
THE NIGERIAN PRACTICE OF DEMOCRACY 2011-2015 (A CASE STUDY OF WARRI SOUTH LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF DELTA STATE)

KENNETH EDEINMENE

Department of Political Science and Sociology,
College of Social and Management Sciences,
Western Delta University Oghara, Delta State,
Nigeria

Abstract: *This study is an empirical examination of democracy in Nigeria. Warri South Local Government Area, Delta State from (2011-2015). The purpose of the research work is to evaluate the effect of anti-democratic elements on democracy sustenance, to compare the level of democratic experiment in Warri South local government in Delta State of Nigeria and to examine the effect of electoral violence on Nigeria democracy. One hundred and twenty copies (120) of questionnaire were administered. Simple percentage -was used to test to analyze the responses formulated for the study. The findings among others was that there is level of democratic experience in Warri- South local government in Delta State of Nigeria, democracy is fundamentally about the social political rights of citizens. It was hereby recommended that For the Nigerian democracy and the process of democratic experiment to survive in this current democratic era, it must ensure equitable distribution of resources to the various class and ethnic groups in Nigeria, and also ensure democratic virtues and hallmarks which include freedom and equality, the rule of law, constitutionalism and separation of powers.*

INTRODUCTION

It is unarguably that democracy is the best form of government for any nation. Democracy is not a potted plant which can be transported into any soil and without work or effort. As aptly summed up by Larry Diamond (2012); it is one thing to get democracy. It is another thing to sustain it, to consolidate it, to breathe real life and meaning into it, to make it endure. In the ancient time, democracy was practiced in its direct form in Athens one of the Greek City-States. According to Simyu (2014), democracy consisted not only rule according to the wishes of the majority of the people, but actual participation of the people themselves. All free adult males were allowed to participate directly in the decision-making process of the entire government.

Democracy in modern times, according to 16th American President, Abraham Lincoln (1861-65), is the government of people, by the people and for the people. Raphael, 2008 define democracy as system of rule in which the entire people or citizenry are assumed to have the right and opportunity to participate, either directly or indirectly, in governance through representative elected by them and these elected representative are in turn, accountable to the electorate. Akpakpan and Umoh (2011) describe democracy as a political system with a high

level of civil and political liberty.

It is system which gives room for competition among political parties and association for power. Democracy allows for mass participation by adult in the selection of leaders and representatives by means of fair and free electoral process. Democracy according to Carl Cohen (2006:7) is that system of community government in which by and large the members of the community participate or may participate directly in the making of decision which affects them all. This definition emphasizes the notion of equality and direct participation. In this direction Philips Shively (2012:322) defines democracy as a state in which all fully qualified citizen vote at regular intervals to choose, among alternative candidate, the people who will be in charge of setting state's policies. John Locke, the progenitor of modern and liberal democracy defines it as a rule by the majority. A government arising from the majority of men uniting into whole power of the community and employing all power in making law by officer of their own appointing (second Treatise, ChXii32)

From Marxist point of view, as represented in the work of Marx and Engels. The communist manifesto, democracy corrects "the dictatorship of the common people, the plebeians. It was very much a class affair; it meant the sway of the lowest and largest class. That is why it was feared, rejected and modified by men of the age of enlightenment spearheaded by the British who valued their property more than the issue of political sentiments.

Democracy is considered superior to all other systems of government because it guarantees and protects the right and interest of all individual and groups, it ensures majority rule and grants the minority the right of dissent. There are three element that make democracy acceptable and attractive and these are participation, representative and accountability, whether it is direct or indirect rule through representatives, democracy has attracted a lot of people and is widely desired and accepted as the closest approximation to the good society in operation and the best form of government, the world over, from European to America, Africa to Asia, Latin America to Russia. In Nigeria, poverty has been deep rooted and makes people loose confident in the government policies ineffective, weaken the basis for it growth and maturity. It renders citizen fragile and vulnerable to external influence which may be the way of inducement to subvert the government. Poverty is capable of breeding disillusionment with respect to what societal objectives are and the responsibilities of the citizen forward the attainment of such objectives. In the face of disillusionment and ignorance democratic experimentation are bound to collapse due to lack of mass participation in government and breakdown of essential principles of democracy.

In this work, attention will first of focused on those element that hindered the sustainability of democracy in the society with particular reference to Warri South Local Government in Delta State. It will also follow by a critical analysis and examination of this element on democratic sustenance in the society and it possible solution.

Nigeria, the most populous black nation on earth with a population of about 140 million people and over 350 distinct language groups, successfully transmitted to democratic governance on May 29, 1999 after so many years of military rule.

The first understandable issue about democracy in Nigeria is that as long as elections are being conducted and ostensible winners and losers are emerging, particularly at die Presidential level, and power is being handed over from one regime to another, then democracy is on course.

Under Nigeria's military regimes, such luxuries were not contemplated. In fact, in military regimes, they simply take over. They detest handover. To hand over therefore, is highly democratic. Thus, to understand democracy in Nigeria, it is not the credibility of the electoral process that is germane, we look at where we are coming from and agree that to have handed over as and when due, are profoundly democratic feats. Hence, defining democracy may ordinarily be a difficult endeavour in other environments. In the Nigerian system however, all the debates about the meaning of democracy have become unnecessary. Democracy is understandably practiced as government of my people, by our people and against their people.

The central element of the democratic process is exclusion. Its most portent manifestation is the solemn exercise of handing over. What has become the most notable dividend of democracy therefore is the cycle of elections in which the citizens are highly privileged to be participants.

Hence in the Nigerian orthodoxy, democracy is monumentally translatable to electoral democracy.

According to Kukah (2012) evidence suggests that countries in transition remain quite prone to backsliding and failure. He contends that this is why it must not be taken for granted in Nigeria that democracy is secure (Kukah, 2012). In any case, it is immediately obvious that Kukah, who is actually the Bishop of the Catholic Diocese of Sokoto in Nigeria, belongs to that class of Nigerians who think that they must express opinion on every subject matter, including democracy. As further evidence of the distractions that Kukah and his school of thought cause for democracy in Nigeria, he claims:

We may pride ourselves with having survived four back-to-back elections and create the illusion that our democracy has been strengthened. This is misleading because first, the elections are still massively fraudulent and our level of success is not measured by international best practices as such. Secondly, with very little evidence of changes in the lives of our people, our democracy remains risky, volatile and vulnerable to internal and external shocks

The challenges that commentators of Kuka's hue usually confront is that they have been exposed to too many research materials on issues that ordinarily are outside their primary calling. They are not actually scholars. They are also not politicians. To understand democracy in Nigeria, their viewpoints must be disregarded. In any case, the general objective of this study is to attempt to further understand democracy in Nigeria. The specific objectives are to: (i) identify the major tendencies of electoral democracy in Nigeria and (ii) demonstrate that truly democracy is on course in the Nigerian State. The methodology of the study is the critical mode of research. The theoretical framework is the elite theoretical framework. Furthermore, electoral democracy in this study stands for a process of equal opportunities for citizens to choose their leaders and when the need arises, to replace the leaders by free and fair election. Against this backdrop, we proceed to consider the understandable tendencies of Nigeria's electoral democracy.

Democracy is a global maiden which every nation woos. The democratic craze is sweeping across the whole world, from the nation states in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to Africa and Asia. It shows that democracy has gathered momentum across the globe as a result of its immense advantages and by implication because of the negative consequences of bad governance (Bello-Imam 2004:1). Consequently, democratic movement all over the world is among other things, an insistence on expression of the will of the people.

Nigeria, the most populous country in Africa has no choice than to align itself with the rest of the world on the democratic crave. However, Nigeria has not been so lucky to be democratized. It has had long tortured history of dancing around democracy but has never gotten it right. This is largely due to some challenges amongst which are lack of large scale free, fair and credible election; lack of freedom of speech and publication; refusal to accept defeat in elections by political gladiators; corruption and attitude of political office holders to corner the wealth of the nation; inobservance of rule of law; and long military rule (Adekola, 2010: 1). The relatively free, fair, and credible elections in Nigeria in April 2011 show that light is beginning to show at the end of the tunnel. The democratic events in Zimbabwe, Kenya, Democratic Republic of Congo, and Nigeria under President Ibrahim Badamosi Babangida and Late General Sanni Abacha among many others show that the democratic struggles and democratization in Africa have been informed by different and sometimes conflicting objectives and strategies between the elites and the masses. (Okoro, 2007). Contrary to popular participation, democracy in the African context means the ability of few people to effectively take control of the powers and authorities of governance with or without the choice of those they represent. In order for democracy to be meaningful it must be characterized or underlined by the principles of openness, representation, accountability, transparency and the defense, protection and preservation of individual and group rights (Vanhanem 2014). African people through democratic struggles and decades of sacrifices have rejected authoritarianism. To that extent, democracy is viewed as the only framework through which development can be facilitated in Africa. Ironically, Ojo (2005) observed that, the democracy in the African context serves the interest of only the ruling class.

In the last half a century, many countries have transited to democracy. More than half of the world's populations now live in a democracy of some sort, although only some 13 per cent of that population resides in full democracies (EIU, 2010). Democracy in Nigeria has three unique features which include: insulation of economic matters from popular participation, manipulation and monopolization of democratic process including the use of violence and electoral fraud to secure legitimacy and peripheral participation of citizens. Surface-level participation does not have far-reaching influence on the outcome of policy choices.

According to Oke (2010) democracy involves the opportunity to participate in decision making in the political process. It repudiates arbitrariness and authoritarianism. Democracy and Nigeria are like Siamese twins; though conjoined, they are uncomfortable and under intense pressure that could result in all forms of hurt, even death. Although, democracy may not be strange to an overwhelming percentage of Nigerians; what may be strange to them is the brand of democracy that invests, first and foremost, in human and material resources for the purposes of political stability, economic viability, scientific advancement, technological breakthrough, educational development and life-enhancing social services. Given the general optimism that Nigeria was going to be the bastion of democracy in Africa following her independence from Britain in 1960, one should normally expect that by now democracy should be deeply rooted and institutionalised in the country. Ironically and unfortunately, Nigeria, as far as the practice and delivery of dividends of liberal democracy is concerned, is yet a cripple that can barely stand let alone walk or run.

History Of Warri South

Warri South is a Local Government Area of Delta State, Nigeria. Its headquarters are in

the city of Warri. Warri, the headquarters of Warri South LGA, is an important sea port in the country and the commercial nerve centre of the state. The area is predominantly riverine with large expanses of mangrove forests and has a land area of approximately 1,520 square kilometres. The LGA consists of several communities namely, Ode-Itsekiri, Agbassa, Orugbo, Ogunu, Obodo, Igbudu, Omadino, Edjeba, Ijala, Ekurede, Ugbori, Okere, Ikpisan, Ifie-Kporo, Ubeji, Ajamimogha and Alders Town. It harbors many industrial establishments including all the major oil companies operating in Nigeria and is also home to three different ethnic groups namely Ijaws, Urhobos and Itsekiris. (<http://www.deltastate.com.ng/Local-Government/warri-south-local-government.htm>) It has an area of 633 km² and a population of 303,417 at the 2006 census. The postal code of the area is 332.

Statement Of The Problems

For democracy to be sustained in Nigeria there is a need to encourage a strong civil societies, mass media and freedom from ignorance and want, right of choice, respect for rule of law, periodic and orderly succession through secret ballot and high level of political participation and political education by political parties.

Since the inception of democracy in Nigeria, there have been a concerted effort by different administration and others non-governmental organization to achieve the aims of democracy but such effort kept meeting some hindrances, and these problems include, lack of mass participation in electoral process, lack of internal democracy among different political parties, economic inequality, pre and post-election violent, politics of ethnicity and tribalism (sectional politics), selling of votes by the electorate, electoral corruption in the part of election officials, politics of God fatherism, lack of political education in the part of political parties and civil societies, bias report by the press and so on, all these elements are anti-democratic in nature and constitutes electoral corruption and their end-product is poverty which is a threat to democracy sustainability.

Research Question

1. What is the effect of anti-democratic elements on democracy sustenance?
2. What is the level of democratic experiment in Warri South Local Government in Delta State, Nigeria?
3. What is the effect of electoral violence on Nigeria democracy?
4. What is the nature and character of electoral violence in Nigeria?

Objective Of The Study

Based on the above research questions or problems, the following are the objective of the study:

1. To evaluate the effect of anti-democratic elements on democracy sustenance
2. To compare the level of democratic experiment in Warri south local government in Delta State of Nigeria.
3. To examine the effect of electoral violence on Nigeria democracy.
4. To ascertain the nature and character of electoral violence in Nigeria

Research Hypothesis

Ho: Anti-democratic elements have no effects on democracy sustenance in Nigeria.

Ha: Anti-democratic elements have effects on democracy sustenance in Nigeria.

Ho: There is no level of democratic experience in Warri south local government in Delta State of Nigeria.

Ha: There is level of democratic experience in Warri south local government in Delta State of Nigeria.

Ho: Electoral violence has no effects on Nigeria democracy.

Ha: Electoral violence has effects on Nigeria democracy.

Ho: There is no nature and character of electoral violence in Nigeria.

Ha: There is nature and character of electoral violence in Nigeria.

Significant Of The Study

In view of accepting democracy as the best form of government for any Nation, this work is significant in a number of ways. The work will help broaden the theoretical and practical understanding of democracy sustainability. That democracy has attracted a lot of people and is widely desired and accepted as the closest approximation to the good society in operation and best form of government, the world over.

The work will modify old ideas and contribute new ideas as well as fill the Lacuna in the stock of existing knowledge.

This work will also avail the public (readers) the opportunity to be acquainted with those conditions necessary and essential element that help democracy to be sustained in our society. The work will be a reference document in future.

Scope Of The Study

The major focus of this study is to evaluate the negative effect of antidemocratic elements on democratic sustenance, examine the economic and political ideology of our leaders, find out institution necessary to sustain democracy and also suggest possible solution for democracy to be sustained in our society.

Attention will be given to the level of democratic experiment in delta as compare to other state in Nigeria.

Definition Of Terms

Democracy: is a system of government in which citizen participate massively in their own government.

Sustenance: the act of providing a means of subsistence

Society: is a formal association of people with similar interest.

Poverty: is a situation whereby incomes and consumption are low.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Framework

Focus of the Review

It is generally believed among scholars that democratic ideas and practice originated from Greece. This is often supported by the fact that the concept "democracy" derives its name from two Greek words "Demos" meaning people and Kratia, meaning rule or power, which translates to "the rule of (by) the people". In the Greek polls (city-state), everybody or citizen

was a zoon politikon, a socio-political animal. Private and public life were not distinct. Consequently, government was a direct rule by the people in direct democracy. Government was guided by the constitution, the politeia, which according to Aristotle "is an instrument for the arrangement of power in the state, especially the supreme power which makes the government". In the Greek society, democracy was a good government because the body of the people possessed the supreme power and liberty and all were free to rule and to be ruled in turn. In this democracy, there was generally affection for human race, love for one's Country and the preference of the Country's interest or the interest of all to one's self interest. In short civic obedience, patriotism and Altruism were all present in the Greek democracy.

The absence of the polis, the city state, contributed greatly to the development of modern democracy. Now the city is bigger than the Greek State. Consequently, the idea of democracy is grossly disfigured. Democracy in modern time can be referred to as what the 16th American President; Abraham Lincoln (1861-65) thought it to be "the government of the people, by the people and for the people. Raphael, (2008). In this sense, democracy refers to a system of rule in which the entire people or citizenry are assumed to have the right and opportunity to participate either directly or indirectly in governance through representatives elected by the them these elected representative are in turn accountable to the peoples It thus appears that the modern conception of democracy is synonymous with majority. The popular conception of modern democratic practice is not without its problem since majority does not imply absolute totality of the entire citizenry. Hence, in every majority there must be a majority, a situation which has made some scholars to describe majority rules as the tyranny of the majority or the oppression of minorities. In order to avoid the "persecution, scholar, mostly these liberal tradition have throughout ages been pre-occupied with how to make democratic governments more responsible and accountable to the people, the majority-minority democracy notwithstanding. To this end several measures, among which are: provision and guarantee of fundamental liberties and human rights division of powers among branches and levels of government, constitutionalism toward ensuring this goal. Democracy is a political ideology and by ideology according to French Philosopher, Antoine Desult de Tracy (2015) refers to ideology as a Science of ideas aimed at classifying and improving the public mind about socio-economic and political life. Christenson (2013), defined ideology as a belief system that explains and justifies a preferred and offers strategy/processes, institutional arrangement. The social democratic ideology is a set of ideas produced by philosophers like John Locke, Montesquieu, J.S mill and others. Marxist-Ideology is set of ideas produced by Karl Maxx that Ideology is the ideas of the ruling class use to rationalize and justify the capitalist system and its privileged position it. The only different between the two is that ideas are simplified in form so as to arouse to the emotions of the masses about their socio-economic and political problems. Political ideology aims at changing the existing political and social order. Social democracy, also called welfare capitalist free-enterprise economy which has been considerably to incorporate egalitarian principles such as equality of opportunity, social security and mass political participation, (Alapiki 2010: 222). There are some basic elements in social democracy and one of these elements is the principle of parliamentary democracy. Social democrats believe that it is more prudent to gain power through democratic means and then their subject the existing capitalist system to progressive reforms, rather than to disrupt the element is the principle of free enterprise which encourages private initiative and achievement. However, the state is

expected to lay down the basic parameters within the economy is allowed to operate. Examples are maintaining of law and order, health services, social security, employment. Welfare capitalism promotes the principle of equality of opportunity. Social democrats are moderately committed to equalitarian principle because they are useful not progressively-taxation and duties are introduced to level out steep discrepancies in income and wealth. In social democracy, the means of production remains in private hands but the state has to guard against undue concentration of economic power. The state may take over them industries to promote the economy and provide essential infrastructure services like industries to promote the services like energy, transport, and communication services.

The foregoing has shown how welfare capitalism has sought to combine the positive features of both classical capitalism and socialism. The emergence of monopolies constitutes a threat of free concentration in market economics. The concentration of capital in multinational firm means that they can evade guidelines or restrictions imposed by national government. In these circumstances, economic discipline is hard to enforce and thereby causing poverty in the society. Social democracies have not been able to come to terms with disruptive effect of technological innovation. On a national scale it may be able to re-channel redundant labour into sector, not yield affected by automation and capitalization. Hence, producer in developing country like Nigeria are thrown out of the market through greater competitiveness of industrial products from the west. In other word unemployment has come to stay. Democratic socialism according to Alapiki (2010, 222) is a Marxist state controlled economy, which has been modified considerably towards entrepreneurial initiative and free market. The essential feature of democratic socialist system is emergence of one-party states. However, the ideal is participatory democracy, which means that those who are affected by public decision should be part of decision-making process, at some point at least. Evidently, there is less repression and more freedom of expression, initiative and movement. Another principle of democratic socialism is that of worker self-management. This principle implies that by participatory democracy, it says that the employee of an enterprise have to do the actual running of firms and enterprises in the economy. There is also the principle of state ownership. The socialist as of the view that capital is an asset and could be owned by the state. Finally, socialist distribution is a cardinal principle of democratic socialism. Firms have to make profit from this certain deduction are made for national interest and the welfare of the community in which the firm operates.

Origin of democracy

The term has old Greek roots. It means a rule of the people. Democracy term was first mentioned about 2500 years ago in Greece cities. Back then, it was the opposite to aristocracy form of government. The modern type of democracy developed in the 19th and 20th centuries. Being a democratic country is the latest trend ever since the 1970s. A lot of nations share the values carried by the term and Nigeria is not an exception. The nation celebrates May 29th as the official public holiday - Democracy Day. Still, the democratic start point really began in 1960. It was on the 1st of October when Nigeria publicly announced its independence from Great Britain. There was a long history of different government forms in Nigeria ever since 1960. Let us mention all the main stages and dates in the development of our country.

Democracy is actually derived from the Greek language and means as much as power to

the people. Democracy is actually a political government form where either people govern themselves in a structure of direct democracy, or there are elected representatives of the people who form the government in a representative democracy. Just like many other political ideas, democracy looks very good on paper.

The original idea was that all people should be equal, at least equally judged by the law, and that all people should have the same chance of becoming an elected official. Unfortunately whoever invented democracy did not calculate how capitalism can bend the idea into the democracy monster we are dealing with today. Since that democracy is the best government form the mankind currently has, it seems that at least for a while the humanity will be sticking with it, albeit the form of democracy deployed may vary significantly, depending on the surroundings and the capability of the population to bend to the amendments applied.

The idea that every single person should be treated equally before the law is a very noble one. There should be no racial profiling, no money making some citizen more equal than the others, or money purchasing the best legal advice there is, whereby people without money play Russian roulette with legal aid lawyers. It would be really nice if political connections and nepotism would not count and all people have the same chance to be judged fairly.

In a democracy all citizens have equal right to the power

With all due respect, Ralph Nader and Al Gore would very probably disagree, just to name a few, but nobody said that United States of America is a perfect democracy. In theory, any and all citizen can become candidates for any elective office function. The previously mentioned financial bending rule applies here most significantly and the more equal citizen can enjoy the oval office, while the less equal citizen can enjoy the guided tour.

Already Aristotle defined democracy as freedom, where rule by the many should allow the citizen to live as they please. While there should be some sort of government ruling over citizen and some sort of constitution defining the liberties, the freedom should be the paramount goal of a peaceful togetherness. While this wonderful theory has nothing to do with the harsh reality; a true democracy would employ citizens' preferences into a binding law. Since that people are individuals and opinions are abundant, furthermore tastes are as variable as the color patterns or the stars in the sky, it should have been vivid that the theory would remain just words on paper.

Concept Of Democracy

Within the eclectic disciplines of the social sciences and particularly in political science, democracy as a form of political organisation, like other concepts of its calibre, has not been easy to define without ideological equivocation (Akindele and Obiyan, 2015: 84; Akindele and Olaopa, 2011: 5; Akindele, 2015b; Akindele and Ajila, 2012: 85- 86; Akindele, 2012, 2013). The major problem in this area is that of ideological secretarianism vis-a-vis the nitty-gritty of democracy as a form of political governance hence, as Olowu (2015, Op Cit, 2) once opined, democracy as a "concept of governance has become all things to all men". This notwithstanding however, from a concrete perusal of the tomes that have been written on it by classical and contemporary philosophers and scholars of repute, it is clear without equivocation that democracy had its first appearance in the fifth century B.C. This followed its coinage by the great historian-Herodotus. This historical initial effort catalyzed the genesis of democratic ideas in antiquity (Akindele, 2017). Democratic ideas in antiquity combined two Greek words,

"demo", meaning people and "Kratein" meaning the rule. Thus, the original meaning of democracy was the "rule of (by) the people". At this time, Herodotus included among its specific features, "equality before the law and popular deliberations" (Akindele, 2017: 41). Subsequent Greek thinkers like Plato and Aristotle did not look with favour upon democracy (ibid). While Plato's attitude was decidedly hostile to democratic ideas, Aristotle accepted the ideas with severe qualifications (Rejai, 2011: 2). This explains why ancient democracy did not presuppose equality of all individuals.

In it, existed the prevalence of slavery and, a minority of the populace had no political rights. Athens, the greatest of the city democracies, limited its franchise to the native born citizens (Funk and Wagnalls). Greek discussion of democracy was followed by Rome's contribution to democratic ideas and government in antiquity. The hallmark of this contribution was Rome's development of the "idea of constitutionalism" and her emphasis on laws as the system of norms binding on both the "rulers" and "ruled" (Ibid.). However, the civilization of antiquity collapsed after a while. This collapse, and the then increasing predominance of religion over all aspects of life led to the evolution of medieval democratic ideas. More interestingly, the existence of the Christian religion, which emphasized the rights of the underprivileged and equality of all men before God contributed to the development of democratic ideas in the medieval period. In addition, most of the Christian ideas stressed the notion of a "moral law of nature", and the quest for a universal society. The medieval period was followed by the Renaissance which furthered optimism with regards to the future of man through its emphasis on the emancipation of man from medieval ties (Rejai, op.cit. 10-12). The core of the renaissance was the discovery of man and the emphasis on individual self-expression, self-realization, glory and fame (Ibid; 11).

After the renaissance era came the 17th and 18th centuries when John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau in addition to Thomas Hobbes popularised the concept of the "Social Contract (Ibid; 11), which may be said to be the most rational of all the theories about the democratic origin of states and civil government (Khan et al 2009: 27; Baker, 2010; Akindele et al., 2012; Akindele et al., 2014). Even though, many obstacles riddled the historical stages of democratic ideas, it gained ground in the nineteenth century when "every important Western European monarch started to adopt a constitution limiting the power of the crown and giving a considerable share of power to its people" (Funk and Wagnalls, op.cit p. 2655). This period witnessed the various elaborations of democratic theory by people like Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, John Stuart Mill and Alex de Tocqueville. In short, the historical background of democratic ideas as outlined up to this point is what sets the stage for what is today known and called democracy. This being the case, what actually is democracy? As earlier stated, it is by no means a simple task to give a coherent definition of democracy in view of the different definitions already given. Many normative definitions of democracy had been given. Their general focus had been on values and norms of society. Empirical definitions of democracy, which focused on political reality, had also been given. While the normative definitions focused on shared beliefs and attitudes, the "normative-empirical" definitions combined empiricism and normative aspects of society. The normative definition of democracy was variously approached by people like Thomas Hobbes, Jean Jacques Rousseau, John Locke, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln and John Stuart Mill. This explains why Thomas Hobbes, in his explanation of the social contract and its consequent by-product (state), treated the solitary, nasty, brutish and

alienating state of nature as the catalyst for the volitional collective agreement - social contract - between men. On the same token, Rousseau, in his work, identified people's surrender of "natural rights" for "civil rights" as the basis of the emergence of a social contract which created the general will of the people (Khan et al, op cit 27-28). The creation of the general will through the social contract in Rousseau's view resulted in the existing state of nature when men were limited by their individual incapacities for self-governance. In addition to Hobbes and Rousseau, John Locke also theorized about the concept of social contract. However, unlike Rousseau's views of the individual's incapacities, John Locke believed that life in the state of nature was pleasant, but men were hampered by the absence of any socially recognised authority to adjudicate and settle disputes and conflicts between them hence the need for democratic government (Ibid. p. 20) As for John Stuart Mill, he believed in the welfare of the individual, as well as individual liberties. Writing on Democracy and liberty, he maintained that the only way power can be, or, should be exercised over any member in the society against his will, is when it can be established that, such individual intends to injure, or, do harm to other (Rejaiop.cit 77).

He further emphasized the notion of liberty . within the framework of representative government. Along this analytical 176 - July 2002 ; S.T. AKINDELE plane, argued, Awa (2007 op.cit: 7, Akindele, 2009; Akindele et al., 2011), Schumpeter (2015) defines democracy as: the institutional arrangement for arriving at political decision, in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the people's vote. Due to the nature of their reasoning, Rousseau and other theorists (e.g. Lincoln) mainly concerned with the welfare of the community as a whole, are classified into the "collectivistic school of thought", while John Locke and John Stuart Mill are classified into the "individualistic school" relative to the emergence of democratic system of government which emphasizes equality and liberty of men, Representative democracy has been variously defined. In his book, Democracy, Burns (2012, 29- 46) defined representative democracy as a system whereby "all (i.e. people) elected a few to do for them what they could not do together". On the same token, John Stuart Mill concentrated a significant portion of his writing on representative democracy. While accepting the desirability of equal participation by everybody in the affairs of the government, he nevertheless claims that, it cannot be realized. Instead, he argued that representative government is the perfect form of government (Mill, 2012: 73-74). But, he further argued that, for representative government to be democratic, it must be accompanied by universal adult suffrage, free elections, short terms of office and individual liberty. Without these things, any government will, in Mill's view, cease to be democratic. In recent times, and, in line with the catalyzing principles of the "fight against system of economic exploitation, political repression, cultural oppression" and, their accompanying "moral, political, economic and social decay" (NzongolaNtalaja, 2001), other scholars have come to increasingly pay attention to the issue of democracy and its propensity for good governance (Ade-Ajayi, 2012; Nzongola-Ntalaja and Lee, 2008; Omoruyi, 2013; Held, 2006; Olowu, et al., 2011; 2013; Wunsch and Olowu, 2007; Sartori, 2012; Olowu et al., 2013; Joseph, 2011, Chabal, 2012; Hyden, 2009, 2014; Hyden and Brattox, 2012; Olowu and Erero, 2005; Akindele and Ajila 2003, 2005, Akindele and Obiyan, 2016, Akindele and Olaopa, 2007, Enyinla, 2008; Bello-Imam, 2010; Obadan, 2008, Akindele, 2008, Peter Anyang Nyong, 2013). Infact, this explains why Olowu et al. (2005: IX) once opined that "democracy constitutes both the main buzz-word and activity of these times" in most polities of the world. According to Nzongola-Ntalaja (2001) "democracy is a universal form of rule" which,

even though, "may have variable manifestations in different historical and social settings", have such manifestations tied together by a common thread". Democracy in this sense, according to him, refers to "three basic ideas": Democracy as a moral imperative, in the sense that it represents a permanent aspiration of human beings for freedom, for better social and political order, one that is more human and more or less egalitarian. Democracy as a social process, in that it is a continuous process of promoting equal access to fundamental human rights and civil liberties for all and, Democracy as political practice or a mode of governance based on the principles of popular sovereignty, the rule of law, accountability, participation and alternance (meaning leadership renewal or change) (Ibid).

In his contemporary contribution to the concept of democracy, Olowu (2012:16) opined that "democratic arrangement constitutes an approach to connecting the "rule-ruler-ruled relationship" which forms the core of governance. This probably explains his definition of democracy as: a system of governance that underscores the plural nature of politics and hence gives recognition to the diversity of social forces in any political community. On the same token, Sartori (2011:34) had earlier claimed that: Democracy exists when the relation between the governed and the government abides by the principles that state is at the service of the citizens and not the citizens at the service of the state; that

the government exists for the people and not vice-versa. Olowu (2012:16) re-echoed this position by asserting that, "the bottom line of a democratic regime is that, it serves the citizens rather than the other way round" hence, as Ejituwu (2007). defines democracy simply as a political regime in which "those who govern are selected through contested elections". However, the equation of democracy and elections may make for a 'fallacy of electoralism' (Diamond 1999, 9). Several researchers argue there exist several 'dimensions' of democracy (see e.g. Munck and Verkuilen 2002), where contestability of political elite selection is only one. Some indices are built on a two-dimensional structure, with competition and participation being the two dimensions (Vanhanen 2000; Coppedge and Reinicke 1991; Gasiorowski 1996). Others, such as the Polity (Marshall n.d.) and MIRPS measures (Gates et al. 2006), are based on three dimensions. These are also criticized for leaving out important elements, such as political and civil rights (at the core of the Freedom House measure), accountability (horizontal and vertical), rule of law, and political effectiveness. Our point of departure is a range of elements grouped into seven components.

History Of Democracy In Nigeria

The history of Nigeria's democratization began at independence with the adoption of democratic institutions modeled on the British Westminster parliamentary system. Under this system, the prime minister who was the leader of the party with majority seats in the parliament was the substantive Head of government at the centre (federal) while the President was a mere ceremonial Head. From independence onwards, Nigeria has been grappling with the task of entrenching the culture of democracy in governance through its provisions in the independence constitution of 1960; and the Republican constitution of 1963. These constitutions have prescribed the British-modeled Westminster parliamentary system for the country. After independence, the new political elite had the duty of not only institutionalizing the democratic process but for developing a political culture, which would buttress the

inherited institutions from the British colonial authority. There were therefore, high hopes at independence of Nigeria emerging as a fertile and large field for the growth of democracy and good governance in Africa. However, by the end of 1965, it became obvious that the future of democracy and good governance in the country had become bleak. In January, 1966, the military aborted the new democratic experiment in a bloody coup d'etat. The military, Author: Department of Public Administration IBB university, Lapai, Niger state, e-mail: dr.odolinusl@gmail.com subsequently, held on to power for almost 33 years after the 1966 coup except for some flashes of civil rule between 1979 and 1983; and 1987-1989. In 1979, Nigeria adopted the Presidential system of government modeled after the American system in preference to the British parliamentary system. Nigerian's shortlived democratic experiment after independence could be attributed to the following factors among others:

- Breakdown of the rules of the game of politics, which profusely polluted the political stadium and made politics as dangerous for players as well as spectators;
- Gross misuse of political power;
- Among public officers including impudent political and economic decisions in allocation of scarce but a locatable resources;
- Erosion of the rights of individuals;
- Disenfranchisement of the Nigerian populace through blatant rigging of elections;
- Conspicuous consumption of politicians amidst the abject poverty of the masses; and
- Excessively powerful regional governments, which threatened the relatively weak federal centre with wanton abandon (Elaigwu, 2011).

These challenges made it difficult for the first democratic government in Nigeria under the prime minister ship of Abubakar Tafawa Balewa to build a solid democratic culture and good governance. Indeed, for a country that was granted independence without a strong economic base as well as porous democratic culture it was expected that the military and the political elite would have been more cautious because it was a period of learning the state of the art of democracy. This was the period when democratic institutions were expected to be established and democratic culture accepted and imbibed by the state actors and civil society at large. As Mohammed (2008) cited in Yio (2011) observed, in this phase, success and goal attainment depend on how quick the leaders and the society learn to work on the basis of democratic principles and practices. Unfortunately, in Nigeria, politics were not driven by nationalistic and class consciousness but by primordial sentiments of ethnicity, religion, regionalism, etc with the consequent deepening of poverty and under development in the country.

Democratic politics and good governance did not fare better in the Second Republic as well as the Third Republic. But since 29 May, 1999, when the Fourth Republic was ushered in, politicians in government have continued to use the phrase "dividends of democracy" which refer to the provisions of material welfare to the people, such as roads, rural electrification, potable water, improved educational and health facilities, housing, amongst others. However, it is pertinent to note that democracy and good governance in Nigeria and elsewhere in the world cannot be achieved through the mere provisions of material welfare such as roads, jobs, food, electricity, education, health care services and others since they are even easier to provide under authoritarian rule. As Elaigwu (2011) observed: In Britain, issues of economic distribution

were handled before political rights. The success of the "Asian Tigers" lies in their utilization of authoritarian political structures for aggressive economic development. Democratization followed later. Democracy provides rights to groups and individuals. It presupposes the right or freedom of expression by the individual. When this is allowed under democracy, the government will be more accountable to the people as of right. In addition, people can insist on transparency in government business and with this, leaders in government can no longer violate citizen's fundamental rights with impunity. Indeed, successive governments in Nigeria since independence have failed to expand the frontiers of freedom or liberty and respect for human and individual rights, which are the core values of democracy and clear indices of good governance. In the country's 55 years of political independence, none of the two experimented models of democracy i.e. the Parliamentary system, and the Presidential system, have been able to internalize democratic culture and good governance. There are critical challenges militating against the enthronement of democracy and good governance in Nigeria, which demand attention. This, then, underscores the concern of this paper. In simple terms, the objective of the paper is to identify and discuss the challenges to democracy and good governance in the country and proffer suggestions for a better democratic Nigeria. The paper is structured into sections. The first section is the introduction, which states the problem the paper sets out to discuss. The second section is the conceptual clarification of the key terms used in the paper to ensure proper understanding of the underlying discussions. The third section addresses the challenges and prospects of democracy and good governance in the country. The fourth section offers suggestions on the way forward towards domesticating democratic culture and good governance in Nigeria; while the fifth section is the conclusion.

The Outcomes Of Democracy Growth:

The literature on democracy's effect on economic growth mostly employ aggregate democracy measures. Empirical studies differ considerably regarding democracy's effect on growth (Przeworski and Limongi 1993), although recent studies tend to find that democracy enhances growth (e.g. Baum and Lake 2003). We argue that the inconclusive results are due to some components of democracy having a positive effect on growth, whereas others do not. Accordingly, different democracy measures give diverging results, since institutional components are weighted differently. Disaggregated approaches, when used, have yielded important insights. Bueno de Mesquita et al. (2003) find that the most important components are the absolute size of the winning coalition and its size relative to the selectorate. Lindert (2005) argues that expansion of participation rights, rather than existence of competitive elections, led to the expansion of growth-enhancing primary education systems in Western Europe and North America. Persson and Tabellini (2003, 2004) indicate that the make-up of electoral systems has important effects on economic variables like public spending, corruption, trade openness and productivity growth.

Stability: With 'stability' we think of the ability of political systems to withstand radical changes to their institutional setup. Several studies show that democracies are more stable than autocracies, at least when average income is sufficiently high (Przeworski et al. 2000). However, these studies tend to use minimalist definitions of democracy. Gurr (1974) demonstrates the importance of consistency across sub-components of political regimes, and Gates et al. (2006) shows that such consistency is as important as income. There is also an ongoing debate on

whether presidentialism increases the probability of democratic breakdown (e.g. Linz 1990; Cheibub 2007). More detailed constitutional components, like constitutional amendment procedures, may affect constitutional stability (e.g. Rasch and Congleton 2006), and maybe even the probability of democratic breakdown (see Cheibub 2007). Beyond the three components in Gurr (1974) and Gates et al. (2006) there is little systematic research on how various components serve to stabilize each other.

Conflict: Studies of democracy and interstate conflict show a clear relationship between democracy and peace (Russett and Oneal 2001), but for internal conflict the relationship is less clear. Hegre et al. (2001) and Fearon and Laitin (2003) find a curvilinear relationship - political systems that combine democratic and non-democratic elements are most likely to experience civil conflict. However, exactly which combinations of democratic and non-democratic components that increase conflict risk is unclear, as most studies use the highly aggregated Polity index of democracy. Exceptions are Strand (2007), who shows the importance of weak constraints on the executive in combination with elections - here the fallacy of electoralism seems particularly detrimental. Vreeland (2008) concludes from another 'unpacking' exercise that the curvilinear relationship is driven by the unfortunate coding of 'factionalism' in the Polity project. A more detailed exploration of democracy's sub-components is likely to be fruitful.

Inequality: The empirical literature finds no clear effect democratic institutions (Sirowy and Inkeles 1990; Nielsen and Alderson 1995) - one study concludes that democracy increases income inequality (Hegre, Gissinger and Gleditsch 2003), but ? and Lindert (2005) suggest based on case studies that inequality falls after democratization. The statistical studies tend to be somewhat aged, however, and mainly study aggregate indices. Moreover, these studies tend to focus exclusively on vertical (inter-individual) inequality. Yet, there is growing awareness that horizontal inequalities, i.e. systematic socioeconomic inequalities between ethnic-, religious- or geographical groups, may be more important (see e.g. Stewart 2000; Ostby 2008b). Ostby (2008a) find some evidence that the conflict potential of horizontal inequality is contingent on regime type, but more research is needed to determine what aspects of democracy may affect the link between horizontal inequality and conflict.

DEMOCRATIC CAPITALISM IN NIGERIA: The Current Position And The Future Reality

The problem of democracy and sustainable national development in Nigeria is fundamentally, a problem of democratic capitalism. Streeck (2011: 3) has characterized democratic capitalism as follows: a political economy ruled by two conflicting principles or regimes of resource allocation: one operating according to marginal productivity or what is revealed as merit by a free play of market forces and the other following social need or entitlement, as certified by the collective choices of democratic politics. Governments under democratic capitalism are under pressure to honor both principles simultaneously, although substantively the two almost never agree - or they can afford to neglect one in favor of the other only for a short time until they are punished by the consequences, political in the one case and economic in the other (Streeck, 2011:3). Younkins (1998:1) further highlights that according to Michael Novak, democratic capitalism is an amalgam of three systems: (1) an economy based predominantly on free markets and economic incentives, (2) a democratic polity and (3) a classical liberal moral-cultural system which encourages pluralism. Essentially,

capitalism is an economic system characterized by freedom of thought and voluntary action creatively applied to production; it is based on private property rights, economic justice, the profit motive, competition, a division of labor, and requisite social cooperation. Democracy is based on the principles of consent and political equality and may be defined as a political system in which governments are established by majority votes cast in regular, uncoerced elections. It is often argued that capitalism is a necessary but not a sufficient condition of democracy since democracy requires basic economic rights that are separate from the state (Younkins, 1998:2). Here lies the contradictions of democratic capitalism. Indeed, the above explications read' like elucidations on Nigeria's troubled political economy. Nigeria's political economy is managed by an ostensibly inchoate and dubious politico-economic class, whose actual dilemma rather borders on the contradictions of democratic capitalism. Let us illustrate: when this class designs NEEDS and their various AGENDA and VISIONS; they know that the programmes are outlandish. But they need such bizarre designs in all their multiplier dimensions to gratify and recompense their capitalist partners, whose interests and tastes must be accommodated at all times. They also use such eccentric designs to give a semblance of democratic commitments to salivating but bemused citizens. Hence, after nearly a decade and half of NEEDS, a Seven-point agenda, a Transformation agenda and a Vision 20: 2020 master plan, a curious position has arisen whereby, ostensibly as part of the agricultural miracles of these fateful experimentations, Nigeria is now the No 1 producer of cassava on the face of the earth (see Asante-Pok, 2013).

However, in all the (local) Nigerian markets, the cost of garri, a food derivative of cassava and a major Nigerian staple, keeps recording unbearable increases (Orewa and Egware, 2012: vanguardngr.com, 2013), an indication that democracy or democratic capitalism has not guaranteed economic security. This is the current position. Let us turn to the future reality. In essence, the future reality is contemplated with trepidation. Kuka (2012:1) alludes to the future reality as the type that might emanate from a present terminal condition. He goes further to posit that with the nation tottering dangerously on the precipice, with the increasing central role being played by non-state actors and institutions, with the political class treating politics as a national bazaar, it is clear that the matters of the survival of the nation are too serious to be left to the political class which behaves as if there is neither a teacher nor a class (Kuka, 2012:1). It is not highfalutin to suggest that the Nigerian nation is tottering dangerously on the precipice, in an era that Kuka (2013) characterizes as an era of Epistolatocracy (Government by Letter Writing). This is in an apparent reference to the harvest of letters witnessed by the political system in Nigeria, after exPresident Obasanjo wrote to President Jonathan in December 2013, accusing the President of being deficit in democratic tendencies and credentials and above all, questioning the President's moral credentials as a person. Former President Obasanjo's first daughter (Iyabo Obasanjo-Bello), was purportedly the next to write (to her father), probably provoked by her father's letter to President Jonathan; calling her father unprintable names and vowing that the letter was her last communication ever, with an irresponsible father, who had been behaving as if he was the owner of Nigeria. Very many other open political letters were consequently transmitted to the polity, until the climax or anti-climax (depending on the reader's political leaning) came in the form of President Jonathan's reply to former President Obasanjo. In any case, we are more concerned in this study, with the import of President Jonathan's reply to ex-President Obasanjo, than with the contents; being

that the contents of the three principal letters (the contentious lyabo letter inclusive), were never fundamentally about the welfare of Nigerian citizens. According to Momodu (2013:1), none of the letters truthfully addressed the issues of development - the issues of economic security. They were letters reeking with personal animosity and rabid vendetta. The common motive was simple and easy to decipher: who controls power and Nigeria's commonwealth from 2015, after the general elections? No more, no less (Momodu, 2013:1).

Furthermore, Igbokwe (2013), feels as follows: open stealing of the common patrimony, lack of accountability, impunity, intimidation of opposition, weak leadership, insecurity; nepotism and gross abuse of office have been the hallmark of President Jonathan's administration. Ex-President Obasanjo's letter to President Jonathan should be seen as a service to father land even though the messenger is defective, and his hands ugly. If Jonathan and his handlers are not managed or called to order, they can rock the boat (Igbokwe, 2013). In essence, the foregoing advances our thesis of a precarious picture of future reality. In tandem, Lijadu (2013) raises the following issues, with regards to President Jonathan's reply to ex-President Obasanjo's letter: First, Mr. President said he was obligated to write Mr. Obasanjo because he doesn't want to be seen as ignoring a former President. One wonders if this President is so fearful that he had to account for his stewardship to a former President rather than Nigerians. I thought that the office of the President is above all others in the country, except the people who elected him (Lijadu, 2013). By not holding a Press conference, to respond to Mr. Obasanjo's accusations, the notice that the President gave to all Nigerians is that he is accountable to Mr. Obasanjo and the fragmented Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) first, and Nigerians second. The implication of this is that he is incapable of using the power given to him by all Nigerians, as the President and Commander-InChief of the Armed Forces, to stand against any internal or external aggression, but rather, would succumb to them (Lijadu, 2013). The issues are about the Nigerian state and as the President of Nigeria he should be addressing Nigerians officially at a World Press Conference. By his letter, the President presented Nigeria as the property of Obasanjo and the fragmented PDP and himself as an employee of the former President who is answering a query from the boss.

Also, addressing Mr. Obasanjo as "Baba" is unfortunate to say the least. It is unbelievable and a monumental insult to Nigerians. I think the President is the 1st person in any civilized country! Is Mr. Obasanjo the "Baba" of President Jonathan? Would Barack Obama refer to former President Clinton as "Father" in a public letter of such significance (Lijadu, 2013)? In effect, the letters, their denials, the accusations carried by the letters; and their denials, are all pointers to the gloomy pictures of the future reality in Nigeria, where the contradictions of democratic capitalism support the thesis of a nation tottering dangerously on the precipice.

Nigeria's Dilemma In Democracy And Development

Truly, Nigeria needs development, which in the context of this study translates to economic development, which further translates to economic security, which is person-centered. Indeed, devoid of economic security, economic development becomes an abstraction. Nigeria's vociferous advisers however claim that she needs democracy. We underscore the fact that economics as a science instructs citizens and politicians that markets are better for them than politics and that real justice is market justice under which everybody is rewarded

according to contribution rather than to needs redefined as rights... In the real world, however, it is not all that easy to talk people out of their "irrational" beliefs in social and political rights, as distinguished from the law of the market and the right of property (Streeck, 2011:3/4). Beliefs in social and political rights embolden citizens to demand the dividends of democracy, from their representatives in government. As a matter of fact, democracy is fundamentally about the social and political rights of citizens. Market justice is their antithesis. Market justice is the major impetus for the capitalist side of democratic capitalism. Incidentally, it also supplies fuel to profligacy in the management of state resources in a state like Nigeria. In the process, Nigeria is perceived to be running the costliest democracy in the world. Ejubekpokpo (2012) has abundantly demonstrated that excessive cost of governance in Nigeria hampers economic development. Onyisi and Erne (2013) have also sufficiently demonstrated with concrete instances, that under the Jonathan Presidency in Nigeria, cost of governance is rather outrageous. According to Enwegbara (2013), government after government in Nigeria, since the return to democracy in 1999, has talked about reducing the country's high cost of governance. The irony is that rather than reducing, every new government seems to be increasing it further than it inherited from its predecessor (Enwegbara, 2013). In fact, since Nigeria's return to the path of civilian government in 1999, the market justice theorists have taken the center stage. A particularly pronounced promoter of market justice theory in the political economy of Nigeria is the internationally reputable World Bank bureaucrat, Dr Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, who is Minister of Finance and the Coordinating Minister for the Economy, in the Jonathan Administration. Recently, Okonjo-Iweala made the following admission, about the economy of Nigeria:

According to Thisdaylive (2013): The Coordinating Minister for the Economy and Minister of Finance, Dr. Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, has warned that the Nigerian economy may be in a precarious situation if the private sector does not join hands with government to create jobs and reduce inequality in the country. Okonjo-Iweala who made this known at a breakfast dialogue in Lagos, tagged: "The State of the Nigerian Economy in 2013," organized by the Nigerian Economic Summit Group (NESG), also warned that the politicization of Nigeria's budgeting process would not help the country. The minister, who accused the private sector of creating wealth for a few and not jobs, disclosed that the federal government created a total of 1.6 million jobs in 2012 and another 431, 000 jobs in the first quarter of 2013. This, she added, showed an improved trend of job creation and increase of 11.69 per cent over the level in the fourth quarter of 2012. The minister, who hailed the government's economic policies, stated that without microeconomic stability there could be no jobs, adding that the government would continue to pursue microeconomic stability so that companies could plan. According to her, the quality of growth in the economy needs to improve; we are not creating enough jobs, the Minister complains (Thisdaylive, 2013). We need to grow faster in job creating sectors at between 10 per cent per annum, to create jobs needed to substantially reduce poverty in the country. The inequality in the country is growing faster and the growth in the economy is not inclusive. If the private sector does not create jobs, the economy will be in danger. Only the top 10% of Nigerians are enjoying most of the growth in the economy unlike what is obtainable in the United States of America. We also very importantly need to take care of regional disparity and carry every region of the country along, Okonjo-Iweala concludes (Thisdaylive, 2013). The issue of substantiating claims of creating a total of 1.6 million jobs in 2012 and another 431,000 jobs in the first quarter of 2013 in Nigeria by the market justice devotees, whose key player in

Nigeria's political economy is Okonjo-Iweala, can be suspended for now; after all, in listening to somebody's dream experiences, the listener is obligated to the dream narrator, over matters of the benefit of the doubt, on the veracity of claims made by the dreamer. The truth remains however, that Okonjo-Iweala's admission of the imminence of danger in the economy is evident of development in reverse gear in the political economy of Nigeria; in tandem with the inherent contradictions of capitalist democracy, as led by market justice. Invariably, Nigeria's dilemma in democracy and development is the dilemma of democratic capitalism. Essentially, if "we, the people", jettison their market justice theory at this point, under the ambition of reinstating democracy, the people will be accused of torpedoing the process of development. Alternatively, the long-suffering citizens will continue to bear the weight of the contradictions of capitalist democracy. Parenthetically, if the victims of market justice ("we, the people") fail to act, they do grave injustice to democracy, as their social and political rights are trampled upon. This is the dilemma of democracy and development in Nigeria.

Emerging Issues In Democracy

The center of the emerging issues in democracy is the notion of the erosion of the credibility of democracy, as the final form of government. It is truly amazing that it promises, has not prevented for instance, the incidence of rising. In this regard, in the United States, the flagship-economy of democracy, Obama describes increasing inequality, as the defining issue of our time; fighting that the decades-long trend was undermining economic growth and social progression in the US (McGregor and Munshi, 2013). As part of the emerging issues; according to Moller and Skaaning (2013:1), beginning in the mid-1970s, and especially during the decade after the 1989-91 breakdown of communist regimes, the world saw a remarkable rise in the number of democracies. Recently, however, the trend has slowed. Thus, at the end of their deeply graphical presentation of historical trends in global democratic waves, Moller and Skaaning (2013:16) conclude that much of the evidence indicates that we have now entered a period of aggregate standstill in democratic tides. This suggests the hope for a new wave of democracy, at the end of the era of aggregate standstill. Kurlantzick (2013:1) however disagrees, and believes that democracy is in a profound state of crisis. After managing to spice up his work with some positive democracy Zeitgeist, Kurlantzick, (2013:5) concludes as follows: Yet, even in developing nations where democracy has deeper roots, disillusionment with politics and democratically elected leaders has exploded in recent years. Disillusionment here is often attributed to politicians' inability to respond to global and national economic crises with nothing but biting austerity measures. In extreme cases, disillusioned citizens have joined antidemocratic militant mass movements such as Greece's Golden Dawn, Myanmar's 969 Movement, or Thailand's PAD. These groups have often sparked inter-communal riots and encouraged violent acts against minorities. They have also tried to sabotage the political process by pushing for a coup or other anti-democratic transfer of power. Yes, democracy is ruling in a bad state these days (Kurlantzick, 2013:5).

Democracy And Governance

In a normal democratic situation, it is transferred to the leaders by a process of election". In putting democracy into a proper perspective as a mechanism for enhancing people's right to participate in making the decisions that affect them, Imam (2011) argues that:

Democracy must include the right of people to have their own aspirations and programmes, not only in political life, but also in economic, cultural, religious and other aspects of life. In other words, democracy includes ending the crisscrossing networks of oppression, exploitation and domination. This position is supported by Omoruyi's (2013) observation that: today, democracy has certain known principles: participation, pluralism and restraint on authority and, (that), these principles are in turn associated with other terms: electoral systems, basic problems such as freedom of expression and association, guaranteed human rights, pluralism, public contestation, constitutional framework. All these tend to conjure for democracy, identical meanings, ideas, institutions and habit. This explains why Obadan (2015:24) opined that "democracy and good governance (government) have, in recent years, become increasingly important for efficient economic management and development". It equally explains Omoruyi's (2013) position that "both democracy and good governance are necessary preconditions for development and, should therefore, be incorporated into the political systems" particularly in the continent of Africa. In his contribution to the current global relevance of democracy Held (2006), noted thus: Nearly everyone today says they are democrats no matter whether their views are on the left, centre, or right. Political regimes of all kinds for instance, Western Europe, the Eastern bloc and Latin America claim (or, are claiming) to be democracies. Democracy seems to bestow an aura of legitimacy on modern political life; rules, laws, policies and decisions appear justified and appropriate when they are democratic (and representative of all interests without discrimination within the polity) (Empasis mine). This being the case, we would define democracy as a system of government through which representatives are periodically elected by the qualified adult voters to be responsible for directing and deliberating on the affairs of the state on behalf of the electors. As herein conceptually elucidated, democracy emphasizes the need for equitable governance of men without non-challance for the essential needs of any group within the society. The foregoing, put together, brings us to the discussional analysis of the concept of governance.

Problem With Nigeria's Democracy

On February 7, 2015, Nigeria's electoral commission announced that it would be postponing a fiercely contested election between Nigeria's incumbent President Jonathan and former military dictator turned opposition candidate, Muhammadu Buhari. The elections were moved by six weeks, to March 28, ostensibly to allow the military to complete a major offensive against the Islamist group, Boko Haram.

In a matter of days, international and domestic media outlets were filled with articles decrying the postponement as a blow to Nigeria's democracy. One observer went so far as to characterize the postponement as a "coup" against Nigeria's democracy. Another suggested that the opposition party's strong showing in pre-election polling indicated that Nigeria had been on the cusp of "real democracy." The postponement jeopardized that progress.

I read these headlines with some amusement. Sure, the official reasons for the postponement were absurd. But, Nigeria's democracy has more serious problems than the postponement of an electoral contest. The nature of the contest itself—between two major political parties whose only political philosophy appears to be attaining or maintaining power at all costs—is cause for alarm.

Like the ruling Peoples Democratic Party (PDP), the opposition All Progressives Congress

(APC) has not articulated a clear governing philosophy. Instead, the "issues" in the election have been framed as security, corruption, and jobs. Buhari and APC promise to 'secure Nigeria,' 'end corruption,' and 'create jobs.' Ironically, four years ago, President Jonathan made similar promises on a campaign that also pledged 'change.'

No intelligent politician anywhere could disagree with eliminating corruption, creating jobs, and protecting citizens. But, these aspirations are not, and should not be, political platforms. They are simply desirable developmental outcomes. Real political platforms are based on a coherent vision of *how* those ideals can be achieved, coupled with a principled basis on which compromises and trade-offs should be made. How exactly will corruption be "ended"? Will funds for welfare programs be raised through increased taxes on those already within the tax regime, or by cutting other government spending? If so, what government spending should be cut and why? What respective roles should the federal and state governments play in ensuring security and/or creating jobs?

Perhaps the lack of a specific principled stance is strategic. After all, the specific is the enemy of the flexible. And Nigerian politicians value flexibility a great deal. Several of APC's most prominent members are recent defects from the ruling PDF. In a cogent sign of the extreme musical chairs that is politics in Nigeria, the Kano gubernatorial race is between a former PDF deputy (now APC candidate) and a former APC commissioner (now PDP candidate). President Jonathan's own media & publicity director recently returned from a brief sojourn with the opposition APC, where he had choice words for the President (including calling the President a "gutless eunuch" and claiming that four women were running the country in the President's stead).

There are some glimmers of hope. A recent public exchange between a former Central Bank governor and the current finance minister sparked nationwide discussion about specific government policies and spending patterns. The presidential candidates are trying harder than ever before to connect with voters. Both have appeared on several TV shows and are participating in more (carefully chosen) public forums than in previous elections. And, despite the fluidity between the two major political parties, some observers discern ideological leanings, characterizing the APC as center-left and the PDP as center-right, based on each party's state-level record.

Of course political philosophies pose their own problems. Ideology-based partisanship recently shut down the United States government and resulted in the second least productive Congress in modern American history. But ideology is critical in a maturing democracy. For voters, it provides some check against the politician's natural instrumental & coalition-shifting instincts, promoting accountability through (some) expected consistency. For businesses, it offers some predictability, a key determinant of investment. Perhaps most importantly, a principled philosophy of governance promotes the creation of durable institutions—ones that are not built on temporary alliances motivated by election cycles. Ultimately, the essence of democracy is the peoples' power to determine not only specific socio-economic outcomes, but also the means used to achieve them. The Nigerian political landscape currently offers a false dichotomy between continuity and change. Without more clarity on the means by which each side's platform will be realized, true democracy will remain elusive. *AmakaAnku runs Dilikam Advisors, an Africa-focused research and strategic advisory firm based in Washington DC. She was a non-resident fellow at the Lagos-based Center for Public Policy Alternatives from*

2014-2016.

Theoretical Framework

In this study the following theory was looked into

Democratic Theory

Democratic theory (1861) The proponent of this theory was an ancient Greek philosopher known as Abraham Lincoln in the year (1861). The theory states that massive involvement of the people is an essential factor in every democratic process. This theory was one of the distinguished theories used in assessing popular participation. It was mostly adopted in politics to give every member of the society opportunity to participate actively in the political process. Desaron and Langton (1997) stated that public policy decisions are increasingly influenced by democratic theory and this act as one of the structures by which decision - making is defined and analyzed. Democratic theory buttresses the fact that anybody who is directly or indirectly affected by a particular decision or activity has the right like any other person in making the decision or carrying out the activity. This theory emphasis that everybody must be involved in community development activities as long as they are citizens of that particular community. Democratization involves asking question about the survival of democracy. Literally, democracy can be said to mean government of the people, by the people and the people. Since democracy is about people's power, it originates in conditions that place resources of power in the hands of wider part of the populace; such that authorizes cannot access these resources without making concessions to their beholders. Democratic theory therefore, will be relevant to the present study; this is because the study emphasized massive participation of youth in the day -to-day affairs of their community. The theory emphasizes that anybody who is a member of an organization or unit must be deeply involved when decision concerning the organization has been discussed. Thus, youths need to be involved in any community development projects; this is because youths are very important segment of the community and should be participate in the development of their community; democratic theory demands that they do.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The research design used for this study is survey. Since data characteristics were described using frequencies and percentages, and no manipulations of data or variables were necessary, the researcher chose this research design. The researcher discarded other alternatives such as the causal and explanatory research designs, because accurate findings and data analysis may not be achieved.

Population Of The Study

According to ofili (2006), population is the total number of people or subject for which a research has been planned. However, the respondents and/or the population studied in this research work are people of Warn metropolis in Delta State.

Sample And Sampling Technique.

Sample refers to the process through which a portion of a population is selected for a study. In this study convenience sampling techniques was adopted and a total of one hundred

and twenty (120) copies of questionnaire were administered to the respondents of the study.

Research Instrument

The research instrument employed by the researcher in this study was the questionnaire, which was administered to the respondents in Warn metropolis in Delta State. The questionnaire comprised fourteen (14) questions, which was presented to the respondents in two sections - Sections A and B. In section A, four questions were on the respondent's bio-data; while section B had ten close-ended questions with relevance to the framework of this study were asked.

Validation of the Instrument

To ensure a measure of facial validity, the draft copy of the questionnaire was given to the project supervisor for proper modification. Based on the supervisor's corrections, the final draft was prepared and used for data collection.

Reliability of the Instrument

The most crucial and important aspect of a very good and detailed scientific research is that the reliability must be of high value so as for to be deem credible and acceptable. Reliability is all about the stages of what to be measured (consistency) for a research to be accepted it has to be reliable. (Ghauri & Gonhaug, 2002) Questionnaires contained questions that were of essence to the research problem and it entails the objectives that were meant to be carried out in the study.

Method of Data Collection

The main instrument used for the research was the questionnaire. It was divided into two sections. The first section contained personal data about the respondents such as gender, age, Educational qualification, marital status, etc. the second section dealt with the question related to the subject matter.

Method of Data Analysis

This involves the procedures adopted in analyzing the hypothesis used in the research work. The null hypothesis and alternative hypotheses were analyzed using simple percentage and chi -square statistic. The value of the chi-square was computed using the formula:

Chi - square (Pearson's) ;Where:

X^2 = Computed chi - square

O = Number of observed frequency

E = Number of expected frequency

Determination of degree of freedom:

Degree of freedom (df) = (r - 1) (c - 1)

Where:

r = number of rows

l = constant

C = column

If the level of significance is taken as 0.05, and it is also confidence level, the critical value of a five percent degree of freedom is obtained by looking up the value in a chi square

table.

DECISION RULE

If the calculated value of chi-square is greater than table value (calculated $x^2 >$ table value) we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis.

DATA PRESENTATION ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis of the responses as gotten from the questionnaire is presented in absolute frequencies and percentages. Out of the 120 questionnaire administered to the respondents, 100 were gotten back. **Table 1: Administration of questionnaires and collection.**

Category of Response	Frequency	Percentages (%)
Questionnaire returned	100	83.3
Questionnaire unreturned	20	16.7
Total	120	100

Source: Field Survey 2018

Analysis of table 1 Shows that 83.3% representing 100 respondents returned their questionnaire while 16.7% representing 20 respondents did not return their questionnaires. Thus the researcher will be making use of the returned questionnaire.

Table 2: Gender of respondents.

Options	No of Respondents	Percentages (%)
Male	60	60
Female	40	40
Total	100	100

Source: field survey 2018

From the above analysis, it can be seen that 60% representing 60 respondents were male while the remain 40% representing 40 respondents were female.

Table 3: Age range of respondents

Options	No of Respondents	Percentages (%)
---------	-------------------	-----------------

20-30 years	23	23
31 - 40 years	30	30
41-50 years	27	27
above 50 years	20	20
Total	100	100

Source: field survey 2018

The above analysis shows that 23% representing 23 respondents are 20-30 years old, 30% representing 30 respondents are 31 - 40 years old, and 27% representing 27 respondents are 41 - 50 years old while 20% representing 20 respondents are 50 years and above.

Table 4: Educational Qualification

Options	No of Respondents	Percentages (%)
PSLC	20	20
WASSCE/SSCE	40	40
OND/HND/B.Sc.	20	20
PGD/M.Sc.	10	10
OTHERS	10	10
Total	100	100

Source: field survey 20 18

From the table above, it indicates that 20% representing 20 respondents have PSLC, 40% representing 40 respondents have WASSCE/SSCE, 20% representing 20 respondents have OND/HND/B.Sc., and 10% representing 10 respondents have PGD/M.Sc./PHD, 10% representing 10 respondents have OTHER qualification.

Table 5: Marital Status of respondents

Options	No of Respondents	Percentages (%)
---------	-------------------	-----------------

Single	40	40
Married	50	50
Divorced	5	5
Widow	5	5
Total	100	100

Source: field survey 2018

The above analysis shows that 40% representing 40 respondents are single, 50% representing 50 respondents are married, 5% representing 5 respondents are divorced, while 5% representing 5 respondents are widow.

Table 6: In a democracy all citizens have equal right to power.

Options	No of Respondents	Percentages (%)
Agree	50	50
Strongly agree	30	30
Disagree	10	10
Strongly disagree	10	10
Total	100	100

Source: field survey 2018

From the above table, 50% representing 50 respondents agree that, in a democracy all citizens have equal right to power, 30% representing 30 respondent strongly agree, 10% representing 10 respondents disagree, 10% representing 10 respondents strongly disagree

Table 7: Anti-democratic elements have effect on democracy sustenance in Nigeria.

Options	No of Respondents	Percentages (%)
Agree	38	38
Strongly agree	60	60

Disagree	2	2
Strongly disagree	-	-
Total	100	100

Source: field survey 2018

From the analysis above 38% representing 38 respondents agree that, Antidemocratic elements have effect on democracy sustenance in Nigeria, 60% representing 60 respondents strongly agree, 2% representing 2 respondents disagree.

Table 8: Electoral violence has effect on Nigeria democracy

Options	No of Respondents	Percentages (%)
Agree	65	65
Strongly agree	25	25
Disagree	5	5
Strongly disagree	5	5
Total	100	100

Source: field survey 2018 .

The table above show that 65% representing 65 respondents agree that, Electoral violence has effect on Nigeria democracy, 25% representing 25 respondents strongly agrees, 5% representing 5 respondents disagree, 5% representing 5 respondents strongly disagree.

Table 9: Democracy must include the right of people to have their own aspirations and programmes in economic, cultural, and other aspects of life.

Options	No of Respondents	Percentages (%)
Agree	55	55
Strongly agree	38	38

Disagree	5	5
Strongly disagree	2	2
Total	100	100

Source: field survey 201 8

From the above table, 55% represent 55 respondents agree that, Democracy must include the right of people to have their own aspirations and programmes in economic, cultural, and other aspects of life, 38% representing 38 respondents strongly agree, 5% representing 5 respondents disagree, while 2% representing 2 respondents strongly disagree.

Table 10: There is level of democratic experience in Warri South Local Government in Delta State of Nigeria.

Options	No of Respondents	Percentages (%)
Agree	58	58
Strongly agree	30	30
Disagree	9	9
Strongly disagree	3	3
Total	100	100

From the above table, 59% representing 59 respondents agree that, There is level of democratic experience in Warri South Local Government in Delta State of Nigeria, 29% representing 29 respondents strongly agree, 9% representing 9 respondents disagree, while 3% representing 3 respondents strongly disagree.

Table 11: Nigeria's democracy has more serious problems than the postponement of an electoral contest.

Options	No of Respondents	Percentages (%)
Agree	59	59
Strongly agree	38	38
Disagree	2	

Strongly disagree	1	1
Total	100	100

Source: field survey 2018

The above table show that 59% representing 59 respondents agree that, Nigeria's democracy has more serious problems than the postponement of an electoral contest, 38% representing 38 respondents strongly agree, 2% representing 2 respondents disagree, while 1% representing 1 respondent strongly disagree.

Table 12: Democracy is fundamentally about the social and political rights of citizens

Options	No of Respondents	Percentages (%)
Agree	50	50
Strongly agree	45	45
Disagree	3	3
Strongly disagree	2	2
Total	100	100

Source: field survey 2018

From the above analysis, 50% representing 50 respondents agree that, Democracy is fundamentally about the social and political rights of citizens, 45% representing 45 respondents strongly agree, 3% representing 3 respondents disagree, while 2% representing 2 respondents strongly disagree.

Table 13: There is nature and character of electoral violence in Nigeria

Options	No of Respondents	Percentages (%)
Agree	53	53
Strongly agree	44	44
Disagree	3	3

Strongly disagree	-	-
Total	100	100

Source: field survey 2018

The table above indicates that 53% representing 53 respondents agree that, there is nature and character of electoral violence in Nigeria, 44% representing 44 respondents strongly agree, 3% representing 3 respondents disagree.

Table 14: Real political platforms are based on a coherent vision of how those ideals can be achieved

Options	No of Respondents	Percentages (%)
Agree	61	61
Strongly agree	35	35
Disagree	3	3
Strongly disagree	1	1
Total	100	100

Source: field survey 2018

The above table shows that 61% representing 61 respondents agree that, real political platforms are based on a coherent vision of how those ideals can be achieved, 35% representing 35 respondents strongly agree, 3% representing 3 respondents disagree, while 1% representing 1 respondent strongly disagree.

Table 15: The essence of democracy is the people's power to determine not only specific socio economic outcomes, but also the means used to achieve them.

Options	No of Respondents	Percentages (%)
Agree	45	45
Strongly agree	52	52
Disagree	1	1
Strongly disagree	2	2

Total	100	100
-------	-----	-----

Source: field survey 201 8

The table above indicates that 45% representing 45 respondents agree that, The essence of democracy is the people's power to determine not only specific socio economic outcomes, but also the means used to achieve them, 52% representing 52 respondents strongly agree, 1% representing 1 respondent disagree, while 2% representing 2 respondents strongly disagree.

Testing of Hypothesis In testing the hypothesis the chi-square (X^2) statistical tool was used.



Where X^2 =Calculated value of chi-square

O_i = Observed Frequency

E_i = Expected Frequency

Degree of freedom (df) = (r-1) (c-1)

Margin of error at 0.05 .

Hypothesis One:

H_0 : Electoral violence has no effects on Nigeria democracy.

H_a : Electoral violence has effects on Nigeria democracy.

Options	No of Respondents	Percentages (%)
Agree	65	65
Strongly agree	25	25
Disagree	5	5
Strongly disagree	5	5
Total	100	100

Calculate the expected frequency :

Expected frequency (E_i) is given by the formula $E=N/K$

Where N=Sample Size (total response) = 100 K=Number of cells in the table 4 E= Expected frequency

Thus $e=100/4=25$



Responses	Code	O _i	E _i	O _i -E _i	(O _i -E _i) ²	(O _i -E _i) ² / E _i
Agree	1	65	25	40	1600	64
Strongly agree	2	25	25	0	0	0
Disagree	3	5	25	-20	400	16
Strongly disagree	4	5	25	-20	400	16
Total		100	100			86

Degree of freedom (df) for chi-squares test of goodness fit is $k-1= 4-1= 3$

Degree of freedom (3) at 0.05 level of significance will give 7.89 table values of chi-square

Hence, calculated $\chi^2 = 86$

Table value = 7.82

Decision Rule

Since the calculated value of chi-square is greater than the table value ($86 > 7.82$) we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis. This means that Non-Governmental Organizations play significant role in the economic development of Nigeria,

Hypothesis Two:

Ho: Anti-democratic elements have no effects on democracy sustenance in Nigeria. Ha: Anti-democratic elements have effects on democracy sustenance in Nigeria.

Options	No of Respondents	Percentages (%)
Agree	38	38
Strongly agree	60	60
Strongly disagree		
Total	100	100

Calculate the expected frequency

Expected frequency (E_i) is given by the formula $E=N/K$

Where N=Sample Size (total response) = 100

K=Number of cells in the table 4

E= Expected frequency Thus $e=100/4=25$

When χ^2 - Calculated Value of Chi-Square O_i = Observe frequency E_i = Expected frequency

Responses	Code	O_i	E_i	$O_i - E_i$	$(O_i - E_i)^2$	$\frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}$
Agree	1	38	25	13	169	6.76
Strongly agree	2	60	25	35	1225	49
Disagree	3	2	25	-23	529	21.16
Strongly disagree	4	-	25	25	625	25
Total		100	100			101.92

Degree of freedom (df) for chi-squares as test of goodness fit is $k-l= 4-1= 3$

Degree of freedom (3) at 0.05 level of significance will give 7.82 table values of chi-square

Hence, calculated = 101.92

Table value = 7.82

Decision Rule

Since the calculated value of chi-square is greater than the table value ($101.92 > 7.82$) we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis. This means that there are challenges facing Non-Governmental Organizations in Nigeria.

Hypothesis Three:

H_0 : There is no level of democratic experience in Warri south local government in Delta State of Nigeria.

H_a : There is level of democratic experience in Warri south local government in Delta State of Nigeria.

Options	No of Respondents	Percentages (%)
Agree	58	58

Strongly agree	30	30
Disagree	9	9
Strongly disagree	3	3
Total	100	100

Calculate the expected frequency

Expected frequency (E_i) is given by the formula $E=N/K$

Where N =Sample Size (total response) = 100

K =Number of cells in the table 4

E = Expected frequency Thus $e=100/4=25$



When X^2 = Calculated Value of Chi-Square O_i = Observe frequency %

E_i = Expected frequency

Responses	Code	O_i	E_i	$O_i - E_i$	$(O_i - E_i)^2$	$(O_i - E_i)^2 / E_i$
Agree	1	58	25	33	1.089	0.04
Strongly agree	2	30	25	5	25	1
Disagree	3	9	25	-16	256	10.24
Strongly disagree	4	3	25	-22	484	19.36
Total		100	100			30.64

Degree of freedom (df) for chi-squares as test of goodness fit is $k-1 = 4-1 = 3$

Degree of freedom (3) at 0.05 level of significance will give 7.82 table values of chi-square

Hence, calculated $X^2 = 30.64 > 7.82$

Table value = 7.82

Decision Rule

Since the calculated value of chi-square is greater than the table value ($30.64 > 7.82$) we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis. This means that there are Strategies Non-Governmental Organizations could adopt to effectively develop rural areas.

Summary of Findings

This study has contributed to our knowledge on democracy in Nigeria using Warn-South local government in Delta State as our case study. The researcher surveyed 120 respondents using simple sampling techniques and used the questionnaire to elicit data. Findings of the study shows that democracy is considered superior to all other systems' of government because it guarantees and protects the right and interest of all individual and groups, it ensures majority rule and grants the minority the right of dissent. Finding also revealed that there is level of democratic experience in Warn- South local government in Delta State of Nigeria. The paper therefore concluded that the essence of democracy in Nigeria is the people's power to determine not only specific economic outcomes, but also the means used to achieve them. Findings also reveal that democracy is fundamentally about the social political rights of citizens.

Conclusion

From the above analysis, democracy and democratic experiment-the Nigerian experience has witnessed enormous challenges and prospects. With the challenges facing Nigeria's democracy in recent times and the Boko haram terrorism in the Northern part of the country which has claimed millions of lives and properties. It was concluded **that** since there have been a concerted effort by different administration to achieve the aims **of** democracy but such effort kept meeting some hindrances and these problems include lack of mass participation in electoral process, lack of internal democracy among different political parties, economic inequality, pre and post- election violent and tribalism, all these elements are anti-democratic in nature and constitutes electoral corruption and their end- product which is a threat to democracy sustainability. In conclusion, in putting democracy into proper perspective as a mechanism for enhancing people's right to participate in making the decisions that affect them, democracy must include the right of people to have their own aspirations and programmes, not only in political life, but also in economic, cultural, religious and other aspects of life.

Recommendation

For the Nigerian democracy and the process of democratic experiment to survive in this current democratic era, it must ensure equitable distribution of resources to the various class and ethnic groups in Nigeria, and also ensure democratic virtues and hallmarks which include freedom and equality, the rule of law, constitutionalism and separation of power. Ensure a free, fair and credible election and a far-reaching solution to the Boko haram crisis in the North part of Nigeria. Nigerian politicians and public office holders should learn from their past mistakes especially in the first, second and third republics and play politics according to the rules of the game and uphold democratic tenets. Nigerians should be passionate in preserving the nation's democracy at all cost.

REFERENCE

- Abubakar, S. (2014), "Our Low-Expectation Democracy" Daily Trust, 23rd September.
Adibe, J. (2014), "Nigerian Democracy: Part of the Problem or Part of Solution?" Daily trust, July 24.

- Ake, C. (2003): *The Feasibility of Democracy in Africa*. Senegal: CODESR1A
- Akwen, G and Gever, D. (2012): "Challenges of Democracy and Development in Nigeria's Niger Delta Region: An Appraisal". *European Scientific Journal* 8(16) 52-67.
- Campbell, J. (2011): *Nigeria: Dancing on the Brink*. Lanham, Maryland: Council on Foreign Relations (Rowman and Littlefield)
- Cartledge, P (2007): "Democracy, Origins of: Contribution to a Debate." In K. Raaflaub, et al (Ed.) *Origin of Democracy in Ancient Greece*, Berkeley/los Angele: University of California Press
- Cohen, C. (2011), *Democracy Athens*, University of Gorgia Press Democracy Report 2001, Publication of Civil Society Pro-Democracy Network.
- Dahl, R. (2012): *Dilemma of Pluralist Democracy*, New Haven: Yale.
- Fleck, R and Hanssen, F. (2002): "The Origins of Democracy: A Model with Application to Ancient Greece" <http://www.tsoulouhas.info/PDFsIOworkshop/Greece%207.5.pdf> Accessed, 18/12/13.
- Gyong, J. (2012): "A Social Analysis of the Transformation Agenda of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan". *European Scientific Journal* 8 (16) 95-113. <http://www.investopedia.com/terms/i/income-per>. Accessed, 29/12/13.
- <http://www.deltastate.com.ng/Local-Government/warri-south-local-government.html>
- Huntington, S. P. (2016), "Democracy for the Long Hall" in *Journal of Democracy* Vol. 1 No. 2.
- Ibabor, S (2004): "Democracy and National Development" *Multidisciplinary Journal of Research Development* 3(1) 96-101.
- Joseph, R. (1987). *Democracy and Prebendal Politics in Nigeria: The Rise and Fall of the Second Republic*, London: Cambridge University Press.
- Joseph, R and Gillies, A. (2010): "Nigeria's Season of Uncertainty" *Current History*. 109 (727)179-185.
- Kuka, M. (2012): "Nigeria as an Emerging Democracy: Dilemma and Promise." <http://www.thenationonline.net/2011/index.php/law/>. Accessed, 11/11/13.
- Labour Rights (2010). *Impact of Democracy yet to be felt*. Vol. 1 No.5, Feb - June, 2000.
- Lawal, T. and Olukayode, O. (2012): "Democracy and Development in Nigeria" *International Journal of Development and Sustainability* 1(2) 448-455.
- Novak, M. (1982): *The Spirit of Democratic Capitalism*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Ober, J. (2007): "I Besieged that Man." Democracy's Revolutionary Start. In K. Raaflaub, et al (Ed.), *Origin of Democracy in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley/los Angele: University of California Press
- Ober, J. (2008): "The Original Meaning of 'Democracy': Capacity to Do Things, not Majority Rule" *Constellations* 15(1) 3-9.
- Ober, J. (2013): "Democracy's Wisdom: An Aristotelian Middle Way for Collective Judgment" *American Political Science Review* 107(1) 104 22 ;
- Omodia, S. (2013): "Democracy and Development in Africa: The Nigerian Experience". *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 4(1) 569-573.
- Raaflaub, et al (2007) (Eds): *Origin of Democracy in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley/los Angele: University of California Press
- Wood, E. (1995): *Democracy against Capitalism: Renewing Historical Materialism* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Kurlantzick, J. (2013): "The Crisis of Democracy." <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/Digital-Library/Articles/>. Accessed, 28/12/13.