

**POLITICAL PARTY NOMINATION AND
SUSTENANCE OF DEMOCRACY IN NIGERIA. A
CASE STUDY OF APC**

By

ODUNAIYA SAMSON OLUWATOBI

MATRIC NO: 17012224019

POL/ECO

**A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL
SCIENCE, SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, TAI SOLARIN
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, OMU-IJEBU, OGUN STATE.**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE
AWARD OF THE NIGERIA CERTIFICATE IN EDUCATION (N.C.E)**

FEBRUARY, 2021

DEDICATION

I dedicate this project to my family and friends.

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that this project work was carried out by **ODUNAIYA, SAMSON OLUWATOBI**, with Matric number 17012224019, under my supervision in the Department of Political Science, School of Arts and Social Sciences, Tai Solarin College of Education Omu-Ijebu, Ogun State.

MR. F.A. AGORO

Project Supervisor

DATE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

A special thanks to God Almighty for seeing me through all the academic hurdles in Tai Solarin College of Education. I thank God for giving me the necessary and needed strength to carry out my project work. All adorations to your Holy Name.

I acknowledge and appreciate the efforts of my supervisor in the person of Mr. Agoro, F. A. for his patience and constructive criticism in ensuring that I achieved the needed objectives of project writing. May Almighty God continue to enrich your wisdom, Amen.

My warmest regards and appreciation goes to my lovely and wonderful parents, Mr. & Mrs. Odunaiya, S. B. for their parental care both spiritually and financially towards me throughout my academic career. May Almighty God protect and keep you safe. So that you can live long to reap the fruit of your labour, Amen.

My words of appreciation and acknowledgement goes to all my lecturers in the departments

ABSTRACT

The study focused on the political party nomination and sustenance of democracy in Nigeria. a case study of APC. The study was guided by the following research objectives: What is the effect of political party on nomination of candidate for political posts; What is the influence of wrong flag bearer of the party on the decision of the people to vote for the party in an election; What is the connection between nomination of candidate by political parties and the sustenance of democracy; What are the possible ways of improving the process of political party nomination in sustaining democracy. The study employed qualitative research design. Interview, focused group discussion and documentary were employed in data collection. The results showed that nominations in political party go a long way to affect the decision of the people and in turn affect the sustenance of democracy. With heavy reliance on secondary data supported by analytical approach, the paper x rayed the role of political parties in the democratic consolidation of Nigeria's Fourth Republic. The climax of the analysis is the identified challenges plaguing democratic consolidation since the commencement of the fourth republic i.e.: Lack of institutionalization and personalization of political parties; Godfatherism; Absence of internal democracy within the political parties and incessant party/political violence. The party system in Nigeria is still weak and vulnerable with no visible signs of adding value to the democratic consolidation. It is recommended that issues of organizational capacity, effective leadership, internal democracy, discipline, institutionalization and personalization, ideological platforms of mobilization and linkage to civil society and the masses should be addressed.

TABLE OF CONTENT

Title Page	i
Dedication	ii
Certification	iii
Acknowledgement	iv
Abstract	v
Table of Content	vi
Chapter One: Introduction	
1.1 Background to the Study	1 - 3
1.2 Statement of the Problem	3
1.3 Objectives of the Study	4
1.4 Research Questions	4
1.5 Research Hypothesis	4 - 5
1.6 Significance of the Study	5
1.7 Scope of the Study	5
1.8 Definition of terms	6
Chapter Two: Literature Review	
2.1 Introduction	7 - 9
2.2 Democracy	9 - 11
2.3 History of Democracy	11 - 14
2.3.1 Democracy Sustenance	14 - 16
2.4 Political Parties	16 - 18
2.5 Nigeria's Political Parties	18 - 26

2.6	Political Parties and Democratic Process in Nigeria's fourth Republic	26 - 29
2.7	The All Progressive Congress (APC)	29 - 30
2.8	Internal Democracy	30 - 32
2.9	Effects of godfathers on internal democracy	32 - 34

Chapter Three: Research Methodology

3.1	Methodology	35
3.2	Data Gathering Instruments	35
3.2.1	Questionnaire	35
3.2.2	Secondary Data	35
3.3	Population of the Study	35
3.4	Sample of Study	35
3.5	Sampling Procedure	35 - 36
3.6	Validity of Research Instrument	36
3.7	Method of Data Analysis	36

Chapter Four: Presentation and Analysis of Data

4.1	Introduction	37
4.2	Demographic Data of the Officials	37
4.3	Research Question	38 - 41

Chapter Five: Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1	Summary	42
5.2	Summary of Findings	42

5.3	Conclusion	42
5.4	Recommendations	43 - 44
	References	45 - 49

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

Generally, political parties play very vital roles in the development and sustenance of democracy. In most, African countries and particularly Nigeria, political parties even play greater role in the fledging democratic process. This is so because most legal regimes relating to election have no provision for independent candidacy. Political parties therefore provide the only platform for people with political ambitions to actualize their ambitions.

To support the above assertion, Section 221 of the Nigeria constitution (as amended) provides that “No association, other than a political party, shall canvass for votes for any candidate at any election”. Section 222 on the other hand further provides that no association by whatever name called shall function as a political party unless:

- (a) The names and addresses of its national officers are registered with the Independent National Electoral Commission”

From the foregoing therefore, political parties have so much power to wield in shaping Nigeria’s political culture and electoral process. Those political parties perform very useful functions particularly in a liberal democracy.

Ujo (2000) is of the view that one of such functions is that of national integration. He asserts further that even if a political party does not form a government, it may still have an important role to play in the political system as an agent of national Integration. Individuals, who identify themselves with national party, identify with the entire political system.

Students of political parties have commonly associated them with democracy itself (Orji, 2013:1). Political parties, are seen by them as “makers” of democracy, this have been so

romanticized that scholars claim that neither democracy nor democratic societies are thinkable without them (Omotola, 2009). In other words, the existence of vibrant political parties is a sine qua non for democratic consolidation in any polity (Dode, 2010). It is patently ironic that political parties largely pursue (and profess) democracy outside the gates and resist it within the gates (Ibeanu, 2013:1). Competitive party and electoral politics is expected to deepen and consolidate the democratic transition, which the country embarked upon in May 1999 (Jinadu, 2013:2). Well-functioning political parties are essential for the success of electoral democracy and overall political development of Nigeria (Adetula&Adeyi, 2013:3).

Indeed, democracy is unthinkable in the absence of viable political parties. Parties are expected to participate in the political socialization of electorates, contribute to the accumulation of political power, facilitate recruitment of political leadership, and serve as a unifying force in a divided polity (Omotola, 2010:125). The objectives which party regulation seeks to achieve, including the lingering question of internal party democracy, namely the push and pull of struggles to get political parties to respect their own rules and act in line with democratic principles in the conduct of their internal affairs, all remains central to the wider consolidation of democracy in Nigeria (Ibeanu, 2013: 1).

The character and tendencies exhibited by political parties have implications for democratic sustenance in the country (Pogeson, 2013: 5). The political party is a critical, formal, institutional, organizational and mobilizational player in the political process particularly in relation to power, democracy, governance, governments and economy (Ikelegbe, 2013:4). The nature of political parties and the nature of party politics have consequences for the nature of governance, democratic consolidation, integration, stability and security. The performance of political parties in terms of articulation, aggregation, representation and organization are critical to political accountability, communication, democratic consolidation and political stability (Ikelegbe, 2013:4).

It should be pointed out that political parties in Nigeria often times adopt anti-democratic means to produce party flag bearers. This singular conduct usually rubs up on the entire political government, creating disenchantment and determination by those bruised in the process to brood vengeance. This has had debilitating effect on Nigeria's democracy effectively taking off aground.

Most of the political parties have very beautiful provisions in the constitutions relating to the emergence of party nomination and flag bearer. It is worth noting that these provisions are observed more in breach than anything else. It is common ground that most of the parties executives simply hand pick those they think they will be able "to control". The party primaries are therefore usually but subterfuge and a sham thus leaving many aspirants and particularly their supporters feeling badly bruised. This is no doubt results in political disquiet and litigation for those who choose to be civil enough and yet for others, they brood venom.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The cornerstone of democracy is the right nomination of candidate from political parties. In a democratic system of government, political party's nomination is a major bed rock for sustaining democracy. Over the years there have been a lot of happenings that affected the essence of democracy which can be traced to the nominations in the political parties. The nominations of the political parties have constantly been called to question as democracy is not well practiced by their nominees and eventual winner of the elections. There is therefore the need to trace the process of nomination and the running of primary elections within the political parties. The political party nomination in Nigeria has been influenced by different ideologies and godfatherism, this of course has degraded the process of nomination and affected the outcome of the party's nomination.

1.3 Objective of the Study

This study focuses primarily on political party nomination and sustenance of democracy in Nigeria using All Progress Congress as a case study. Specifically, the study set out to achieve the following objectives.

1. To determine the effect of political party on nomination of candidate for political posts
2. To find out the connection between nomination of candidate by political parties and the sustenance of democracy.
3. To find out the extent at which wrong flag bearer of the party influenced the decision of the people to vote for the party in an election?
4. To determine the possible way of improving the process of political party nomination in sustaining democracy.

1.4 Research Questions

1. What is the effect of political party on nomination of candidate for political posts?
2. What is the influence of wrong flag bearer of the party on the decision of the people to vote for the party in an election?
3. What is the connection between nomination of candidate by political parties and the sustenance of democracy?
4. What are the possible ways of improving the process of political party nomination in sustaining democracy?

1.5 Research Hypothesis

HO: There is no significant relationship between political party nomination and the sustenance of democracy.

H1: There is significant relationship between electoral political party nomination and the sustenance of democracy.

1.6 Significance of the study

The justification of the study lies in the fact that it will bring out the process involve in political party nomination as it determines the sustenance of democracy. It will also help political party to be fair and transparent in their choice of nominating candidate for political party. It will also expose the effect of the political party nomination on the peoples' choice in voting in an election.

1.7 Scope/Limitation of the study

This research work covers an empirical study on the effect of political party nomination and sustenance of democracy in Nigeria. The study focused entirely on political party. Therefore, the finding in this research work is guided or dependent on information derived from the sample party (All Progressive Congress). In the cause of the study, the researcher encounters some limitations which limited the scope of the study;

Time constraint: The researcher will simultaneously engage in this study with other academic work. This consequently will cut down on the time devoted for the research work.

Inadequate Materials: Scarcity of material is also another hindrance. The researcher finds it difficult to long hands in several required material which could contribute immensely to the success of this research work.

Financial constraint: Insufficient fund tends to impede the efficiency of the researcher in sourcing for the relevant materials, literature or information and in the process of data collection (internet, questionnaire and interview).

1.8 Definition of Terms

Political Party: A political party is an organized group of people who have the same ideology, or who otherwise have the same political positions, and who field candidates for elections, in an attempt to get them elected and thereby implement the party's agenda. They are a defining element of representative democracy.

Democracy: Democracy is a form of government in which the people have the authority to choose their governing legislation. Who people are and how authority is shared among them are core issues for democratic theory, development and constitution. In other words, Democracy is the government of the people, by the people and for the people.

Nomination: Nomination is part of the process of selecting a candidate for either election to a public office, or the bestowing of an honor or award. A collection of nominees narrowed from the full list of candidates is a short list.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, various scholastic views are reviewed critically and analytically on the different thematic issues of concern on the subject matter including democracy, Democracy Sustenance, Political Parties in Nigeria and the All Progressive Congress (APC).

2.1 Introduction

Democracy is unique both as a philosophy and as practice of government. Its uniqueness is jealously tied to the popular notion of pluralism or people's will. As system of government, it relies on mass mobilization of people and their involvement in the whole process of establishment and administration of government. This novelty of democracy could not have meant much except for the role of established political parties, which serve as the collection pod for people's ideas and interest about government of their Osaghae's (2011).

Through political parties, people actualize the opportunities provided by democracy to make input not only in the decision making process but in the process of selecting choice of leadership through competitive elections. Ikelegbe (2004) notes that elections denote voluntary participation, in the choice of leaders and bequeath or invest legitimacy on the leadership so choose, and a perfect system of election is a reflection of the level of political development and systemic stability in any democracy. If elections become a fundamental basis of democratic system, without prejudice to Osaghae's (2011) idea of fallacy of electoralism, which condemn the notion of reducing democracy to mere staging of elections, organization of the mass of people and articulation of their interest demands some level of organization which brings party organizations as basis for mass mobilization and interest aggregation.

The place of political party in a democracy goes beyond mass mobilization for election support only, but covers areas of political education and promotion of relative stability in the polity by serving as a connecting rod between the teeming populace and their representatives in power. This also becomes another significant relevance of political party, the access to power, and

recruitment of leadership through sponsorship of qualified members for elections makes political parties bedrock of a democracy especially in highly populated and plural societies.

Nigeria is among those African examples of grooming democracy which still finds stable party systems problematic (Appadorai 2004). At her independence in October 1960 following the end of British colonial administration, emphasis was on political parties as dominant actors in the political process and they (political parties) reflected more of ethnic and primordial interest rather than national. For instance, Northern People's Congress (NPC) portrayed itself as a party for the Northern people, and while the National Council of Nigerian Citizens (NCNC) dominated the political scene in the Igbo-dominated Eastern part, the Action Group (AG) commanded unrivalled support in the predominantly Yoruba-ethnic group- dominated West, subsequent efforts made by successive leaderships especially the Military in raising political parties with national appeals have yielded rather little result, therefore, from Second Republic (1979 – 1983) through the botched Third republic (1989 – 1993) down to the present era of democratic rule commencing in May 1999, political parties in Nigeria have made more sectional and narrow appeals than national, faced with lack of internal democracy as they all battle sustained system of internal strife. Whereas minimum conflict or disagreement is considered inevitable in any form of human organization especially in politics, as evident even among established democracies in the World, development and operation of a viable mechanism for internal-conflict management is strategic to the consolidation and stabilization of the group. In Nigeria however, primordial interest and self-based contestation have patterned internal organization of political parties, which often makes differences or conflict of interest irreconcilable (Johari, 2014). The trend is common to all the political parties, including the federal government led-party, All Progressive Congress (APC), the major national opposition party, People's Democratic Party (PDP), other minor opposition parties such as All Progressive Grand Alliance (APGA), Labour Party (LP), Accord Party (AP) and teens others. The parties are celebrated for floating structures that are not rooted in due process, rule of law, supremacy of party constitution and party discipline.

Meanwhile, for Nigeria, as for any other democracy, political parties' organization and comportment pose dare consequence for sustainability or stability of democracy itself. Political parties either oversee or control government depending on whether they are in government or in opposition, and this is why internal organization and cohesion of political parties holds daring implication for government success. Therefore, lack of internal democracy hampers parties',

especially the ruling party's capacity to effectively coordinate government and savours its democracy.

Caton (2007) criticizes that political parties are not exactly the darlings of public opinion. Just like politicians, parties usually get a bad rap: parties only want power; they abuse government and look after themselves rather than the public good. Political parties often fail to perform their crucial roles as associated with democracy adequately or with sufficient credibility. Some are fundamentally weak and rely heavily on the personal appeal of their leader. If parties are not properly connected to society due to lack of internal cohesion or absence of internal democracy, they will remain distant from voters' concerns.

Finally, the best person will not occupy political office if candidate selection is based on nepotism rather than on merit or democratic norm.

2.2 Democracy

Democracy is a small participatory community where every citizen plays a role in political decision-making with a constitutional guarantee of individual rights/rules of an individual mass opinion and where decisions are made by all members of a society and all are rational and well-informed in a community where the common good is decided by consensus after full debate (Cunningham, 2002:4). In the 3rd century BC, Aristotle emphasized that government might be exercised by few powerful people which is Aristocracy, proper rule by few known as Oligarchy, rule by one person known as Monarchy and a rule by majority decision making which is Democracy (Aristotle, 1986). Surprisingly, of the above four identified, Aristotle did not see democracy as the best as he settled for aristocracy (Edigheji 2004).

Modern scholars have given democracy a thorough and concise meaning in different ways for instance; Appadorai (2004), Varma (2005), Laski (2011), Kapur (2012), Johari (2014) and Arora (2016) identified democracy as a form of government that is operated based on the principle of collective decision, majority participation, supremacy of the electorates and a system in which people participate freely by contributing their quota in the running of their state. Democracy can be either liberal or social as the name implies. Liberal Western democracy is anchored along liberal values where the society is free for equal participation and free participation in the affairs of their state. It is a system encouraged by the USA and Western European countries. Socialist democracy is the one practice mainly by Eastern communist countries of Europe and China

where freedom of participation is limited, and decision making is restricted (Appadorai, 2004: 74). Democracy in its current form traced its root from the ancient Greek City States of Athens and Sparta where people gathered in the market square for collective decision making (Kapur, 2012: 143). In the modern days, population explosion made it impossible to practice such collective decision at once and that led to modern representative democracy where people elected their leaders through a popular vote to decide on their behalf (Johari, 2014:111).

Democracy has been variously defined and observed as a technique through which popular participation in government is organized and enjoyed among nationals of nation-states. Abraham Lincoln provided the simplest and widely held definition of democracy as, ‘government of the people, by the people and for the people’ (Wada Nas, 2004). The understanding that could be discerned from Lincoln's observation pointedly expressed is that democracy is an avenue through which popular participation of the masses is involved in the selection of their representatives, and varieties of definitions have centred on this notion.

The basic contention is that no compelling justification for democracy could oppose the view that people ought to be treated as political equals (Seward, 1998). In understanding this view, it can be clearly stated that, for democracy to thrive; it must supersede any hegemonic disposition. Nevertheless, democracy should be based on honesty, decency, and good governance whereby the will of the people in choosing their representatives is most effectively respected. Democracy construes man as the centerpiece and focal point of its body of operation. This is why sovereignty belongs to him just as power is vested in the people collectively and is administered by them or by officers appointed by them. However, in a general sense democracy is governed by multipartism, electoral competition, respect for fundamental human rights and equality before the law. Political theorists have often divided democracy into four components; contestation over policy and political competition for office; the participation of the citizenry through partisan but collective actions; accountability of the rulers to the electorates through the mechanism of representation, plurality and the rule of law, and, finally, civilian control over the military.

Democracy signifies rule by the people. It is the rule by demos, a citizens-body, consisting of members who are considered equal for the purposes of arriving at governmental decisions” (Dahl, 2012). Schumpeter (2002) focuses on electoral competition among political

elites and parties as bases of democracy; he opined that democratic method is that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the people's vote. In addition, most definitions of democracy now include the notion of respect for basic civil liberties: freedom of the press, freedom of speech, the right to habeas corpus, etc. This dimension is important because a regime can hold competitive elections with broad participation, yet in the absence of guarantees of civil liberties, it is not unequivocally democratic.

According to Edigheji (2005), a classical definition of democracy was offered by Huntington who conceives a political system as being democratic; "to the extent that its most powerful collective decision makers are selected through fair, honest and periodic elections, in which candidates freely compete for votes and in which virtually all the adult population is eligible to vote". This became the dominant way in which democracy was conceived. Despite the fact that scholars might have emphasized different aspects of it, there is a general consensus that liberal democracy has some basic principles, namely; citizen participation, equality, political tolerance, accountability, transparency, regular free and fair elections, economic freedom, control of the abuse of power, a bill of rights, the separation of the powers of the executive, the legislature and the judiciary, accepting the result of elections, human rights, a multiparty system and the rule of law. Edigheji (ibid) further posits that electoral democracy advances social and political rights. However, this concept tends to give greater premium to the professionalization of public policy, with a strong emphasis on political parties and civil society. This approach runs the risk of losing the fundamental sight of the fact that citizens make democracy.

In any tradition or approach adopted towards defining or understanding the concept of democracy, it will be evident that as a philosophy and form of organization of state, is direct opposite of authoritarianism or dictatorship, where mass mobilization and somewhat free opportunities for political choices are institutionalized. The degree of institutionalization may vary and that accounts for the need to discuss democracy sustenance.

2.3 History of Democracy

Liberal democracy has a checkered history. When voting, a key element of exercising one's political rights, was first introduced in today's liberal democracies, it was confined to a tiny

minority of propertied males (usually above 30) who paid taxes (Chang, 2002). Even then, the notion of “One Man, One Vote” was unheard of. Different male voters had different voting rights, depending on their age group, the amount of property they had and their levels of education. In France, for example, between 1815 and 1830 franchise was granted only to males above 30 years who paid at least 300 francs in direct taxes (Chang, 2002). This narrow definition of the “French people” meant that only 80,000-100,000 people out of a total 32 million (that is, 0.25% - 0.3%) of the population) could vote. Between 1830-1848, there was some relaxation of franchise requirements, but still only 0.6% of French people were allowed to vote (Kent, 1939; Chang, 2002). France, the exemplar of liberty, equality and fraternity, introduced universal *male* suffrage in 1848, that is, half a century after the landmark French Revolution of 1789.

In England, prior to the Reform Act of 1832 (a watershed event in the history of suffrage), many craftsmen and labourers with little or no property were disenfranchised. Voting power was monopolized by the landlords who could decide 39 of the 40 county elections through bribery, patronage or direct influence on the tenants (Dauton, 1998: 477-8). Even after this Reform Act, voting rights were only extended from 14% to 18% of the males. In Italy, voting was again pegged to one’s sex (i.e being male), one’s age, one’s level of education and the ability to pay tax.

The case of USA is also informative. In the USA – which obtained political independence from Britain in 1776 – voting was tied to wealth up until the 19th century. But some concessions were grudgingly made to the white-poor. In 1821, the state of New York, for example, removed property restrictions on white voters. African-Americans, however, had to have at least USD250, “a sum beyond the reach of nearly all the state’s black residents” (Foner, 1998: 74). By 1860, blacks (males only!) could vote on the same basis as the whites in five New England states (p. 74). The 1870 Fifth Amendment to the Constitution was, no doubt, a victory for African-Americans. It explicitly legislated against denying voting rights to anyone “on account of race, colour, or previous condition of servitude” (Garraty and Carnes, 2000: 445). However, substantial obstacles remained. As Foner (1998: 154) usefully points out, the Southern states subsequently disenfranchised African-Americans between 1890 (Mississippi) and 1908 (Georgia). These states invoked criteria such as poll tax obligations and property requirements (which also disenfranchised some poor whites) as well as literacy tests, which were applied to illiterate whites leniently (Garraty and Carnes, 2000: 473). The threat of violence kept even the

qualified black voters from registering and the fewer registered voters from voting. This state of affairs lasted till the 1965 Voting Rights Act, which was introduced after the Civil Rights Movement. In short, the USA – the proverbial haven of liberty and human rights – consolidated universal suffrage nearly two centuries after its political independence.

Universal male suffrage was attained in most advanced democracies of today by the end of the First World War (1918). But these countries were sectarian democracies. For one thing, the women and ethnic minorities continued to be disenfranchised. Most contemporary “democracies” attained universal suffrage after World War II. Finland obtained universal suffrage in 1944; France, Germany and Italy in 1946; Belgium in 1948; Japan in 1952; Australia in 1962; USA in 1965; and Canada and Portugal in 1970 (Chang, 2002). Australia and New Zealand were the first countries to grant voting rights to women (in 1903 and 1907 respectively) although Australia did not enfranchise non-whites (the aborigines) until 1962. Norway allowed votes for tax-paying women or women married to tax-paying men in 1907, although universal suffrage was only introduced in 1913 (Chang, 2002). Women were only allowed to vote in USA in 1920 and UK in 1928. In Sweden, women had (limited) voting rights in municipal elections as early as 1861, but they were not enfranchised till 1919. In many other countries (e.g. Germany, France, Finland, Switzerland), women were not allowed to vote until after World War II.

Even when the advanced capitalist countries achieved formal democracy, it was of poor quality, comparable to the flawed democracies of Africa today. Secret balloting, for example, was not common until the 20th century. In Prussia, employers could exert pressure on their workers to vote in a particular way (until the electoral reform of 1919), thanks to the lack of secret ballots. Norway, which was relatively advanced in terms of democratic institutions, only introduced secret balloting in 1884. France introduced the voting envelope in 1913 – several decades after the introduction of universal suffrage (cf. Kreutzer, 1996).

These pathologies of democracy were worsened by widespread anomalies of vote buying and electoral fraud. In British politics, for example, bribery, threats and promises of jobs to voters were common until the late 19th century. The first serious effort to control electoral fraud was the Corruption Practices Act of 1853-4 (O’Leary, 1962: 23-4). This Act, for the first time,

legislated against activities such as bribery, undue influence and intimidation. However, the measures remained ineffective (p. 24-5). The Corrupt and Illegal Practices Act of 1883 managed significantly to reduce electoral corruption, but the problem persisted well into the 20th century (Howe, 1979-80). In the USA, after the introduction of universal male suffrage, there were numerous cases of electoral fraud, vote-buying, forced “donations” to electoral campaign funds and other forms of corruption (Cochran and Miller, 1942: 158-9).

In the late 19th century, legislative corruption in the USA, especially the state assemblies, was alarmingly high. Theodore Roosevelt (a future president) lamented that the New York parliamentarians who engaged in open selling of votes “had the same idea about Public Life and Civil Service that a Vulture has of a dead sheep” (Garraty and Carnes, 2000: 472).

In short, the history of “good” “democratic” governance in today’s mature democracies has a sobering effect. It was after several decades of electoral reforms and social struggles (eg for female or black suffrage) that the advanced countries acquired the very basic trapping of democracy.

2.3 Democracy Sustenance

A political party is much more than an organization for seeking and controlling political power. More critically, it is an organization for expressing and harmonizing interests, and that intermediates between the citizens and political society, government and state (Ikelegbe, 2013:7).

There are numerous types of political parties such as elite-based parties, mass-based parties, ethnic-based parties, electoralist parties and movement parties (Gunther and Diamond, 2003). Political parties have been defined in different ways. Nnoli (2003) defines a political party as a group of people who share a common conception of how and why state power should be organized and used. Political parties have also been conceived as an instrument for contesting elections for the purpose of selecting candidates and parties to exercise political power (Yaqub 2002:122). A political party is simply a body of organized individuals whose ultimate aim and goal is to contest for governmental power through the instrumentalities of elections. While it should not be mistaken that the mere existence of political parties presupposes that a society is

democratic or otherwise, however, competitive and periodic elections have come to at least define the character of liberal democracy (Momoh, 2013:).

Political parties perform functions that include; mediating between citizens and state institutions; recruiting and preparing individuals for political leadership; organizing election campaigns; aggregating societal interests, and providing a participatory, responsive relationship with the people; political recruitment and training; education, socialization, breeding consensus, providing alternative world views and political communication among others (Pogoson, 2013:4).

A sustainable democracy is one that has reached the point of irreversibility to authoritarianism, (Osaghae 2011). In the absence of deep rooted democratic culture and practices, democracy remains formalistic and vague with threats of failure still apparent. Boyte (2004) aptly described unsustainable democracy as “When politics become the property of professional elites, bureaucrats and consultants, most people are marginalized in the serious work of public affairs. Citizens are reduced to secondary roles as demanding consumers or altruistic volunteers. Moreover, with the transformation of mediating institutions..., such as civil society think-tanks ... [this] became technical service providers – citizens lost all stake and standing in the public world.” Consequently, the democracy largely neglect the issues of economic justice - basic needs, such as access to food, shelter, medical care and housing, absence of equal opportunity for all citizens in terms of access to essentials for human existence. Gordon (1998) poignantly captured the essence of a democracy working in the opposite direction to sustainability or consolidation as that, “Democratic citizenship is undermined if there is too great a contradiction between the egalitarian norms of a democratic polity and the inequalities of individuals and groups in civil society. Glaring inequalities undermine democracy in two basic ways; first, by fuelling social discontent and political instability and, second, through the persistence of poverty, by excluding more or less extensive sections of the population from access to the political process and its fruits.” Awa (1991) however argued that democracy sustenance is management of effective system of delivery of some economic empowerment and a higher state of living for the people. A democracy that cannot deliver on the basic needs of the people will be short-lived. Thus in the view of some scholars, socio-economic justice is at the heart of democracy sustenance.

People or popular will is at the centre of discussion of democracy sustenance. To maximize degree of sustenance, however, citizens will have to be organized for participation in networks of consultative decision-making. It (democracy sustenance) encompasses improving the citizens' socio-economic conditions in a way that will lead to a qualitative improvement in their living conditions. This is the heart-beat of all developing nations like Nigeria and the focus of this paper.

Mainwaring (1990) holds that a democracy must meet three basic procedural criteria towards sustainability: (1) competitive elections must be the principal route to political office. There must be competitive popular elections for the legislature and the political executives. Fraud and coercion may not determine the outcome of democratic elections; (2) there must be broad adult citizenship. In recent decades, this has meant nearly universal citizenship. Almost all countries have some exclusion, criminals, the insane, military personnel and the illiterates are often among them. The illiterate, however, may be so numerous that their exclusion undermines the notion of generalized adult suffrage. It is impossible to establish an exact threshold at which exclusions mean that a regime is no longer democratic, in part because the tolerance for exclusions has diminished over time; (3) Democracies necessarily provide guarantees of traditional civil liberties for all; minority rights must be protected. Meanwhile, the level of democracy sustainability may not be concisely a factor in the local environment of the state alone, but sometimes certain aggressive factors in the external environment or foreign inducement shape the chances or otherwise of democracy consolidation.

2.4 Political Parties

Political parties are pre-eminent institutions of modern democratic governance. The general consensus in comparative political thought and among policy makers is that political parties play a central role in deepening and fostering democracy in both established as well as emerging democratic politics. This is aptly captured by the assertion that political parties created democracy and modern democracy is unthinkable save in terms of the political parties" (Schattschneider, 2002). The relevance of political parties in the organization of modern politics and governance is not a recent phenomenon of contemporary societies. Political parties have been part and parcel of political organization since the creation of the

nation state. As early as the 18th century, Edmund Burke described a political party as a body of men united for promoting, by their joint endeavours, the national interest upon some particular principle in which they are all agreed (Churchill, 2003). Modern political parties however exhibit three distinct characteristics lacking in Burke's definition. First, they have become more organized and centralized institutions with bureaucratic structures, secretariats and paid staffers.

Secondly, modern parties do not necessarily work towards a national interest, but any kind of interest including regional, ethnic, racial, religious or economic objectives. Parties are not organized along a particular principle as many manifest a conglomeration of varying interests, ideologies, principles and objectives. Third, political parties are largely organized with the sole objective of competing for and capturing political office (Hague and Harrop 2007). The nature, forms and functions of political parties have continued to evolve in response to socio-economic and political changes in society. Earlier conceptions of political parties have therefore demonstrably changed over time. The element of competition and striving to govern is a central component of modern political parties. Sartori (2005) aptly describes a political party as "any political group identified by an official label that present at elections, and is capable of placing through elections, candidates for public office.

This definition however still falls short of capturing the organizational as well as interest aggregation and articulation dimensions of political parties. Maliyamkono and Kanyongolo (2003) describe political party as an organized association of people

working together to compete for political office and to promote agreed-upon policies. The foregoing conceptualization of political parties is derived from a general consensus on the utilitarian and functional view of their perceived "usefulness" in modern democracies. According to Diamond (2007) the importance of political parties lies in the functions they perform in modern democracies by linking citizens to government. These include the articulation and aggregating of diverse interests, recruitment and preparation of candidates for electoral office, crafting policy alternatives and setting the policy agenda, organizing and participating in electoral competition and forming effective government and thus integrating groups and individuals into the democratic process. Consequently, political parties not only provide the means by which citizens can participate in the governance process, but also structure the

political landscape to enable competition between varying interests and policy objectives. This characterizes the classification of political regimes advanced by Dahl (1971) which categorizes democratic processes along the two dimensions of political competition and political participation.

2.5 Nigeria's Political Parties

The history of Nigeria's party politics since the coming into force of the 1979 Constitution, and even before it, shows strong deficits in the practice of competitive party and electoral politics. The persistent and seemingly intractable deficits include: (i) the personalization of politics, and the prevalence of the God-father syndrome; (ii) the negative influence of money; (iii) lack of internal democracy, especially the imposition of candidates; and (iv) election-related violent political conflict within and between political parties (Ibrahim, 2007; Ibrahim and Aturu, 2009: 34-46 cited in Jinadu, 2013: 5). The major parties in Nigeria have been near similar in composition, policy positions, manifestoes, ideological leanings and strategies (Omotola 2009:622-626). Consequently the parties are not organizational platforms for alternative views and programmes of governance and development but associations, factions, cliques, and networks for power and resource struggles, 'Bereft of clear ideological identity and commitment, and issue based politics (Omotola 2009:612).

The parties lacking in ideological content as a platform for action, identification, mobilization, legitimization and conflicts management (Nnoli 2003:181-183), the parties have turned to money, identity, patronage and violence. Beyond ideology and programmes, perhaps with a few exceptions, the performance of the parties in terms of organization, functions, operations and management has been dismally poor (Nwosu 2008:136). The parties are not democratic and popular organizations, as they have lacked basic liberal internal mechanisms, standardized rules and regulations for actual consultation and collective decision making. The parties being platforms for personal, sectional and patronage struggles and interests, have lacked a strong directive, controlling, disciplinary and unifying core that holds together (Omotola 2009:612).

Whilst political parties are at the core of democratization of Nigeria, evidence suggests that elections have been the weakest link in our quest for democracy in Nigeria (TMG, 2003; Anifowose & Babawale ed, 2004 cited in ikelegbe, 2013). This primarily arises from the fact that

the agencies and groups that are recognised to facilitate, moderate and participate in the elections have not taken the vocation with the best ethical and professional commitment (Adetula, 2008 quoted in ikelegbe, 2013). The political parties became vehicles for democratization. They not only undermined and prejudiced the highly flawed party primaries but they also determined its outcome. Ever since, internal party democracy and the selection of candidates have become a highly vexed issue. These group of people all constituted one-third of delegates (Momoh, 2013:14).

What they tend to do is to create channels for adversary relationships and facilitate a permanent opposition mentality. The nearest they appear to get to their conventional roles is to represent the democratic forms but not substance of promoting resolution of contending options. The Elite make use of them as mechanisms for perpetuating division and cleavages, fighting among themselves, securing power and intimidating their opponents (Tukur, 2004:570). Local leaders use them to obtain public office or influence or get businesses or settle scores. As for the general populations, their main purpose of joining or working for political parties tends to be for commerce, for blackmail, or to satisfy immediate requirements for small sums of money. So at the end of the day, the working of the parties results in factions, disagreements, rancour and violence. The outcome could be break-up and further creation of room for opportunists, exhibitionists and time-savers (Tukur, 2004:570).

The three main political parties during the First republic (1960-66) were seriously afflicted by ethnicity and were regionally based, with Nigeria People's Congress (NPC), National Council for Nigeria and the Cameroons (NCNC) and Action Group (AG) being more popular and obtaining their support and dispensing patronage to people of the North, East and West respectively. Politics then has been correctly described largely as one that was based on a tripod, which eventually constituted one of the major reasons for the collapse of that republic through the first Nigerian military coup of January 15, 1966 (Olagunju, 1992). It was in response to the problem of ethnicity as a major contributor to the collapse of the party system and the First republic, that the Murtala/Obasanjo regime decided to put policies in place that will re-position political parties for national integration during the Second republic (1979-1984) (Simbine,

2013:2). Hence, in the electoral provisions contained in the transition programme of that period, the military attempted to solve the problem of ethnicity in their formation and management by requiring political parties to have “national spread” and to be national in outlook and programme, in order to be eligible for registration and subsequent participation in elections (Simbine, 2013:2). Thus, only five political parties out of fifty political associations that applied for registration were eventually registered. These parties were the Great Nigeria People’s Party (GNPP), the National Party of Nigeria (NPN), the Nigerian People’s Party (NPP), Peoples Redemption Party (PRP), and the Unity Party of Nigeria (UPN) (Simbine, 2013:2). Taking the argument further and offering explanation to the events that culminated in the termination of the third republic, Simbine (2013:2-3) affirmed that:

During the aborted Third republic, two political parties were registered and allowed to operate namely, the National Republican Convention (NRC) and Social Democratic Party (SDP). Thereafter, under the Abacha transition programme, eighteen political associations applied for registration as political parties, out of which five were registered, viz: The Congress for National Consensus (CNC), the Democratic Party of Nigeria (DPN), the Grassroots Democratic Movement (GDM), the National Centre Party of Nigeria (NCPN) and the United Nigeria Congress Party (UNCP). The apparent bankruptcy and lack of distinctive ideology made former Attorney-General and Minister of Justice, Bola Ige, to describe the parties as “five fingers of a leprous hand”

In Nigeria, the long-drawn struggle for the return of power to an electorate came to pass when the Fourth Republic came into existence in 1999 (Abutudu, 2013:3). Political parties in the current dispensation euphemistically called the Fourth Republic essentially have had the same party structure as in the past, in which there is a National Working Committee (NWC), the zones, the states, local governments and the wards levels of operation (Momoh, 2013:12). Two key points summarizes the complicated existence and relations within and between political parties in the Fourth Republic. First is the proliferation of political parties in a manner that dwarfed those of previous republics. Second is the internal contradiction that has promoted fractionalization which in itself tends to promote the creation of new parties by aggrieved or

ambitious members (Momoh, 2013:12). Commenting on the character of the political parties of the fourth republic Abutudu (2013:5) opined that:

In general, the political parties that emerged in the fourth republic were hardly anchored on the forces that spearheaded the struggle against military rule. In fact, in most cases, the individuals who formed and dominated these parties constituted an integral part of the authoritarian political establishment, and participated in the so called democratic transition programmes with little or no regard for any prior liberalization of political space as a prelude to electoral contest. They were always part of any transition programme that the military chose, with little or no inclination to question its motives, logic or form. The isolation of the civil society from the actual process of party formation largely promoted a transition to a civil regime with military, authoritarian mind-set.

Nigeria's political parties emerged in the "historical-situation" or trajectory of disenchantment with military rule and militarism. However, the formation of the parties was so sudden and hurried. Similarly, Ware's typology of "weak penetration" by existing political parties is apt, but contrary to his claim that weak penetration will give ground to new political parties to win more voters or members, the evidence in Nigeria shows that new political parties are equally weak and have no convincing message to woo the electorate (Momoh,2013:8). All the political parties, including the party in government at the centre, are weak. All the political parties need to be organised on the principle of all inclusiveness, rather than exclusion (NAILS, 2005:249).

Agbaje, Akande and Ojo (2007: 82) were expansive and extensive in advancing events that culminated in Fourth Republic. Vivid and critical as their argument is, they offered three reasons for the event not mincing words in their declarations arguing that: There are three factors that need to be stressed in the struggle against authoritarian rule from the mid 1980s, and which have major implications for the nature of political parties and electoral processes that emerged in the Fourth Republic. First, the ideas and the forces that defined that struggle were not the ideas and forces that actually shaped the character of the transition and the Fourth Republic that emerged from it. Thus, those who shaped the rules of the Fourth Republic and who took over the reins of the state were not those who fought for democratic rule. Rather, those who shaped the rules, and

inherited state powers in the Fourth Republic were in essence, always closely associated with, or aligned with military rule. Often, they were political products of military rule.

Second and closely associated with the above is the fact of regimentation of the political transition process. The military was quite sensitive to the pressure from civil society to democratize, but it kept a close tab on the elaboration of the rules that governed the transition process as well as the constitutional framework of the Fourth Republic. Nowhere was this more pronounced than on the process of political party formation. Since 1979, military rulers in Nigeria had sought to control the party formation process by insisting on having to give formal recognition for political parties before they could operate as such. The rationale for this approach has been to prevent the emergence of political parties with ethnic, regional or religious colouration. These were in fact the bane of the political parties under the First Republic (Bogaards, 2010: 730). Parties thus, failed in their responsibility of contributing to the consolidation of democracy in Nigeria's First republic (Simbine, 2013:3).

In the third place, there is the prolonged political turmoil which arose from the annulment of the presidential elections of 1993 by the regime of General Ibrahim Babangida. The protests over this annulment forced General Babangida from Office in the same year, and brought in General Sani Abacha after barely six months of the interim contraption put in place by Babangida when he left office. The call for the validation of the 1993 elections won by Chief M.K.O. Abiola dogged Abacha for the five years he was in office although he did all he could to transcend that paradigm by coming up with his own transition programme and its full complement of five political parties. While these efforts of Abacha terminated with his demise in 1998, it has been argued that the origins of political parties in the Fourth Republic can be situated in the agitation for the validation of the June 12 (1993) presidential elections.

The controversial and sudden death of General Sanni Abacha (the then head of state) signaled the commencement of the fourth republic. Upon his sudden death, General Abdulsalami Abubakar, as it was alleged, who was to have been retired by General Abacha, along with other senior military officers on June 8, 1998 (Iroanusi, 2000: 178), emerged as the new Head of State on June 9, 1998. He was essentially preoccupied with organising another transition to civil rule

while attempting to re-enact a collaborative foreign policy with countries that had regarded Nigeria as a pariah state (Fawole, 1999 and Adebajo, 2006: 10-16).

In stating the premises upon which he arrived at a conclusion for dissolving all the five political parties, former Head of state, General Abdulsalami Abubakar stated that, ‘in particular, democratization was marred by maneuvering and manipulation of political institutions, structures and actors. In the end, we have only succeeded in creating a defective foundation on which a solid democratic structure can neither be constructed nor sustained (Gen. Abubakar, 1998)’. Thus, he doubted that the parties could be the strong pillars and instruments through which democracy can be cultivated and entrenched, maintaining that these qualities were certainly lacking in the Nigerian political space (Simbine, 2013:3-4). Abdulsalami’s transition programme essentially threw up three major political parties: Alliance for Democracy (AD), All Peoples Party (APP) and the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) (Momoh2013:11).

In the march towards the Fourth republic, the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) initially granted provisional registration to nine (9) political parties in 1998 (Simbine, 2013:4). The 1999 elections ushered in the Fourth Republic. Three political parties contested the elections. These were the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP), the All Peoples Party (APP) and the Alliance for Democracy (AD). The political parties that had sought to engage the emerging democratic order were 24 (Abdu, 2002: 94). However, only three were registered by the Independent National Electoral Commission to assume the status of political parties. This was with the condition that after the local government elections of that year, those that had 10% votes and above in at least 24 states of the Federation would qualify to contest the subsequent State and Federal elections (Simbine, 2013:4).

This was after supposedly surmounting the constitutional huddles of showing that they were not sectional, ethnic, or religious party and that their membership and support bases were sufficiently reflective of the diversity of the country. The empirical test of this national spread requirement was the nationwide local council elections conducted in 1998. Actually, the AD did not exactly pass the test “but was nevertheless registered. The government felt this was the only way that the South West which had sustained the pro-democracy agitation since 1993, would participate in the transition programme, thereby lending it credibility” (Agbaje, et al 2007: 84)

A major feature of the Fourth Republic is the proliferation of political parties, that primarily do not seek to contest elections, but which are in more ways limited and self serving in roles and interests. Though the number of political parties was 30 in 2002, 33 in early 2006 and 50 in 2007, only 16 fielded candidates in the 2003 General Elections while only 26 contested the 2007 General Elections. Even the parties that contested the elections were merely “temporal machines for electoral contests” (TMG, 2003:18).

Thus the major parties, Peoples Democratic Party (PDP), Alliance for Democracy (AD), Action Congress of Nigeria (ACN), and All Nigeria Peoples Party (ANPP) were plagued by deep internal crises, disorder, recurring tensions and turmoil manifested in factional fighting, expulsions and counter-expulsions, multiple executives and dual offices. There is a high level of money politics, political vagrancy, indiscipline and in-cohesion (Omotola 2009:612). Some months into the Fourth republic, with Obasanjo as President, politicians began to clamour for the registration of more parties. The federal government initially refused to register more political parties, a development that forced the unregistered associations to seek redress in court (Simbine, 2013:4).

With Court judgment in their favour, it appeared that a floodgate was opened for parties to seek and get registered. Thus, while about 30 political parties contested during the 2003 elections, the number grew to 63 as the 2011 elections drew near. As of April 2013, only 25 political parties are recognized by the election management body (Simbine, 2013:4). With the registration of the new political parties; All Progressives’ Congress (APC) which is a product of a merger from the three main opposition parties: Action Congress of Nigeria, All Nigerian people’s party, Congress for progressive Change and factions of two other parties) People’s Democratic Movement (PDM), Independent Democrat (ID) the number of the political parties still stand at 25.

What became the three dominant parties in 1998 viz Alliance for Democracy (AD), Peoples Democratic party (PDP) and All Peoples Party (APP) later (ANPP) had huge military presence both in their formation and membership, particularly the latter two parties. As such, from the outset the behaviour of the political parties was heavily influenced by a culture of militarism while some of the parties were preponderantly constituted by militicians. In addition, they

lacked ideological rooting. However, the Fourth Republic has been characterised by numerous internal crises, godfather politics and factionalisation within political parties (Momoh, 2013:13).

At the 1999 Presidential election, Chief Olusegun Obasanjo of PDP had contested against a coalition of two other parties (APP and AD) which had brought forward Chief Olu Falae as presidential candidate (Momoh, 2013:13). The election was however not free and fair while traces of ethnic politics still manifested in the creation of political parties as AD had its main followership in the south west. But while the 1999 elections were not free nor fair, the 2003 General Elections were characterised by fraud, miscounting, rigging, and malfeasance. In addition, the election was not issue-oriented, the political parties lacked well-thought out programmes and manifestos, the executive lord over the other two arms through actual disrespect of ruling or threat of impeachment and blackmail, (Momoh, 2006: 71-73).

The 2007 General elections could best be described as *electoral Tsunami* or what have been euphemistically referred to as Direct Capture (DC), within the overall strategic framework of Primitive Accumulation of Votes (PAV). In early stages of PAV political parties rigged elections and although the state was generally not neutral, its institutions were used (instrumentalised) for the purpose of achieving PAV “In other words, state institutions were first captured by private interests, particularly political parties, and then deployed for PAV” (Ibeanu, 2009: 15).

Political parties in Nigeria are not keen about deepening democracy; rather they are more preoccupied with the crude capture of power. They have abandoned their traditional role of membership recruitment and mobilisation, and political education (Momoh, 2013:27). With the emergence of godfathers, owners and joiners, political nomads and the use of uncivil means to win elections, Nigerian political parties have continued to contribute to de-democratisation. The central challenge of party system dwells on party processes, inter-party relationship, violence, and other ecological factors (Momoh, 2013:27).

In contra- distinction, Jinadu (2013:6) rising to the defence of political parties in Nigeria especially in the fourth republic contend that:

This is not to say that all has been bad or that all has not been well since May 1999. It is only to point to creeping and indeed deepening contradictions, which require urgent policy action. The action is urgent, if the considerable and obvious progress the country has made towards deepening democratic transition since 1999 in the following areas is not to turn into a fleeting mirage: (i) continuing commitment to federalism; (ii) the political succession, in line with constitutional fixed term limits and/or through democratic elections, at the federal and state level, even if still problematic and controversial in several respects; (iii) the ebb and flow in the watchdog role of the legislature and judiciary especially at the federal level, under the separation of powers; (iv) the apparent subordination of the military to civilian control; (v) the vibrancy of the civil society as democratic sentinel; and (vi) the limited, though not inconsequential, success of democracy-promoting institutions, such as the independent national electoral commission, the national human rights commission and the economic and financial crimes commission.

2.6 Political parties and democratic process in Nigeria's fourth republic

In the march towards the Fourth republic, the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) initially granted provisional registration to nine (9) political parties in 1998 (Simbine, 2013:4). The 1999 elections ushered in the Fourth Republic. Three political parties contested the elections. These were the People's Democratic Party (PDP), the All Peoples Party (APP) and the Alliance for Democracy (AD). The political parties that had sought to engage the emerging democratic order were 24 (Abdu, 2002: 94). However, only three were registered by the Independent National Electoral Commission to assume the status of political parties. This was with the condition that after the local government elections of that year, those that had 10% votes and above in at least 24 states of the Federation would qualify to contest the subsequent State and Federal elections (Simbine, 2013:4).

This was after supposedly surmounting the constitutional huddles of showing that they were not sectional, ethnic, or religious party and that their membership and support bases were sufficiently reflective of the diversity of the country. The empirical test of this national spread requirement

was the nationwide local council elections conducted in 1998. Actually, the AD did not exactly pass the test “but was nevertheless registered. The government felt this was the only way that the South West which had sustained the pro-democracy agitation since 1993, would participate in the transition programme, thereby lending it credibility” (Agbaje, et al 2007: 84)

A major feature of the Fourth Republic is the proliferation of political parties, that primarily do not seek to contest elections, but which are in more ways limited and self-serving in roles and interests. Though the number of political parties was 30 in 2002, 33 in early 2006 and 50 in 2007, only 16 fielded candidates in the 2003 General Elections while only 26 contested the 2007 General Elections. Even the parties that contested the elections were merely “temporal machines for electoral contests” (TMG, 2003:18). Thus the major parties, People’s Democratic Party (PDP), Alliance for Democracy (AD), Action Congress of Nigeria (ACN), and All Nigeria Peoples Party (ANPP) have been plagued by deep internal crises, disorder, recurring tensions and turmoil manifested in factional fighting, expulsions and counter-expulsions, multiple executives and dual offices. There is a high level of money politics, political vagrancy, indiscipline and in-cohesion (Omotola 2009:612). Some months into the Fourth republic, with Obasanjo as President, politicians began to clamor for the registration of more parties (Simbine, 2013:4). With the registration of the new political parties; All Progressives’ Congress (APC) which is a product of a Merger from the three main opposition parties: Action Congress of Nigeria, All Nigerian people’s party, Congress for progressive Change and factions of two other parties) People’s Democratic Movement (PDM), Independent Democrat (ID) the number of the political parties still stand at 25.

At the 1999 Presidential election, Chief Olusegun Obasanjo of PDP had contested against a coalition of two other parties (APP and AD) which had brought forward Chief Olu Falae as presidential candidate (Momoh, 2013:13). The election was however not free and fair while traces of ethnic politics still manifested in the creation of political parties as AD had its main followership in the south west. But while the 1999 elections were not free nor fair, the 2003 General Elections were characterised by fraud, miscounting, rigging, and malfeasance. In addition, the election was not issue-oriented, the political parties lacked well-thought out programmes and manifestos, the executive lord over the other two arms through actual disrespect of ruling or threat of impeachment and blackmail, (Momoh, 2006: 71-73).

Political parties in Nigeria are not keen about deepening democracy; rather they are more preoccupied with the crude capture of power. They have abandoned their traditional role of membership recruitment and mobilization, and political education (Momoh, 2013:27). With the emergence of godfathers, owners and joiners, political nomads and the use of uncivil means to win elections, Nigerian political parties have continued to contribute to de-democratization.

Political parties are seen as inevitable in establishing the necessary link(s) between the state, civil society and democratic consolidation. They are the gatekeepers and the measuring political barometer for indicating the degree and effectiveness of the practice of democracy. Being the heart of democracy, they make and/or mar a stable political system (Kura, 2011:270). Some of the functions/role of political parties include: governance, representation, policy making and execution, interest aggregation and articulation, peaceful change of government, making government effective and responsive (opposition parties function also as pressure group), accountability, social and integration functions. In sum, wherever a political party exists, it tends to perform common functions at different stages of economic, social, political and judicial development (Kura, 2011:270).

In this milieu, political parties hold, perhaps, the highest recruitment and mobilization potential in Nigeria's democracy, yet they have squandered it on the platter of opportunism and narrow-minded and self-seeking interests. Rather than give direction to membership, political parties are being hijacked and manipulated by a few members who bifurcate the party by differentiating between "owners" and "joiners". In some cases, some political parties are subcontracted to those characterized as Candidate-members (Momoh, 2010).

In a democracy, political parties perform a number of functions, topical among which are two, namely (i) being principal instruments for contesting elections, the election being staged to select candidates as well as parties to exercise political power (authority) (Yaqub, 2002), and (ii) being instruments of political education, interest aggregation, political socialization, and political recruitment. Either in government or in opposition, political parties are expected to perform these two crucial functions in addition to others, depending on the character of the political system in which they operate.

These anchors of democratic consolidation are expected to create material and psychological conditions, and institutional processes to serve as powerful bulwarks against a reversal or regression to the sad historical experience with the practice of competitive party and electoral politics in the country's First and Second Republics. In this respect the significance of political parties for sustainable democracy and elections is that, under conditions of competitive party and electoral politics, and the conduct of free and fair elections, whose outcome is expectedly ex ante indeterminate (Przeworski, 1991), political parties (i) present the electorate with a choice of candidates and programmes from which to choose, and in doing so (ii) help to decide which party or coalition of parties should govern for a fixed number of years. The requirement of competitiveness and the ex-ante indeterminacy of the substantive outcome of elections is what distinguish the party in a liberal democratic political system, from the concept of the party in an authoritarian or one-party political system (Jinadu, 2013: 3).

The relationship between a viable political party system and democratic consolidation is evident. Political parties are the heart of democracy and without which, democracy cannot function (Adele 2001:35). Political parties are an essential component of democracy and central to an understanding of how politics works. Political parties are also the crucial link between the citizens and the government in a democracy. There can be no meaningful democracy without a properly functioning party system (Agbaje, 1999; 192). While democracy rests on the informed and active participation of the people, political parties are viable tools in this regard. Democracy exists where the foremost leaders of a political system are selected by competitive elections in which the bulk of the population has the opportunity to participate. Evidently, the condition of the parties, in a political system, is the best possible evidence of the nature of any democratic regime (Anifowoshe, 2004:59).

2.7 The All Progressive Congress (APC)

The All Progressive Congress (APC) was formed on 6 February 2013 in preparation for the 2015 General Election. The APC is an outcome of the merger of three biggest opposition political parties and a faction of the fourth one to establish a stronger opposition that will challenge the ruling PDP which has ruled for straight sixteen years. The parties that formed APC merger are: Action Congress of Nigeria (ACN), All Nigeria Peoples Party (ANPP), a faction of All

Progressive Grand Alliance (APGA) and Congress for Progressive Change (CPC). The merger was a result of a prolonged attempt to wrestle power from PDP because the opposition parties realized that they can never defeat PDP individually since each of the opposition has its stronghold. For instance, ACN dominated the Southwest, ANPP and CPC dominated the Northeast and Northwest while APGA dominated some Southeastern states. The first attempt was made in 2011 between the ACN and CPC which failed to materialize in the late hours due to clash of personal interests by the party stalwarts (Retrieved from <https://ngvotes.com/history-of-all-progressives-congress-apc-nigeria/> 16 February, 2018).

The major challenge faced in the merger of APC was an attempt that was allegedly believed to have been staged by the ruling PDP to scuttle the registration of the party by sending other parties called African People's Congress and All Patriotic Citizens with the same abbreviation 'APC' to deny the actual APC from being registered owing to its strength and threats to the ruling PDP. The electoral body; Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) went ahead to register the APC after fulfilling all the criteria for registration of parties constitutionally. The major boost or strength that the newly established APC received was the emergence or decamping of strong PDP members called the new PDP which was a faction that emerged after disenchantment of some members of the PDP from the party's convention in 2014. The party welcomed the new PDP members involving five state Governors of Adamawa, Kano, Kwara, Rivers, and Sokoto, ten serving Senators in the upper chamber, 22 serving Members Federal House of Representatives including the Speaker of the House and other top PDP founding fathers such as Alhaji Atiku Abubakar.

The party's major contribution was its ability to win the Presidential Election barely two years after its formation with 53.96 % of the total votes; the party won most of the seats in the upper chamber with 55.05 % and the lower chamber with 62.5 % and the Governorship seats was won by the party with 61.29 % (INEC, 2017).

2.8 Internal Democracy

Internal democracy is the process of consolidating wider democratic principles and the method of instituting party politics and discipline in political parties. It is an avenue where

political parties foster the transparent means of party nomination or primaries, ideological underpinnings of members and maintenance of discipline and order. Internal democracy expresses the basic principles of democracy within political parties (Jude & Ika, 2013). Internal democracy is the assumption that transparency, accountability and fair play in terms of equal opportunity should be available and accessible to all party members as observed by (Okhaide, 2012, Ojukwu & Olaifa 2011, Liebowitz & Ibrahim 2013 and Hallberg 2008).

In the absence of internal democracy, a great problem ensued which tramples the tenets of democracy and democratic values and this problem is intra-party conflicts. Intra-party conflict has been known to have taken place in Nigerian democracy and Nigerian political parties since the First Republic (1960-1966). However, its manifestations become more pronounced in the Fourth Republic (1999-Date) perhaps, because of the longer democratization period ever witnessed in the history of the country. Intra-party conflicts have many implications on Nigerian political parties and democratization including cross-carpeting, violence, anti-party activities, instability, poor governance and other obstacles to proper democratization as argued by Jude & Ika (2013), Toyin (2014) and Awofesu & Irabor (2016).

Internal democracy denotes various means of carrying along all party members in internal party decision making and other deliberations (Scarow, 2004). Duverger (1963) emphasises that internal democracy is the pillar behind a proper functioning of democratic system. In a different way, Sartori (1977) observed that the logic of party competition is what made a vibrant functioning democracy and not internal democracy.

Internal democracy is an all inclusive top to bottom approach party decision making involving party primaries, representation, accountability and fair ground for all members to be carried on board by the party internally (Okhaide, 2012).

Internal democracy or intra-party democracy means parties have an agreement laid down procedure and principles of mutual decision making and avoiding of conflict or managing it in order to prevent arbitrary decision or imposition of candidates as against the majority members wish. Internal democracy is vital for democratic consolidation and representation. It provides a room for proper recruitment of members, socialization, training, discipline, accountability and transparency. Any party that lacks internal democracy is considered as undemocratic even though no political party can declare itself as undemocratic even if it is so. Some factors can

undermine internal democracy by arbitrary leadership in the party and marginalization of some party members. The effects of absence of internal democracy create anti-party activities, conflicts, failure in election and deviation from the principles of democracy (Omilusi, 2016).

Internal democracy involves parties' selection of candidates, consultation, internal principles of party discipline and sanction, promotion of parties' ideology, accountability (Awofeso, Obah-Akpowaghaga & Ogunmilade, 2017). Hallberg (2008) identified two major methods of promoting internal democracy: the advocacy and legal/regulatory measures. The advocacy perspective includes selection of party leaders, party representative for election, collective decision making and peaceful negotiation. The second aspect is legal/regulatory means which should consist of party constitution, gentleman agreement on principles and regulations governing representation, minority consideration, negotiation and punishment for members.

2.9 Effects of godfathers on internal democracy

The emergence of godfather in the Nigerian political scene is posing a great threat not only to political parties but also to good governance, socio-economic development, and stability of democratic governance (Chukwuemeka, 2012). He states that one of the most disturbing and damaging influences of godfathers in Nigeria's fourth republic is in the domain of making nonsense of a truly free, fair and credible electoral process in which the electorates by right are expected to freely elect people of their choice into public office to represent their interests. In a study titled "political godfathers and governance in a developing democracy: insight from Nigeria, Nkwede, Ibeogu, and Nwankwo (2014) used descriptive and content analysis to investigate whether political Godfathers affects good governance in Nigeria. The study found that Godfathers has threatened the country's nascent democracy. The study concludes that among other thing, competitions among godfathers to control state powers and resources through their favoured godsons and daughters have denied the electorate the right to elect their preferred candidates, thereby rendering elections and electoral processes ineffective to the disenchantment of other party members. Besides this, the struggle for control of state power has also resulted in some worst electoral violence in the country.

In Nigeria, the majority of the people regard godfather phenomenon as a huge challenge to internal democracy. This is because the godfathers use their influence as the major financier of the party to impose candidates on the people or substitute a candidate who has been duly elected to fly the flag of the party during general elections. The imposition or substitutions are always necessitated by disagreement between the godfather and the godson on what should be gains of the godfather (Ikejiani-Clark, 2008). As Ngige (2008) has observed, the magnitude of the mafia-style phenomenon of godfathers is also demonstrated by how the godfathers decide party nominations and campaign outcomes. He noted further that when candidates resist the godfathers use violence to deal with the situation. He posits that the godfathers are mainly interested in controlling the party machines instead of presenting popular candidates for healthy electoral competitions. He observes that with such control of the party organization, godfather cum APC has various ways of eliminating popular candidates from the so-called party primaries. The problem, however, is that when such unpopular candidate eventually becomes the winner through manipulations in the election, he/she enjoys less support because the godfather will always be around to recoup his investment and when the godson refuses to honour the agreement, war always ensues between them.

For instance, Bassey and Edet (2008) observed that in Anambra State, the problem of Godfathers has done more harm in the PDP than in any other place, particularly in the gubernatorial position taken at different times. As he recounted, from 1999-2003, the battle was between Dr.Chinwoke Mbadinuju and his godfather, Emeka Offor. Dr.Mbadinuju refused to dance to the tune of his godfather and as a consequence, Mbadinuju lost bid for the second tenure as the pressure from his godfather made him perform far more below expectations in governance. The bickering and acrimony raised by the two actors are yet to settle when two others emerged. Chief Chris Uba and Dr. Chris Ngige. Uba was the godfather of Ngige as the governor of Anambra State, 2003-2006. Ngige refused to pay back his godfather the necessary commission and patronage. Since then, peace never returned to the seat of power in Anambra State. Eventually, appeal court declared Mr. Peter Obi as the winner of the 2003 gubernatorial election in Anambra State in March 2006 and this marked the beginning of scattered elections in Nigeria in this political dispensation (Ogbeide, 2012; Okoli and Ali, 2014; Olorungbemi, 2014; CDD, 2017). Similar situations occurred in Enugu State, Ebonyi and Oyo States. Therefore,

candidate imposition by godfathers does not only affect the party's internal democracy but also the generality of the people who would be or are always at the mercy of the godfather in terms of welfare that would have come from good governance (Kura, 2014; Badejo and Obah-Akpowoghaha, 2015; Okonkwo and Unaji, 2016; Okafor and Aniche, 2017).

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Methodology

Survey research will be used for this research work. However, library information will also constitute reasonable percentage of the data used in the work.

3.2 Data Gathering Instruments

3.2.1 Questionnaire

The research instrument use for data collection for this study is a four factor structured questionnaire. The questionnaires will be issued to the literate and learned with closed ended questions and open ended where necessary.

3.2.1 Secondary Data

There will be a general review of relevant literatures such as textbooks, journals and other printed documents, magazines and newspapers. Unpublished works will also be consulted.

3.3 Population of Study

The Population of the study comprises of all elected government officials in All Progressive Congress in Ogun State.

3.4 Sample of Study

The simple random sampling that is, sampling with replacement was used to sample 50 elected officials out of the total population that formed the study population.

3.5 Sampling procedure

The questionnaires were administered personally on 50 government officials. The respondents will be required to tick (✓) against an option that best suited their opinion

(strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree). Some of the administered questionnaires completed will be retrieved at the spot while others will be collected at much a later date.

3.6 Validity of Research Instrument

Validity is the ability of a test to measure that the investigation purported to measure. To ensure face validity of the instrument a draft of the questionnaire will be presented to the research lecturer for necessary correction and recommendation will be made to improve the quality of Instrument.

3.7 Method of data analysis

The data collected in the course of this study will be presented both descriptively and statically. The descriptive method deals with the presentation of the variables of the study (in relation to the subject) such as the profiles of respondents.

The descriptive method is employed to enable explain answers obtained from interview process and questionnaires presented to respondents.

Statistically, data will be presented with the use of tables to show the frequency of respondents and their responses to research questions presented in the questionnaire.

The Simple Percentage (%) method for the presentation and analysis of numerical data will be used to test the hypothesis posited for the study.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter contains the results of data analysis. The general descriptions of the data were presented. Data were analysed using the descriptive analysis such as frequency counts, percentages, while the inferential analysis of Chi - Square was used to test the research hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

4.2.0: Demographic Data of the Officials

Table 4.2.1 showing Officials` Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	38	76	76	76
	Female	12	24	24	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.2.1 revealed that 38 (76%) of the respondents were male while 12 (24%) were female.

Table 4.2.2 showing Officials` Age Range

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	30 – 40 years	15	30	30	71.7
	40 years above	35	70	70	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.2.2 revealed that 15 (30%) of the officials were between the age of 30 – 40 years while 35 (70 %) were 40 years above.

4.3.0 Research Question One

What is the effect of political party on nomination of candidate for political posts?

Table 4.5.1: showing officials responds on nomination of candidate

Environmental factors	YES		NO		Total
	O	E	O	E	
Party members nominates candidate for political posts perform well	35	70	15	30	50
Party hierarchy hand pick candidate for political posts perform well	10	20	40	80	50
Political party nomination is based on interest to run for election	38	76	12	24	50
Political party nomination is based on ability to lead the people	16	32	34	68	50
Political party candidates are picked outside the party members to run for election	12	24	38	76	50
Total	111		139		250

$$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$$

$$\text{Degree of freedom (df)} = (R - 1)(C - 1)$$

Where R = The number of rows, C = The number of column

$$\text{Then df} = (2 - 1)(5 - 1) = 1 \times 4 = 4$$

$$\chi^2 - \text{Calculated value} = 29.02$$

The critical χ^2 value at 4 df is 7.8147 [i.e. $\chi^2 (3, 0.05) = 7.8147$]

Since, the calculated value (29.02) exceeds the critical value (7.8147), this implies that, political party nomination of candidate for political posts has great effect on the nation and the people govern.

Research Question Two:

What is the influence of wrong flag bearer of the party on the decision of the people to vote for the party in an election?

Questions	YES		NO		Total
	O	E	O	E	
Wrong flag bearer is easily accepted by the people	15	30	35	70	50
Wrong flag bearer of the party affects the outcome of the election negatively	45	90	5	10	50
Wrong flag bearer of the party don't have anyone to vote for them in the elections	10	20	40	80	50
Wrong flag bearer of the party end up stepping down for another party candidate	8	16	42	84	50
Wrong flag bearer of the party send the right message to the people	5	10	45	90	50
Total	83		167		250

$$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$$

$$\text{Degree of freedom (df)} = (R - 1)(C - 1)$$

Where R = The number of rows, C = The number of column

$$\text{Then df} = (2 - 1)(5 - 1) = 1 \times 4 = 3$$

$$\chi^2 - \text{Calculated value} = 48.49$$

The critical χ^2 value at 3 df is 7.8147 [i.e. $\chi^2(3, 0.05) = 7.8147$]

Since, the calculated value (48.49) exceeds the critical value (7.8147), this implies that, wrong flag bearer for the party affects the decision of the people. The people disregard the party and do not vote of the party. The political party lose the position to another political party.

Research Question Three:

What is the connection between nomination of candidate by political parties and the sustenance of democracy?

Questions	YES		NO		Total
	O	E	O	E	
Nomination of candidates in political party helps to uphold democracy	45	90	5	10	50
Hand picking of candidates upholds democracy	10	20	40	80	50
Elected candidate rule democratically	35	70	15	30	50
Sustenance of democracy depends on the nomination of candidates from political party	48	96	2	4	50
Total	138		62		200

$$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$$

Degree of freedom (df) = (R – 1)(C – 1)

Where R = The number of rows, C = The number of column

$$\text{Then df} = (2 - 1)(5 - 1) = 1 \times 4 = 3$$

χ^2 - Calculated value = 31.79

The critical χ^2 value at 3 df is 7.8147 [i.e. $\chi^2 (3, 0.05) = 7.8147$]

Since, the calculated value (31.79) exceeds the critical value (7.8147), this implies that, there is a connection between nomination of candidate by political parties and the sustenance of democracy. Democracy should be practiced in political parties in other to ensure that the candidate of the people takes the leadership of the nation.

Research Question Four:

What are the possible ways of improving the process of political party nomination in sustaining democracy?

	YES		NO		Total
	O	E	O	E	
Nomination should be done by party leaders	20	40	30	60	50
Nomination should be done by all members	40	80	10	20	50
Internal democracy should be encouraged	45	90	5	10	50
Transparency on nomination of candidate should be encouraged	50	100	-	-	50
Total	155		45		200

$$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$$

Degree of freedom (df) = (R – 1)(C – 1)

Where R = The number of rows, C = The number of column

$$\text{Then df} = (2 - 1)(4 - 1) = 1 \times 3 = 3$$

χ^2 - Calculated value = 31.79

The critical χ^2 value at 3 df is 7.8147 [i.e. $\chi^2 (3, 0.05) = 7.8147$]

Since, the calculated value (31.79) exceeds the critical value (7.8147), this implies that, in sustaining democracy there is need for political party to improve the way they nominate candidate to contest for an election by encouraging internal democracy and transparency.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

The Study focused on Political Party Nomination and Sustenance of democracy in Nigeria, A case study of APC. The study employed qualitative design as it intended to seek respondents' opinion on how they experience factors for affecting academic achievement of the selected Schools. The sample was purposeful and it involved 50 respondents both. Interviews, Focus group discussion and documents were employed as data collection methods.

5.2 Summary of Findings

The first research question inquired: The effect of political party on nomination of candidate for political posts. The results showed that nominations in political party go a long way to affect the decision of the people and in turn affect the sustenance of democracy. It was gathered that some political hierarchy often times hand pick who will run for an election neglecting the internal democracy of the party.

The second research question inquired on how wrong flag bearer of the party influences the decision of the people to vote for the party in an election. Wrong flag bearer of the any political party often times affects the voter's decision for the party. The voters have come to understand the kind of internal democracy played political party hierarchy and they decide who they will vote for. A wrong candidate of the political party can cause the party to lose the election to other party.

The third research question intended to know the connection between nomination of candidate by political parties and the sustenance of democracy The result showed that the sustenance of democracy solely depends on the nomination of candidate by political party. Election starts from nomination of candidates from the political party which speaks

volume of the outcome of the election at large. Therefore, to sustain democracy the nomination process should fair and transparent.

Lastly, the fourth research question seeks to know the possible ways of improving the process of political party nomination in sustaining democracy. The results shows that to sustain democracy political party should be transparent and allow all members to participate in the process of nomination of any political candidate. This will give room for proper assessment of all candidate.

5.3 Conclusion

The analyses of this study have to pinpoint the problems of neo-liberalism in Nigeria and how to renew the democratic virtues, rebuilding traditional institutions system of justice, law and ‘new’ democracy in the country. The study has tried to bring to fore the illusion of party unity among the country’s political parties with more emphasis on the fourth republic. And also, the study expedites actions on how to ensure democratic renewal and sustainable development in Nigeria with scientific inquiry that through proper political orientation, the masses would say no to political violence that can emanates from misuse of liberalism.

Consequently, the work of democratization must be viewed an ongoing process and democrats everywhere are to be involved in struggle to consolidate and extend the realization of democratic principles. Several conditions are thoughts to be conducive to the germination, growth and sustenance of the democratic system. First, it has to be desired by the people who must also be prepared to strive and sacrifice to attain it. The citizens must be willing to tolerate opposing views and show respect for the lives of other people. While the majority must act in tolerant way, the minority must learn to accept the decisions of the majority. In effect, for democracy to thrive, it is necessary that the people be broad – minded and have a liberal disposition. The recognition of these paradoxes has led, not only, to the call for the broadening of the notion of democracy but also to incorporate socio-political and economic advancement of the masses.

5.4 Recommendations

1. The party must go back to the drawing board and establish some rules governing intra-party relationship and members conduct ahead of 2019 General Election;
2. The party should discipline or sanction those who are disobeying party principles;
3. Those who are creating confusion in the party should be suspended from contesting any political office against 2019 in order to ameliorate the crises;
4. The party needs to call for a genuine national convention to draw an ideology and principles of operation that all members must signed and agree on;
5. The committee set up for reconciliation should endeavour to identify the root causes of the crises and their nature and make a feasible recommendation for implementation in order address the issue and
6. Collective decision and transparent party activities should be promoted effectively.

REFERENCES

- Abimbola, J. O. and Adesote, S. A. (2012) Party Internal Democracy and the Challenge of Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria, 1999 – 2011: A Historical Analysis *Journal of Social Science and Public Policy* Vol. 4, Cenresin Publications, pp. 46 – 57.
- Adebayo, P. F. (2006) ‘Political Parties: Formation, Development, Performance and Prospects’ In Ojo, D. (ed.) *Challenges of Sustainable Development in Nigeria*, Ibadan: John Archers, pp. 63 – 71.
- Adeosun, A.B. (2014). Democracy and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria’s Fourth Republic: Issues and Challenges. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 19(10), 05-10.
- Adibe, J. (2015). *The 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria: The Issues and Challenges*. Washington: Brookings Institution.
- Agbaje, A. (2008). Political Parties and Pressure Groups’ in Anifowose, R. and Enemuo, F. (Eds) *Elements of Politics*. Lagos: Sam Iroanusi Publishers.
- Akinboye, S. O., and Anifowose, R. (2008). Nigerian Government and Politics, in Anifowose, R. and Enemuo, F. (Eds) *Elements of Politics*. Lagos: Sam Iroanusi Publishers.
- Aleyomi, M.B. (2013). Intra-Party Conflicts in Nigeria: The Case Study of Peoples Democratic Party. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 15(4), 281-296.
- Aleyomi, M. B. (2010) Consolidating Nigeria’s Democracy through Effective Management of Electoral Violence *Political Science Review*. Vol. 5(1), pp. 1 – 29.
- Aleyomi, M. B. (2013) Intra-Party Conflicts in Nigeria: The Case Study of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*. Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 281 – 296.

- Anifowose, R. (1999) 'Political Parties and Party System in the Fourth Republic of Nigeria: Issues, Problems and Prospects' in Olurode, L. and Anifowose, R. (eds.) *Issues in Nigeria's 1999 General Elections*, Lagos, Nigeria: John West Publications, pp. 55 – 78.
- Bains, H. (1992) Democratic Renewal, *Discussion Weekly*, Vol. 1 No. 1.
- Baker, B. (2000) Can Democracy in African be Sustained? *Commonwealth and comparative politics*, Vol. 38.
- Bartolini, S. and Mair, P. (2001) 'Challenges to Contemporary Political Parties', in Diamond, L. and Gunther, R. (eds.) *Political Parties and Democracy* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 327 – 343.
- Baylis, J. (2011) 'International and Global Security', in Baylis, J. et al (eds.) *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations* 5th Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burnell, P. (2004) *Building Better Democracy: Why Political Parties Matter*, London: Westminster Foundation for Democracy.
- Campbell, J. (2013) *Nigeria: Dancing on the Brink* (2nd Edition), USA: CFR Book. Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 1 – 92.
- Carothers, T. (2006) *Confronting the Weakest Link. Aiding Political Parties in New Democracies* Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Caton, M. (2007) Political Parties: Necessary for Democracy?: The Crucial Role of Party Assistance for Strengthening Democracy, *International IDEA*, <http://www.idea.int> (Retrieved on September 15, 2013).
- Diamond, L. and Gunther, R. (2001) 'Types and Functions of Parties' In Diamond, L. and Gunther, R. (eds.), *Political Parties and Democracy* USA: The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 1-39.

- Dode, O. R. (2010) Political Parties and the Prospects of Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria: 1999-2006. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, Vol. 4(5) Pp. 188-94.
- Doyle, M. (1997) *The Ways of War and Peace* New York: W. W. Norton, p. 280.
- Elischer, S. (2008) Do African Parties Contribute to Democracy? Some Findings from Kenya, Ghana and Nigeria, *Afrika Spectrum* 43(2), pp. 175 – 201.
- Eme, O. I. and Anyadike, N. (2011) Intra and Inter-Party Crises in Nigeria's Fourth Republic: Implication for the Sustainability and Consolidation of Democracy in Post Third Term Nigeria *Journal of Social Science and Public Policy* Vol. 3, Cenresin Publications, pp. 38 – 52.
- Field, B. N. & Siavelis, P. M. (2008) Candidate Selection Procedures in Transitional Politics, *Party Politics* 14(5), pp. 620-639.
- Harvey, D. (2007) Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction, *the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 610, pp. 22 – 44.
- Held, D. (1996) *Models of Democracy* Cambridge: Polity, 2nd Edition p. 25.
- Kemahlioglu, O. R. et al (2009) Why Primaries in Latin American Elections?, *Journal of Politics* 71(1), pp. 339-352.
- Lamy, S. L. (2011) 'Contemporary Mainstream Approaches: Neo-realism and Neo-liberalism', in Baylis, J. et al (eds.) *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations* 5th Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lindberg, S. (2004) The Democratic Qualities of Competitive Elections: Participation, Competition and Legitimacy in Africa. *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 61 – 105.

- Macho, O. (1994) 'Democracy in Africa: A Theoretical Overviews' In Omoruyi, O. et al (eds.) *Democratization in Africa: Nigeria Perspective*, Benin: Hima & Hima Ltd, pp. 12 – 13.
- Martinez, E. & Garcia, A. (2005) What is Neoliberalism? A Brief Definition for Activists *Corpwatch*, <http://www.corpwatch.org> Retrieved July 11, 2013.
- Olagunju, T. (2000), 'Building Party-Based Democracy, in Nigeria', in Ibrahim, Y. L. and Haruna, D. (eds.) *Democracy, Good Governance and Development in Nigeria*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books, pp. 62 – 75.
- Omodia, S. M. (2010) Political Parties and Party Politics in the Nigerian Fourth Republic, *Trakia Journal of Sciences*, Vol. 8(3).
- Omotola, J. S. (2009), Nigerian Parties and Political Ideology *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences*, 1 (3), Guild of Independent Scholars, New York, USA, pp. 612-634.
- Omotola, J. S. (2010) Political Parties and the Quest for Political Stability in Nigeria *Taiwan Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 6(2), Pp. 125-145.
- Onwudiwe, E. & Berwind-Dart, C. (2010) "Breaking the Cycle of Electoral Violence in Nigeria", *United States Institute of Peace*, Washington, DC.
- Osimiri, P. (2013) An Ethical Critique of Neoliberal Development in Africa, *Covenant Journal of Politics and International Affairs*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 62 – 71.
- Panicker, A. (2013) Neoliberalism, Counter-Hegemony and Politics of Civil Society: A Study of the Plachimada Movement in Kerala, India *International Journal of politics and Good Governance* Vol. 4, No. 3.
- Scholte, J. A. (2000) *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*, New York: Palgrave.
- Shehu, A. T. (2012) Strengthening Judicial Intervention in Electoral Disputes in Nigeria, *African Journal of Social Sciences* Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 74 – 88.
- The 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (as amended).
- The Transparency International Corruption Index, 2013.

- Tyoden, S. G. (1994) 'Party Relationship and Democracy in Nigeria' In Omoruyi, O. et al (eds.) *Democratization in Africa: Nigeria Perspectives*, Benin: Hima & Hima, pp. 119 – 122.
- Van de Walle, N. (2007) 'Meet the New Boss, Same as the Old Boss? The Evolution of Political Clientelism in Africa', in Kitschelt, H. and Wilkinson S. I. (eds.) *Patrons, Clients, and Policies: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 50 – 67.
- Weart, S. (1998) *Never at War: Why Democracies Will Not Fight One Another* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, p. 90.