebayo, P. & Omotola, J. (2007). Public Perceptions of the 2007 Nigerian General Elections: *A Journal of African Elections*, No.6. Pp. 200-207.
- Adele, J. (2012). Electoral Violence and Nigeria's 2011 General Election: *A Journal on International Review of Social Science and Humanities*. Vol.4, No.1 pp.205-219.
- Akhakpe, I. (2011). Election Crisis, Liberal Democracy and National Security in Nigeria's Fourth Republic: *A European Scientific Journal*, Nov edition Vol.8 pp.21-36.
- (2008).The Challenges of Electoral Administration, The Constitution: *A Journal of Constitutional Development*, Vol.8, No.2.
- Bangbose, J. (2009). Presidential Election and Refugee Crisis in Togo: *A Journal of International African Studies*, Vol.3, No.2.

- Herbert, S. (1962). Comments on the Theory of Organization,
A Journal on American Political Science Review, Vol.46.pp. 30.
- Joseph, L. (2007). Reflections on Political Parties and
Political Development, Four Decades Later: *Party Politics*, Vol.13,
No.2.pp143.
- Nwolise, O. (2007). Electoral Violence and Nigeria's 2007
Election: *A Journal of African Election*, Vol.6, No.2.pp. 150-170.
- Odaudu, Daniel (2012). Political Parties and Democratic Sustenance in
Nigeria: *A Journal of Representative Democracy*, Vol.2, pp 1-25.
- Omo, Omoruji (2002). Parties and Politics in Nigeria, Boston:
Advancing Democracy in Africa, No.8.
- Omotala, J. (2006). The Limits of Election Monitoring: The 2003
Nigerian General Elections Representation: *A Journal of
Representative Democracy* 42, No.2.pp.57-67.
- (2009). Garrison, Democracy in Nigeria: The 2007
General Elections and the Prospects of Democratic
Consolidation: *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics* Vol.47,
No.2.pp 195-221.
- (2011). Political Parties and the Quest for Political
Stability in Nigeria: *Taiwan Journal of Democracy*, Vol.6, No.2
pp.125-145.
- Richard, J. (1997). 1990-1997: From Alberture to Closure: *A Journal
Democracy*, No.2 pp.2.

Government publications

Federal Republic of Nigeria, *The 1999 Constitution of The Federal Republic Of Nigeria* .Lagos, Nigeria: Government Printers.

Newspapers and Magazines

Aliu, A. (2011). Edo: Huge cost of Primaries: *The Guardian*, Lagos

Akpan, J. (2011). Political Violence, Death in the Land of promise: *The Guardian*, Lagos, 20th May.

Bello, N. (2011). ACN Petitions Tribunal over Defeat in Ondo Legislative Polls: *The Guardian*, Lagos on 25th August.

Oladoyinbo.Y, Nwaoko. S & Olukoya, O. (2011). Violence Mars Campaigns in Ondo, Ekiti, Ogun as PDP, ACN, LP Supporters Clashes leave 7 dead: *Nigeria Tribune*, Ibadan, 12th March.

Omotayo, A. (2011). Post-election Violence in Nigeria: 121 people has Killed and 15,000 displaced: *The leadership Newspaper*, 20th April.

Sabiu, A. (2011). Presidential Election Fallout: 423 Killed, 4500 Displaced: *Nigerian Tribune*, Ibadan.15th March.

Sobechi, L. (2011). Thugs Targets Local Church: *The Guardian*, Lagos.