

DEMOCRACY AND GOOD GOVERNANCE IN NIGERIA 1999-2015: A REVIEW



By

S. Kamsalem¹, F. S. Liberty¹ and U. Ismail²

¹*Department of Political Science, University of Maiduguri, Maiduguri, Nigeria.*

²*Liberal and Language Studies, Ramat Polytechnic, Maiduguri, Nigeria.*



ABSTRACT

This paper reviews democracy and good governance in Nigeria from 1999 to 2015. Nigeria is the largest African country with numerous populations which ranked as 8th most populated in the world. Since the beginning of democracy in 1999, there has been a steady but intensive effort to converse the trend of political misery and disappointment which previously characterized political life in Nigeria. Long years of political misrule and of course, bad governance exemplified by personalized political regimes and ruthless dictatorship left Nigerians politically demoralized and economically incapacitated with an immersed population ravaged by poverty, illiteracy and disease, armed robbery, religious and sectarian conflicts, tribal and ethnic conflicts among others. Regrettably, Nigeria harbors the highest stock of the continent's poorest people. The debilitating poverty of the people accentuated by the economic crisis seems to have provided a basis and indeed a common platform in the demand for democracy and good governance. This attempt recognized itself in the call for political pluralism and good governance. Good governance could succeed through: effectiveness, equity, accountability, participation, security and rule of law among others. Democratic development, nation building and national development would continue to be mirage in the country if democracy is no link with good governance.

Keywords: *Democracy, Good Governance, Political Elites, Nigeria.*

Introduction

Democratic form of government guarantees basic personal and political rights, fair and free elections and independence of courts of law. Nation states in the modern world are responsible for the delivery of essential goods to their citizens. The purpose, legitimacy and justification of any nation state are to provide essential political goods, such as rule of law, transparency, participation and human rights; sustainable economic opportunities and human development among others. The above essential of democratic rule could only be achieved through good governance (Mo Ibrahim, 2008).

Good governance increases citizens' inspiration on the decisions and actions of regime leaders, reduce the causes and risk of mass dissatisfaction and improves firmness of democratic order.

Since the arrival of democracy on May 29, 1999, Nigerians with excitement and believe that democratic governance could bring about miracle and positive change for better; were jubilating that the problems of insecurity, conflict, violence, socio-economic under-development, political instability, human right abuse and inequality among others in the country as a result of long period of military regimes would be solved, (Jega, 2007). Many others also perceived the return of democracy as the much desired opportunity to correct some of the mistakes of the past, for national development and nation building.

The struggle for democratization and good governance in Nigeria has relevance not only in liberalizing the political arena and achieving civil and political liberties but also in ensuring better living standards and social welfare for Nigerians.

The proponent of state failure, Zartman (1995) conceptualizes state in terms of its capacity to properly perform those basic functions that it claims to qualify as one, when a state can no longer properly perform its basic functions, or claim legitimacy to govern and when it has lost control over its own political and economic spaces it has failed i.e. when the structure, authority (legitimate power), law and political order have fallen apart, Zartman (1995). In recent times, instances of bad governance have been pervasive throughout Nigeria to the extent that the governed have become worried as to the meaning and purpose of governance in general. This paper reviews democracy and good governance in Nigeria from 1999 to 2015

Literature Review

Democracy and Good Governance

Democracy and good governance have become universal phrases used exclusively to label the trends of prevailing political development.

Democracy

The end of the Cold War has privileged liberal democracy globally, as the most credible form of government and basis of governmental legitimacy (Huntington, 1995). Diamond (1999) sees democracy as government in which power and civil duty are expressed by adult citizens directly or through their representatives. Democratic rule depend on the ideologies of majority rule and individual rights. It is accessible, responsive and responsible to the people (Heywood 2010).

Democratic form of government uphold and promote basic human rights such as freedom of speech, religion and equal right and protection under participate fully in the political, economic and cultural life of society. Citizens in a democratic state have not only rights, but also have the responsibility to contribute in the political system that in turn, protects their rights and freedom, (Diamond, 1999).For democratic governance to succeed, citizens must be free to express themselves openly, publicly and repeatedly both in speech and writing (Augie, 2004).

Good Governance

Good governance encompasses all facets of the way a democratic state is governed. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 2007) describes good governance as a participatory, transparent and accountable, effective and efficient, equitable, respect for the rule of law, ensuring political, social and economic priorities based on broad consensus in society. Good governance is about the democratic institutions, system process and leadership behaviour.

Many development intellectuals in Africa have vexed to intricate on the importance of good governance to the development in Africa and Nigeria in particular. However, some see the concept of good governance as mere formula by the West to foster their interest in Africa. Good governance to donor Nations as those countries that practice multi-party system of democracy, economic base on the principle of private ownership and international free and a good

Good governance conveys around democratic stability, reduces high risk of mass dissatisfaction and democratic order. It also encourages fair play,

justice and equity as guiding principle of public action which implies leaders ensuring that their actions are generally guided by popular wishes and aspirations. Moreover, good governance is all about political power of authority with respect. Above all; good governance is about good democratic rule (Ismail, 2014).

Democracy and Good Governance in Nigeria

There are relationships that exist between democracy and good governance. Because, good governance is the distinct most vital element of democratic rule. Good governance is crucial in a democratic society. It has a part of ensuring economic development and sustain democracy. Democracy and good governance involves the opportunity to participate in decision making in the political process (Ake, 1991). Since the end of colonial rule, Africans have suffered constant and serious setbacks in which neither the political institutions that were bequeathed to African nations by their colonial rulers nor the leaders leave to expectations, Ndulu and Achille (1995).

Kofi Annan the former United Nations Secretary-general conceptualized democratic good governance as a mechanism of ensuring respect for human rights and the rule of law, strengthening democracy, promoting transparency and capacity in the management of public resources. However, Anan's analysis is different with democratic rule in Nigeria, this is because, there is no respect for human rights, no free and fair elections at all level, politics is based on ethnicity, religious sentiment, patro-clientalism and prevendalism. Sach (2005) colourfully described the governance of Africa like eighteen century medicines which doctors used stitches to draw blood from patients, often killing them in the process. Meaning Africa remained a sick continent lying hopelessly in the emergency ward and waiting for comprehensive political and economic surgery.

Asch's (2005) analysis on the nature of democratic governance in Africa has under-estimated the level of the sickness of the African states, especially Nigeria. John & Forj (2006) brilliantly captured the historical events which affected the democratic governance of African states.

John & Forji (2006) goes on to posit that:

African continent is ridden with conflict, failed or weak states incapable of providing the needs of the people. At the same time, Africa remains the richest natural resource continent with most its population living under squalor or abject poverty. No other continent has suffered like Africa

However, John and Forji's (2006) argument is not good enough to analyse the political and economic failure of Africa. This is because, African political leadership or democratic regimes have themselves to blame for their inability and incapacity to develop the continent rather than shifting the blame to the colonial masters. Moreover, it is as a result of the attitudes and behaviors of the regime leaders in Africa that the continent has become the land of poverty, conflict, insecurity, under-development and all forms of social problems, (Shehu, 2010).

Africa's return to multi-political pluralism has not earned the acceptance and respect of the citizens as a valid pattern of governance. Governments have ruined the economy and have generated dissension and political instability through mass rigging of elections which brought about violent conflicts that resulted in the destruction of property and above all, insecurity of lives of the citizens. The political sociology of most African States after the 1990s, like in the 1960s has also acquired a mournful guise of respective failure, Davison (1992). It could be right to argue in line with the above assertion that most Nigerians have attributed the economic and political under-development of the country to the regime leaders. It could be argued that since the return of the democratic governance in Nigeria, the citizens are yearning for good democratic governance that can improve their condition of living and welfare, demands for political participation and involvement in the choice of their political leaders and decision making. However, Nigerian is not part of decision making process and their welfare and demands are not in the agenda of the regime leaders.

In the 21st century, Africa's post-colonial states continue to experience diverse forms of political and socio-economic crisis, Abubakar (1998). One of such crises which since 1990s pre-occupied the political agenda of almost all African states was the crisis of democracy and good governance, (Wiseman, 1995).

Taking the above assertion of Abubakar and Wiseman into consideration, it could be argued that majority of informed opinions and scholarly works on the African post-colonial states tend to uniformly emphasize the fact that over five decades of independence did not produce the anticipated socio-economic and political development in the continent. The general euphoria that greeted independence has vanished, because African post colonial states were turned into instruments of violence, repressing and coercion instead of evolving democratic norms, values and culture. African leaders adopted authoritarian and personalized leadership (Tar, 1998).

Tar's description of the personality of the African post-colonial

leadership attitude is the common nature of leadership and democratic governance in Nigeria. This is because; the political leadership or the regime leaders have turned the machinery of government and public resources into their personal belongings, instead of providing the needs and demands of the general public.

However, these institutional reforms have failed to explain their obvious and unavoidable consequences because most African states' economic performance has been equally disappointing. Some African states are indeed poorer today than they were on the eve of the independence; Nigeria is a typical example, Moyo (2011). Moyo goes further to argue that the economies of various African states are now in deep crises as a result of bad democratic regimes. It could be argued that Moyo has brilliantly captured the nature of the political economy of the African states. Tar and Shettima (2010) argued that as African communities continue in their march towards neo-liberal democracy, elite power politics has assumed new macabre heights. The continent's governing class is demonstrating dramatic behaviors in achieving and sustaining power by all means possible. For instance, as a result of bad governance or leadership failure, Nigeria is bedeviled with social problems such as poverty, crime and insecurity among others as a result of bad democratic regimes.

Independence has brought about many changes in Nigeria including sustained efforts to build effective institutions of governance. However, several decades later, Nigeria still struggles to consolidate these institutions of governance as evidenced by the political, economic and social turmoil prevalent in many parts of the country which brought about very low political participation and decision making. It is increasingly understood that success of governance requires cooperation of states and non-state actors. The challenges of governance are the root causes of Nigeria's current political and economic problems. Jonah (2008) asserts that it could be right to argue that Nigeria's democratic governance is a failure. This is because , poor or bad democratic governance in Nigeria has led to a situation where people cannot make the right choices in electing and dismissing their leaders, a situation which makes the leaders unable to decide on the proper development process, mode of survival and the way forward for both present and the future generations, (Jonah, 2008).

Perhaps, in line with the Tar and Shetima's argument, Nigerian political elite and the regime leaders use government power, resources and all available means to stay in power. However, it could be argued that democracy in Nigeria has not provided the people the opportunity to participate in decision making

and the entire governance process. The people are totally excluded in taking decisions in matters that concerns their welfare.

However, in Nigeria, it could be claimed that democratic rule has no relationship with good governance. Because from commencement of the fourth republic, the regime leaders in the country are not dedicated to providing good governance to the general public. Democracy is all about the greatest happiness to the greatest number. But in Nigeria, democracy is for the happiness of the few political elites.

Heywood (2010) argues that good governance is the yardstick for standard democratic rule. The rudiments of good governance such as accountability and transparency, rule of law, political participation, inclusiveness in decision making among others are not captured in the practice of governance in the country.

In Nigeria, the affairs of the people are not managed effectively by the regime leaders and this had led the nation as one of the backward country in the world leading the country to social, political and economic problems as a result of high rate of poverty (Shehu, 2012). Governance in today's Nigeria is such that depicts and gifts a ridicule of the extensively acclaimed symptoms of good governance. In Nigeria, democracy and the official governmental practice have been hijacked by the regime leaders and the political elites and apologist to the extent that citizens experience despair, insecurity, tragic death, illusion, deceits, poverty among others, instead of happiness.

Nigeria political landscape seems lead for tragedy. The political leaderships in the country have stripped naked the values, rules, principles and the entire basics of democratic governance, abandoned the rules, principles and processes and has allowed obsequiousness to hold power.

Tijjani (2007) opines that the bureaucratic and administrative service in Nigeria is politicized by the political regime leaders for their political ambition and corrupt practices. He went further to argue that the appointments, promotions and posting within the Civil Service are used as instruments by the political leadership to influence and control the public servants. Tijjani concludes that in Nigeria, the civil servants are not only politicized but have become active politicians and these have made the dream of good governance by the people of Nigeria seventh heaven. Nigeria have no access to basic services such as potable water, electricity, good sanitation, roads and health care among others. All of this is coupled with high illiteracy rate especially among youths, women and rural dwellers. The lack of access to basic medical care occurs against the backdrop of ravaging diseases. All of these are a result of the absence of good governance and political will from the regime leaders to

cushion the effects of the harsh socio-economic realities experienced by the populace. The state of bad governance and under-development in Nigeria had reinforced by authoritarian nature of the regime leaders, politics of inclusion and exclusion, elitist politics and corruption among others.

under abject poverty and inequality; Because the masses or citizens are supposed to enjoy good life, that is, basic necessities of life such as good health delivery, quality education, portable drinking water, security of lives and property, etc. However, when such basic needs are not met it could result to conflict and social vices. The high rate of crime specifically the insurgency and deadly acts by the terrorist sect of group Jama'atul Ahlil Sunnah Lil Da'awatu Wa Jihad (Boko Haran) is attributed to poverty, frustration and form of marginalization, above all ungovernable space in the State (Shehu, 2010). Shettima (2012) argues that since the return of democratic rule, Nigeria have plagued by bad governance as a result of the attitude of the regime leaders. The humanitarian crisis and the current Boko Haram violent conflict which were brought about by the high level of poverty and income inequality can be attributed to the ungovernable space created by the leadership. In spite of these governance failures in the country, the question of good governance is not in the agenda of the leadership.

Adejumobi (2000) argued that the nature of democracy in Nigeria is one where the political elites dominate both the electoral and political process. Adejumobi's assertion on the hegemonic power domination of the political elites is the true reflection of the nature of democratic rule or the political process in Nigeria. Consequently, representative democracy in Nigeria is replaced by elitist politics.

Shettima (2012) argued that the nature of democratic rule in Nigeria is the political struggle among the political class, politics of rancour and bitterness, ethnic based politics and intimidation of opposition groups, the use of state apparatus to undermine others are the major sources of challenges to democracy. The above analysis of Shettima on the Nigeria democratic rule is the true picture of political and democratic governance in Nigeria. Because the political elites or the regime leaders in the Nigerian fourth republic use every government apparatus or power to win election and capture state power. Perhaps one of the major issues confronting the present democratic rule in Nigeria is how to promote the substance and content of democracy and not its infrastructure or form. As Ihonvbere (1998) once noted that the strategy of African's experience of the third waves of democratization lies in the fact of its non-transition to the ideal tenets of democratic norms and values.

The most desired democratic rule or experiment in Nigeria is how to

put in place a democratic regime that is profoundly transformative in the sense of changing the perception of the regime leaders about power, changing their character and attitudes towards the disposition of political power to democratic values and norms, how to be accountable, responsive and responsible to the electorates.

Bello (2012) analyse the multiplicity of factors hindering the democratic rule in Nigeria, bad governance, human rights abuse, unjust and inequitable distribution of national resources including political post, poverty, unemployment, hunger, starvation and political dominations are the common features of democratic rule in Nigeria.

Diamond (1992) argued that democracy as a political practice has institutional, procedural and behavioural dimensions involved in a complex network of institutional mechanisms that includes the executive, legislative and judicial arm. The procedural dimension involves adherence to rules, procedures and norms of democratic practice, rule of law, due process, electoral regularities and constitutionalism among others. The behavioural dimension is the attitudinal disposition supportive of democracy. However, in Nigeria, the above political practice is missing. The country's zero-sum of power politics and the electoral democracy in Nigeria appear to have huge implications for the sustenance and consolidation of democratic governance (Tar, 2007).

It could be argued that Tar's above analysis on the problems of the Nigerian democracy has affected governance at the national or federal level. Osewa (2015) observed that Nigerian democratic rule and nation building is characterized by corruption, militancy, vote rigging, thugs, religious and ethnic clashes, unemployment, poverty and income inequality, crime and insecurity among others.

The dilemma of Nigeria's democracy is compounded and seemed to be even greater since 1999. Onyinyechi and Ayuba (2011) argued that democracy and electoral activities in Nigeria have assumed a crisis level. This is because almost every attempt to conduct a free and fair election in Nigeria to ensure transition from one leadership to another has often ended up with serious political violence and conflict. Because every democratic regime is compounding the problems of governance in the country than to pull the nation and the entire people out of their predicament.

Bamisoye and Awefeso (2011) analysed Nigerian democracy as the type where the attitudes and behaviour of the political class and the regime leaders have negatively affected the democratic governance. In line with Bamisoye and Awefeso's analysis in Nigeria, the political elites more often

deviate from the constitution and the electoral rules to fulfill their personal ambition. In Nigeria, political analyst, commentators and observers attributed the political and economic problems of the country to the political elites particularly the regime leaders.

Thomson (2004) posit on the nature of the democratic rule in Nigeria as the type where the political and electoral process and the voters are influenced by the political elites and the regime leaders. Moreover, another common feature of democratic rule in Nigeria and which is more disturbing is lack of regime-change (incumbency continuum); a sustained tradition of political change regime continuity. The incumbency factor has affected the democratic governance in Nigeria where almost all political leaders in the country irrespective of the political status, do not want to lose election and can use all available means to stay in power.

Nigerians ought to ask themselves about what went wrong with their political freedom and autonomy. This situation has generated a question as to whether the Nigerian state had a clear sense of strategic purpose of development through democratic governance. One would also rightly ask whether there was a strong commitment with strategic intervention intended to raise the hope of the people generated by the achievement of political independence. Put another way, did Nigerian state develop a vision for democracy and good governance for improving the wellbeing of the citizens of the country?

In other words, many people have doubted even the democratic governance as the best form of government as is claimed. This is because since 1999, democratic governance in Nigeria has not yielded positive impact on the needs of Nigerians. Nigerian democracy is characterized by post-election violence, lack of independent electoral body to conduct free and fair elections, poverty and income inequality, gender inequality, abuse of rights of women, children and vulnerable group, corruption and absence of separation of power among others. And all these have exacerbated towards the feudalization of state power, a trend that has widened the differences which produced tension in inter-relations and successfully visited organized anarchy on the political system as a whole, Abubakar (1998). It can be argued that, it is as a result of the above assertion that Nigeria's democratic rule is far away from the expectations of the citizens and is yet to achieve democratic values and good governance.

Similarly, Tar (2010) argues that Nigeria as a country has faced intermittent political turmoil and economic crisis since gaining independence in 1960. Political life has been scared by conflict perpetrated along ethnic, religious and geopolitical lines and misrule or bad governance undermined the

authority and legitimacy of the state. This is because, the authority and the legitimacy of the state is questionable and undermined as “result of the bad democratic governance in the state.

Tar (2010) went on deeply to analyse the democratic rule in Nigeria posit that:

Nigeria, despite its wealth remains highly under-developed and its citizens live in abject poverty, Poor governance has severally limited infrastructural development and the provision of school services, hindering economic growth and leaving much of the country marred in ethnic, tribal, religious, regional or geographical, sectarian conflict and poverty. The government's human record has been poor, (Tar, 2010).

Elections held in the decades after the transition were flawed by Nigerians and the international community with each poll progressively worse than the previous ones according to Domestic and International Observers, Tar (2010). Nigeria's political elite both civilian and military have failed the country. Politics is based upon patrimonial inclinations where access to political office normally translates into corrupt access to the nation's wealth. Elections are routinely and blatantly rigged, (Burnell, 2001).

Moreover, Tar (2010) on Nigeria's democracy and power structure argues that in Nigeria, access to state resources and power has been a subject of fierce contestation between different factions of the ruling class and components of the federation. Given the contentious nature of Nigeria's federalism, democracy and nation-building have proved elusive in the aftermaths of independence. The Nigerian ruling class failed to deliver a functioning and viable democracy resulting in military intervention in the nation's affairs.

Shehu (2010) argued that the fundamental problem and troubles of Nigeria is simply and squarely a failure of leadership. The Nigerian problem is the unwillingness or inability of the regime leaders to rise to their responsibility. Perhaps, in line with the above argument, every Nigerian or non-Nigeria has realized that in spite of the natural endowment in the country, Nigeria is taking three steps backward and one step forward because of bad governance or leadership.

Tar (2010) on the nature of the democratic governance in Nigeria brilliantly posits that:

Nigeria's zero-sum nature of power, politics and electoral democracy appear to have huge implication to the substance of liberal democracy and good governance. The key

questions are if democracy is all about participation, rule of law and legitimate negotiation for power, how could it work in a country where elite have appropriated ethnicity, wealth and religion, regionalism to outwit one another and remain in power? How could democracy thrive in a state where stakeholders hold on to the state's power while official corruption and abuse of state resources are elevated to mere state polity? How could democracy thrive in a system where elections are abused through commercialization of votes, ballot box stuffing, buying of the election officials and manipulation of election result, (Tar, 2010).

Taking the above assertion of Tar, it could be rightly argued that the Nigerian political elite often use wealth, religion and ethnicity as instruments or machinery of winning elections and excludes the electorates in the governance of their own state and community until another election. Moreover, Shehu (2010)) similarly analysed that bribery, use of thugs and weapons continue to be part of the political development in Nigeria and the country's electoral politics since 1999. Elements of money politics, use of thugs and dangerous weapons were effectively used by the political class to alienate the electorates and have a firm grip on the machinery of government. The trends helped to sustain the phenomenon of 'godfathers' which assumed a portent force in Nigeria. The Nigerian electoral system which thrived on patronage made the illegal use of money and weapons the surest option available to the political elite, Shehu (2010).

The above analysis on the nature of democratic rule and electoral process is the order of the day in the Nigerian political system. In Nigeria, almost every politician or candidate has recruited thugs to win election at all costs and had given them protection, above all to intimidate oppositions. Moreover, it could be argued that as a result of the failure of leadership or state failure in Nigeria, the coercive power and sovereignty of the state is in question, because every Nigerian felt that there is no government and governance in the lives of the citizens. This is because, the security and basic needs of the people are not provided by the so-called government. The former President of South Africa, Mbeki as cited in Armouko (2003) argued that in Nigeria, the patterns of exclusive politics, political centralization and alienation and the authorization forms of governance are so evident and these constitute the root of internal conflicts and the state of underdevelopment.

Nigerian governments to Ake (1996) have failed to provide services to public but only to private interest and dominant factions of the elites. The

Nigerian democratic leaders give precedence to political domination over social transformation and thus to be in conflict with the majority of their population. It is as a result of the political domination argued by Ake, that the Nigerian populace are always in socio-economic and political crisis with their leadership.

Utomi cited by Augie (2004) on the nature of democratic governance in Nigeria argued that it is clear that Nigeria has a crisis of democratic rule because it can be seen clearly that the social services and basic needs of the citizens are in short supply. As a result of these, the gains of democratic governance continue to elude Nigeria. Conflict and ethnic wars, post-election violence, religious, tribal and sectarian conflict, poverty etc are the constant companions of citizens in Nigeria. Taking Utomi's assertion into consideration, it could be argued that in Nigeria, majority of the people are living below poverty line, income inequality, insecurity of lives and property are constant companions of the people in the country.

Conclusion

Nigerians thought that the return to democratic rule in 1999 would have changed their lives for the better and pave way for a prosperous future. Because democratic governance have the capacity to provide good governance. However, the paper concludes that democratic regimes in Nigeria since 1999 have not met the expectations of the electorates through the practice of democratic governance.

The reviews recognized that democratic contents, quantity, values, and norms which are pre-condition of good governance are missing in the practice of democratic governance in Nigeria.

The paper finally revealed that unless good governance and genuine democracy are institutionalized that would provide Nigerians with hopes and emancipate them from the shackles of insecurity, crime, unemployment, hunger, human rights abuses etc the future will turn out to be bleak, as the regimes leaders continue to deviate from the norms and culture of the global practice of liberal democracy. Moreover, for good governance to be achieved in Nigeria, Nigerians must show their discontentment and must hold the regime leaders responsible for the actions and inactions. And above all, Nigerians should have an influence on the actions and decisions of the regime leaders, hence good governance will be achieved.

REFERENCES

- Abubakar, D. (1998). Civil Society and Democratic Governance. Being a paper presented at *Workshop on Welfare Association's Building Block for Democracy organized by African Centre for Democratic Governance (AFRIGOV)*, Jos, 9th – 11th June, 1997
- Ake, C. (1996). *Democratization of Disempowerment in Africa*. The Booking Institution, Washington D.C. U.S.A
- Augie, A. (2004). Human Rights and good Governance in Africa. A critical Nexus expanding Human Heights. Presented at the *Fourth African Development Forum (ADF-IV)* Addis-Ababa, Ethiopia
- Bamisoye, A.O. and Awefeso, O. (2011). *Democracy and Democratic Practice in Nigeria: Issues, Challenges, and Prospects*, Lagos Mac Grace Publishers.
- Bello, A.A. (2012). Democracy and Good Governance in the Nigerian Fourth Republic “Missing Link” M.Sc. Thesis, University of Maiduguri (Unpublished).
- Burnell, P., Vicky, R., and Rise, R. (2011). *Politics in the Developing World*, 3rd Edition, Oxford University Press
- Davison, B. (1992). *The Blackman's Burden – Africa a Course of the Nation state*. London: James Carry.
- Diamond, L. (2004). “Democracy, Development and Good Governance: The Inseparable Links. Being the Text of Lecture presented at the *Annual Democracy and Governance Lecture at the Centre for Democratic Development*, Ghana.
- Diamond, L. (1997). *Consolidating the Third Name of Democracies*. Baltimore N.D. John Hopkins University Press
- Diamond, L. (1992). “*Economic development and democracy reconsidered*” In: *Re-examining democracy*, Essay in honour of Seymour Martin Lipset, Larry Diamond and Gary Marks, Newbury Park, C.A. Sage.
- Heywood, A. (2011). *Global Politics*. Palgrave, 1st Edition: Macmillan., U.K.
- Huntington, S.P. (1995). “Armed forces and democracy”. *Journal of Democracy*,6:3.
- Ihonvbere, J.O. (1994). The Irrelevant State, Ethnicity and the Quest for Nationhood in Africa” *Ethnic and Racial Studies*,17(1):42-60.
- Ismail, U. (2002). The Success and the Limitations of Abubakar Abdulsalami: Transition to Civil rule (Unpublished).
- Jega, A.M. (2007). *Democracy Good Governance and Development in Nigeria*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.

- John, W. and Furji, F. (2006). Political Governance and Conflict Management: Why the Development Politics and the Poor need a Strong Structure? Yaounde *Centre for Action Oriented Research on African Development* (ARAD) Assessed on 9th January, 2011.
- Jonah, J. (2008). The Governance Challenges in Africa. A paper presented at United Nations Conference, 22nd September, Washington DC (Unpublished).
- MO, I. (2007). African Governance Report: accessed on 05/08/2015.
- Moyo, D. (2010). “Dead Aid”. *Why Aid is not working and How there is another way for Africa*. England: Penguin Group.
- Ndulu, B. and Achille, N. (1995). Towards Defining a New Vision of Africa for the 21st Century: Global Coalition for Africa in Washington DC (Unpublished)
- Onyinyechi, C. and Ayuba, H. (2011). Democracy and Political Governance in Nigeria. *International Journal of Administration and Development Studies*, 2:2.
- Osewa, O. (2015). An Assessment of Goodluck Jonathan Administration. Accessed on 4th April, 2016.
- Shehu, K. (2010). Democracy and Political Governance in Africa. 2003-2008. M.Sc. Dissertation, University of Jos (Unpublished).
- Shehu, K. (2012). Borno: A Raped, ravaged State. *Journal of Art and Social Sciences*, 1(3):3-9.
- Shehu, K. (2010). African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM). Democracy and Political Governance in Africa. (2003-2008). M.Sc. Thesis. University of Jos (Unpublished).
- Shettima, A.G. (2012). The Missing Link in Borno's Political Leadership. *Liwuram Journal of the Humanities*, 2:10.
- Tar, A.U. (2010). Nigeria: Contested Elections and an unstable democracy. *Review of African Political Economy Journal* 540-548.
- Tar, U.A. (2007). Nigeria: Contested elections and Unstable Democracy: *Review of African Political Economy Journal*. Muhan G. Alfred, B. and Williams, S.Z. (Eds.) ROAPE No.113.
- Tar, U.A. (2008). Rentier Policies, Extractive Economics and conflict in the Global south: *Emerging Ramifications and theoretical exploration*. K.C. Omeje (ed.) Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Tar, U.A. and Shettima, A. G. (2010). Hegemony and Subordination: Governing Class, Power Politics and Contested Electoral Democracy in Nigeria. *Information Society and Justice*, 3(2):135-149
- Tar, A.U. (2012). The Challenges of Democratization in Africa and Middle

East. *Information, Society and Justice*, Vol. 3, No.1, July, 2012. Pp. 81-94. ISSN 1756-1078

Thomson, A (2004). *An Introduction to African Politics* 2nd edition, London: Routledge

Tijjani, K. (2007). *Crashing The circle: another view of the Just Concluded Local Government Elections in Borno State* (Unpublished).

UNDP (2007). *Sustainable Human Development*. UNDP Policy Paper

Wiseman, J. (1995). *Introduction: The Movement Towards Democracy: Global, Continental and State Perspectives*. In: Wiseman, J. (Ed) *Democracy and Political Change in Sub-Sahara Africa*. London. Rutledge.

Zartman, I.W. (1995), *Cowardly Lions: Missed Opportunities for Preventing Deadly Conflict and State Collapsed*. Lynne Reinner, London.