

**GODFATHERISM AND INTERNAL PARTY DEMOCRACY:  
A STUDY OF THE PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC PARTY (PDP) IN ANKPA, OMALA,  
AND OLAMABORO OF KOGI EAST SENATORIAL DISTRICT (2011-2015)**

**BY**

**Seidu SULE,  
B.Sc. Political Science (KSU), 2012  
(P15SSPS8038)**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES,  
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA, NIGERIA  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF  
(M.Sc) IN POLITICAL SCIENCE**

**DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES,  
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES,  
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,  
ZARIA**

**JUNE, 2021**

## DECLARATION

I declare that this dissertation titled “**Godfatherism and Internal Party Democracy democracy: A Study of the People’s Democratic Party (PDP) in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro of Kogi East Senatorial District (2011-2015)**” is as a result of my research effort and to the best of my knowledge has not been presented anywhere else for the award of (M.Sc) in Political Science, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria. All quotations and citations made in this work have been duly acknowledged in the references.

Seidu SULE

---

Name of Student

---

Date

## CERTIFICATION

This dissertation; “**Godfatherism and Internal Party Democracy: A Study of the People’s Democratic Party (PDP) in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro of Kogi East Senatorial District (2011-2015)**” has been read and approved as a partial requirement for the award of Master of Science (M.Sc), in Political Science of Ahmadu Bello University Zaria, Nigeria.

Dr. Jacob Audu _____	_____	_____
Chairman, Supervisory Committee	Signature	Date
Dr. David, O. Moveh _____	_____	_____
Member, Supervisory Committee	Signature	Date
Dr. RahanatuLawal _____	_____	_____
Head of Department	Signature	Date
Prof. Sani A. Abdullahi _____	_____	_____
Dean, School of Post Graduate Studies	Signature	Date

## **DEDICATION**

This work is dedicated to Almighty Allah; and my beloved uncles, brothers and friends, Suleiman Musa, Dr. Gabriel Musa, Isiaka Oseni, Sule Yakubu, Isah Ogohi, Tairu Drisu, Victoria Agama, Muhammed Aishat Endurance (my baby), Danladi Yusuf and mama Laruba. I also wish to appreciate the entire lecturers of the Department of Political Science of Ahmadu Bello University Zaria for their encouragement and for being patient with me through out the period of this study.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and fore most, I wish to appreciate the support of Almighty Allah who granted me the grace and privileged of writing this dissertation. Its success is to His glory. While reflecting on the number of people and scholars who played key roles in helping to organise this work. I wish toacknowledge the contribution of my supervisors, Dr. Audu Jacob and Dr. David O. Moveh and Dr Mekudi. Your many useful pieces of advice and corrections provided the direction for this work. I appreciate you for always being available and for making this work better. No doubt, you have provided me with solid foundation from which to build a career and i will be forever grateful.I also appreciate friends and relatives that contributed in one way or the other to making this program a success. Worthy of mention, is Mrs Eleojo Audu. In addition, I thank Yakubu Yunusa, Muhammed Lawal,Aunty Asana Yusuf, Mr.Vincent Udama, Hamza Abdul,Seidu Shafiu, Lawal Muhammed, Haruna Ibrahim, Ocholi Suleiman, Amina Oseni, Tairu Drisu, Sule Yakubu, Juwera Suleiman ( Aunty), Hajara Suleiman, Iliyasu Abubakar, Blessing Omorogbe, Brother Egbunu Isah, Ezekiel Adukwu, Fatimo Yusufu, Mama Aiba Ogbadu, Mrs Mabel Okpanachi Oseni, David Ndah, Haruna Muhammed, Akoh Charity, Musa Yakubu, Morgan Ilemona and finally Mallam Hassan Garba the Registrar Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria for their immense contributions towards this work.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Content	Page
TITTLE PAGE .....	ii
DECLARATION.....	iii
CERTIFICATION .....	iv
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	xi
LIST OF ACRONYMS .....	xii
ABSTRACT .....	xiii
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Background to the Study.....	1
1.2 Statement of Research Problem.....	3
1.3 Research Questions.....	4
1.4 Aim and Objectives of the Study.....	4
1.5 Research Assumptions .....	5
1.6 Significance of the Study.....	5
1.7 The Scope of the Study .....	6
1.8 Limitations of the Study.....	7
1.9 Working definitions of Terms .....	7
1.10 Organisation of the Chapters.....	8
CHAPTER TWO.....	9
LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	9
2.1 Introduction.....	9
2.2 Literature Review: .....	9
2.2.1 The Origin, meaning and nature of godfatherism .....	9
2.2.2 godfatherism In Nigeria.....	16

2.3 Concept of Political Party .....	21
2.4 Concept of Democracy.....	24
2.5 Concept of Internal Democracy .....	31
2.5.1Challenges of Internal Democracy .....	34
2.5.2 Godfatherism and Internal Democracy.....	36
2.6 Godfatherism and Regional Politics in Nigeria .....	37
2.7 People’s Democratic Party and Internal Democracy .....	46
2.7.1 Principle Adopted by People's Democratic Party to Promote Internal Democracy .	49
2.7.2 People’s Democratic Party (PDP) Constitution and Internal Democracy.....	50
2.8 Fourth Republic Experience (1999 – 2015) .....	52
2.9 Gap in Literature .....	59
2.10 Theoretical Framework.....	59
2.11 Review of Empirical Studies: A study of Kwara and Oyo.....	63
<b>CHAPTER THREE.....</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>68</b>
3.1 Introduction.....	68
3.2 Research Design.....	68
3.3 Location of the Study .....	69
3.4 Sources of Data Collection .....	70
3.5 Population of the study and Sample Size .....	70
3.6 Sample Size Determination .....	71
3.6.1 Sampling Technique.....	72
3.7 Method of Data Collection .....	73
3.7.1 Quantitative Data .....	73
3.7.2 Qualitative Data .....	74
3.8 Method of Data Analysis .....	74
<b>CHAPTER FOUR .....</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>4.0: DATA PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION AND ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>75</b>
4.1 Introduction.....	75
4.2 Bio Data of the Respondents .....	76
4.3 Godfatherism and Internal Party Democracy in the Study Area .....	78
4.4 Discussions of Major Findings.....	87

4.5 Discussion of Findings .....	88
4.6 Godfatherism and Internal Party Democracy .....	90
CHAPTER FIVE .....	92
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	92
5.1 Summary .....	92
5.2 Conclusion .....	92
5.3 Recommendations.....	93
References.....	95
APPENDICES .....	105





## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 4.1: Age Distribution of Respondents .....	76
Table 4.2: Gender of Respondents.....	76
Table 4.3: Marital Status of Respondents .....	76
Table 4.4: Occupation of the Respondents .....	77
Table 4.5: Educational Qualification of Respondents .....	78
Table 4.6: Did godfather factor affect the conduct of PDP primary election in your constituency in 2011? .....	78
Table 4.7: What factor worked against your party in 2011 election in your constituency? .....	79
Table 4.8: Did the influence of godfathers affect equal participation by all PDP members in decision making in your constituency in 2015 elections? .....	80
Table 4.9: Were the rules and regulations guiding PDP primary followed? .....	81
Table 4.10: Was the primary election of PDP in 2011 elections in your constituency free, fair and credible? .....	82
Table 4.11: Did PDP candidates in 2011 election emerged out of consensus or election? .....	83
Table 4.12: Was the PDP primary election in 2015 in your constituency free, fair and credible?.....	83
Table 4.13: Did the PDP primary election for the post of the House of Representative in 2011 election in your constituency held at the constituency headquarters or outside? .....	84
Table 4.14: Have the PDP leaders respect PDP constitution?.....	85
Table 4.15: Have inclusiveness of rank and file members in taking decision has effect on internal arrangement of PDP in your constituency .....	85
Table 4.16: What measures do you think can be put in place to address the influence of godfatherism on the internal affairs of PDP in your constituency? .....	86

## **LIST OF APPENDICES**

Appendix 1: Questionnaires.....	105
Appendix 2: Interview guide .....	107
Appendix 3: Names of Interviewees.....	110

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

ABU .....	Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
ACN .....	Action Congress of Nigeria
AG .....	Action Group
APC .....	All Progressive Congress
APGA .....	All Progressives Ground Alliance
IDI .....	In-depth Interview
KIL .....	Kashim Ibrahim Library
KSU .....	Kogi State University, Anyigba
LASU .....	Lagos State University, Lagos
NCNC .....	National Council of Nigeria Citizens
NEPU .....	Northern Elements Progress Union
NNDP .....	Nigeria National Democratic Party
NPC .....	Northern People's Congress
NPN .....	National Party of Nigeria
NRC .....	National Republican Convention
PDP .....	People's Democratic Party
SDP .....	Social Democratic Party
UPN .....	Unity Party of Nigeria

## **ABSTRACT**

Godfatherism has become a challenge to the functioning of internal party democracy particularly in developing countries of the world. Godfatherism has influence on internal party democracy in developing countries than developed World. In (2011-2015), in Kogi State (Kogi East in particular), people experienced undue interference by the political godfathers which undermined the internal party democracy of many political parties. (This undue interference by the political godfathers has affected basically the internal democracy of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) in the period under study). The broad aim of this study is to examine godfatherism and internal party democracy: A Study of the People's Democratic Party in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro of Kogi East Senatorial District (2011-2015). The objectives of this study area: to assess the influence of godfatherism on internal party democracy of the People's Democratic Party in the study area, to examine the nature of political godfatherism in the study area, to find out whether the influence of political godfatherism can be addressed in the study area. Elite theory was adopted as a theoretical framework. The researcher obtained data from both primary and secondary sources. A sample of one hundred and forty nine (149) respondents were derived from the population of the key stakeholders of People's Democratic Party at the ward level in the study area. In-depth interview was conducted at the Local Government level with the key stakeholders of the party. Data was qualitatively and quantitatively presented and analysed using simple percentage. The research found that lack of respect for PDP constitution, lack of proper conduct of primary elections, lack of inclusiveness of rank and file members of PDP and unequal decision making have affected the internal democracy of the People's Democratic Party in the study area. The research proffers the following recommendations: first, there is need for every members of the party to respect the party constitutional laid down rules and regulations as regard to the conduct of both primary and general election in the study area; secondly, political awareness campaign should be put in place to address the influence of godfatherism on internal party democracy.

# **CHAPTER ONE**

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Background to the Study**

In developed and developing countries of the world, godfatherism has become one of the central elements of democratic system. It exists in many countries such as America, Germany, France and many African countries. When the issue of godfatherism gained entrance into Nigerian politics, it became a different thing. With the gradual institutionalisation of democracy, godfatherism has taken its toll on the politics of the country, thereby causing disaffection, disharmony, disunity and conflict among various political and interest groups. It has led to intra- party division within many political parties and consequently undermined the unique features of democracy in Nigeria (Francis,2015;1)

However, Nigeria has experienced tremendous role of godfatherism on the choice of party candidates. The implication is that contestants no longer rely on their popularity among the electorate and party party manifestos but on their choosing godfathers to help them secure electoral victories. This whole process undermines the usual popular sovereignty and other attributes that make democracies unique and preferable than other system of government (Korike, 2011: 113).

Political parties have been facing all sort of anti-democratic activities including electoral manipulations and malpractices during primary and secondary elections. More often than not, both primary and main elections have been characterized by all kinds of illegal means of selecting party representatives and generally lack of internal party democracy (Dike,2003). Evidence from research reports has revealed that most Nigerians believe that internal party democracy does not affect the reliability of the elections but also the quality

of leadership, governance and the general welfare of the populace (Sartori and Duverger, 2012).

According to Okoli and Alih (2014), intra-party opposition, with particular reference to (PDP) experienced in Nigeria fourth republic (1999 to date), has been complicated by the issue of godfatherism which the outcomes are inimical to the sustenance of democracy in Nigeria. It has led to the utter destruction of the party structure and ethos of (PDP) in many states in Nigeria.

Kogi State is a heterogeneous state that is largely dominated three main ethnic groups, the Igala, Ebira and the Yoruba in three senatorial districts. The eastern part is dominated by Igala people. The Igala people have been controlling the highest political offices in the state since 1999. The Ebira dominate the central part of the state and Okun, (the Yoruba speaking) dominate the western part of the state (Yusuf, 2006).

There are three major political parties between 1999-2011 in Kogi State (PDP, ACN and CPC) among others in the state. These parties are just there on paper but in the real sense, it is a one-party state controlled by the political godfathers. People's Democratic Party (PDP) since 2003 in the state has not been working towards a healthy democratic state due to lack of internal democracy. Credible choice was not always guaranteed and this has affected the progress in the internal political arrangement of the Peoples Democratic Party in Kogi State and Kogi east in particular.

Internal democracy is the method of including the party members in intra-party deliberation and decision making. It is a democracy within the party and the extent to which a party subscribes to and abides by the basic democratic tenets (Susan, 2004)

Internal party democracy is a key ingredient of any democratic system of government. This is because democracy ought to begin from the parties and how they choose their candidates for election proper. If candidates are chosen other wise than in line with the tenet of democracy, the political space would be tainted and no true democracy can be said to be in existence. A key ingredient of internal democracy is that every candidate interested in an elective office should be given an opportunity to test his popularity within the party through transparent and inclusive candidate's selection process. Anything short of this is a total deviation from the democratic norms and principle.

## **1.2 Statement of Research Problem**

Godfatherism has effects and influence on the choice of party candidates in the politics of many countries. Since Nigeria returned to democratic rule, it has continued to experience an unprecedented rise in political violence ranging from, armed robbery, political assassination, kidnapping and poor governance as a result of the crisis loomed between godfathers and godsons (Gideons, 2010).

However, experience has shown that the application of this concept mostly results in democratic failure and as a result of the fact that members of society are denied the right to elect the candidates of their choice into political and appointive positions, the whole experience has been that of pains and domination arising from poor performance and poor service delivery among godsons.

In recent democratic experiment, many political parties in Nigeria find it very difficult to adopt an open electoral system for democratic sustainability due to the influence of political godfathers. The challenge as a matter of fact is internal (intra-party) democracy in political parties. One of the parties in Nigeria before (2015) election where lack of internal party

democracy is very visible is the People's Democratic Party (PDP). It is against this background that this study examines the godfatherism and internal party democracy of the People's Democratic Party (PDP): A Study of Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District (2011-2015).

### **1.3 Research Questions**

The study is guided by the following research questions:

- i. What is the influence of political god-fatherism on internal party democracy of the (PDP) in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District?
- ii. What is the nature of political godfatherism in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District?
- iii. How can the influence of godfatherism on internal party democracy of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) be minimized in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District and Nigeria in general?

### **1.4 Aim and Objectives of the Study**

The aim of the study is to examine the relationship between godfatherism and internal party democracy: A Study of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District (2011-2015). However, the specific objectives of the study shall be to;

- i. Assess the influence of political godfatherism on internal party democracy of the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District (2011-2015).



- ii. To examine the nature of political godfatherism in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District
- iii. To find out whether the influence of godfatherism on the internal party democracy of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) in Ankpa Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District can be address.

### **1.5 Research Assumptions**

The study is guided by following assumptions:

- i. Godfatherism influence internal party democracy of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) in Ankpa, Omala, and Olamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District (2011-2015) elections.
- ii. The nature of political godfatherism determined internal party democracy in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District.
- iii. Influence of political godfatherism on internal party democracy in the study area can be addressed by aggressive political awareness and respect for party constitution

### **1.6 Significance of the Study**

This study is significant on the basis that existing literature discussed the influence of godfatherism on internal party democracy of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) in many states in Nigeria, and not in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District. A lot has been written on internal party democracy and its consequences but, scanty on the specific influence of godfatherism on internal democracy

of(PDP) since 1999. To the best knowledge of this researcher, no such study has been conducted in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District.

Furthermore, the study will provide the future researchers and readers with valuable information through its findings regarding the influence of godfatherism on the internal party democracy of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District.

It will also serve as a reference material to students in the field of political science to build upon in order to make political parties in the study area and Nigeria as a whole more institutionalise and democratic in nature

Indeed, the study of the influence of godfatherism on internal party democracy of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) will be of immense benefits to policy/decision makers, politicians, scholars, students and civil society organisation on how to overcome the problems of godfatherism in Nigeria

### **1.7 The Scope of the Study**

The study examined the relationship between godfatherism and internal democracy of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District (2011-2015). The justification for the choice of this period is that, it was a period where the imposition of candidates is rampant in Peoples Democratic Party in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District. For instance, the the imposition of the former governor Son to represent the seventh assembly from this constituency. More so, chairmen and councillors were imposed

through the influence of dominant individuals in the party which affected the party within the period under study

### **1.8 Limitations of the Study**

One of the challenges encountered in the field was the delay by the respondents in the study area to grant audience to the researcher. (However, the researcher's visit to People's Democratic Party (PDP) offices in the three (3) local governments that constitute the constituency actually yielded good result since the interviews were conducted with the keystone holders.)

There was also a challenge of accessing respondents who do not understand the concept of godfatherism and internal democracy. Notwithstanding, this challenge was overcome through the use of research assistants who are card-carrying members of PDP in the study area.

Finally, lack of cooperation by some respondents was another challenge encountered when administering the questionnaires.

### **1.9 Working definitions of Terms**

**Agodfather** could refer to a person who sponsors or provides care or support for a person or project. In the same token, it could be used to describe a person directing an illegal and criminal organisation. Godfatherism is a term used to describe the relationship between a godfather and godsons (Akinola, 2009)

**Political godfatherism** connotes the sponsorship of contestants in an election by a wealthy and influential individual or groups who in turn expects protection and other forms of reward or privileges(Ume, 2004)

**Democracy** is a government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation usually involving periodically free elections(Chafe,1994)

**Political parties** are the principal mechanism for ensuring citizen participation and representation in public policy and in fact through which an individual share democratic value (Nwankwo,2001)

**Elite** is a group of person exercising the major the major share of authority or influence within a larger society. That is, they are set of people with the highest indices in their areas of endeavour (Constantine, 1968)

**Internal Democracy**, also known as intra- party democracy, refers to the level and methods of including party members in the decision making and deliberation within the party structure (Majudi, 2013)

### **1.10 Organisation of the Chapters**

This dissertation is organised into five interrelated chapters. Chapter one includes introduction, statement of research problem, research questions, aim and objectives of the study, research assumptions, significance of the study, scope and limitations of the study and working definition of terms. Chapter two deals with literature review and theoretical framework. Chapter three deal with methodology. Chapter four contained analysis and interpretation of data and five is summary, recommendations and conclusion

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

This chapter reviews relevant literature on the subject matter. The reviews are thematically organized as shown below. It also provides theoretical framework showing its relevance and limitations.

#### **2.2 Literature Review:**

##### **2.2.1 The Origin, meaning and nature of godfatherism**

The concept of godfatherism has its origin in Christianity (especially the Catholic faith), it implies a situation in which a man is chosen to act as a father to a Christian child or husband and wife to act as godparents to a Christian child in order for the latter to become god-fearing, obedient and law abiding (Udo,2011). The concept is a Christian relationship that exists between a godfather with a sacred responsibility in the Christian faith to help nurture and train a child (the godsons) with the expectation that the godson becomes a mature and successful adult (Isaac, 2005)

The idea of godfather and godson is more religiously inclined and of a moral value to the spiritual growth and development of the godson. At baptism, the godson is formally initiated into the church. He is put under the supervision of the godfather who now becomes a role model, guiding the spiritual life of the godson so that he does not go astray from the Christian precepts. Here, godfatherism is used in the positive sense of the word so as to help promote morality and uprightness in the Church (Coker, 2004)

This is a situation where godfather sponsors or supports their benefactors or godsons and gives them advice on how to excel in their areas of assignments. The relationship creates a mutual atmosphere capable of enhancing social intergraion and provide good governance (Anekwenze,2004).

The concept of godfathers is widely practiced in all parts of the world, but here in Nigeria, it has assumed a disturbing and worrisome dimension. These godfathers offer the service of their support only in anticipation of financial returns that are alarmingly huge and extravagant as opposed to that of their service to the people (Edigin and Lambert, 2010)

Godfatherism means the systematic expression of the bourgeois power in doing or undoing a common cause of action or public interest. It assumed a notorious dimension because of its preponderance for evil in our contemporary society, so much so that at the mention of the word 'godfather' what comes to mind is the America- Mafia film in which certain gun wielding and drug cabal held a whole nation captive (Ailamenkhue, 2010).

Godfatherism is a political phenomenon that denotes the activities of few political leaders choosing and imposing new political leaders in their respective political formations outside the concerns of the mass political societies. They control and influence the country's economic and political affairs and structures by authoritarian political attitude outside the concerns of the masses and the constitutional and democratic principles and concepts. The

manipulation by godfathers reflects a lack of internal and true democracy in the political parties. There are imposition of candidates, zero conduct of party primaries, and where they are held at all, the winning aspirant often gets supplanted by an anointed candidate who either did not have a good showing at the exercise or may not even have contested in the instance (Udoh,2016) .

Political godfatherism connotes the imposition of political candidates by powerful sponsors, tending to complete possession for the purpose of selfish gratification (Mbamara, 2004, Bassey, and Enetak, 2008) The godfather is the political slave merchant while the godson is the political slave or slave boy or political article for sale. The godson is purchased with big sum of money under a democratic oath. Their aims and objectives include appointments, stealing, robbery and looting of government treasury. The decision making, appointments and contract awards are usually manipulated by the godfather. In the words of Ajayi (2014); Chukwuemeka, Oji and Chukwuma(2013), godfatherism is a kind of politics where an influential person in a popular or ruling party will assist someone usually the godson to emerge as a winner in any elective post in a political system either by all means, he will help him to emerge victorious in the state irrespective of whether such a candidate is popular or not. Political godfatherism represents a self-seeking individual who is out to use the government for his own purpose. The effects of this incident is enormous to the state as what usually obtains is that when the incumbent godson is at pains to satisfy the whims and caprices of his godfather among other competing demands on the scarce resources of government, the interest of the larger number is savagely undermined. This according to Joseph (1999) has left democracy in Nigeria to assume the form of prebendalism.

Overtime, it became a popular lexicon of politics like mafianism which describe a formidable power bloc with enormous influence like Kaduna mafia (Bala and Tyden, 1987). Mafians are strong socio-economic and political elites with shared political values and interest within an organized structure headed by political godfather. The activities of political godfathers make politics attractive to criminals as noted by Coker (2010). This is because of the use of violence which denies the emergent regimes any form of legitimacy because they emerge as a regime without any social contract with the people (Kew, 2010). This is because godfatherism perceives winning election as the ultimate end of democracy (Animasawun, 2013). Collier (2010) identifies guns, wars and coups as technologies of political violence in the third world countries. In Nigeria, godfatherism remains one of the ills in the political process since 1999. This is because it has configured public office like an eatery which only the godfather gives the ticket to whoever he likes and once any beneficiary disobeys him, he gets him out of the eatery (Adebanwi, 2010).

Danoye (2004,) see godfather as a human being who plays god to his people. He provides their basic needs tends for them, protects them and assists them to secure and achieve their objectives. He further states “his support could be seen as investment, which he believes must yield some profits in the future”. This is also peculiar to godfathers powerful blocs that have tremendous influence in the society such as Kaduna mafia (Bala and Sonni, 1987). In the words of Akinola (2009), a godfather is a kingmaker, boss mentor, and principal, while a godson is the beneficiary and recipient of the legacy of godfather. He further states that” godfather is someone who has built unimaginable respect that secures victory for candidate of his choice”. He continues by saying that the politics of godfatherism involves the anointing of a godson who is expected to win an election by using the influence, wealth, political structure and political experience of a godfather.



According to Isaac (2005), the word godfather conjures up different meaning to different people. In many parts of Europe and America, it is simply associated with a cuddly uncle. The words have almost the same meaning in the Catholic Church tradition. A young man trying to become baptized or married in the Catholic Church is expected to have a godfather. The Catholic Church godfather is simply chosen from among the larger congregation and need not be a relative to godson. The later counsels the young person on how to live a responsible life. In France, the term ‘godfather of industry’ is used to depict corporate titans, that is businessmen with most clout, and an intriguing class of people who keep the economy running. The French ‘godfather’ can be broken-down into two types: the first are those who manipulate the economy for their own benefit, and the second are those that can be referred to as crisis fixers, social reformers, and populist advocates of the poor. Another type of godfather is often seen in America ‘cowboy films’. Such people are associated with mafia gangs in the films. The godfather is usually a big boss, he surround himself with all manner of criminal, often violent clientele. The later take orders from the big boss and defer his good judgments in virtually all things. The godfather defend his adopted sons when they run into problems, either with law enforcement agents or members of other gangs (Albert, 2005).

Several attempts have been made by scholars to look at the etymological meaning and nature of political godfatherism. Political Scientists and Philosophers look at it from different perspectives based on their ideological and intellectual orientations. Some scholars such as Ume (2004) argued that political godfatherism in developing countries is part of institutional building and that is still part of development while at the same time constitute the heaviest milestones of any country.

According to Kamal (2011), the concept of godfatherism in Nigeria politics is not a new phenomenon. It has been in existence right from the inception of party politics in the country. This concept of godfatherism in politics implies a dominant individual in politics of an area or geo political zone who is capable either by virtue of her/his influence, past record or current political power of determining who wins election in that area or zone.

Azeez (2014), observes that in Africa and other developing countries godfatherism has become a central point of political system. The concentration of power and wealth in the hands of politicians explains the scramble for the control of its structures and institutions by the political class in the society in diverse ways. In nascent democratic experience, the power tussles among the members of the political class have resulted in violence in varying forms and intensities. Bauchi state was a good example in 2011 election, Corp Members were killed by some groups of people before and after election.

Political godfatherism connotes the imposition of political candidates by powerful sponsors, tending to complete possession for the purpose of selfish gratification (Mbamara, 2004, Bassey, and Enetak, 2008) The godfather is the political slave merchant while the godson is the political slave or slave boy or political article for sale. The godson is purchased with big sum of money under a democratic oath. Their aims and objectives include appointments, stealing, robbery and looting of government treasury. The decision making, appointments and contract awards are usually manipulated by the godfather. In the words of Ajayi (2014); Chukwuemeka, Oji and Chukwurah (2013), godfatherism is a kind of politics where an influential person in a popular or ruling party will assist someone usually the godson to emerge as a winner in any elective post in a political system either by all means, he will help him to emerge victorious in the state irrespective of whether such a candidate is popular or not. Political godfatherism represents a self-seeking individual who

is out to use the government for his own purpose. The effects of this incident is enormous to the state as what usually obtains is that when the incumbent godson is at pains to satisfy the whims and caprices of his godfather among other competing demands on the scarce resources of government, the interest of the larger number is savagely undermined. This according to Joseph (1999) has left democracy in Nigeria to assume the form of prebendalism. The Nigeria political process prior to 1999 rules was dominated by military dictatorship after several years of political subjugation or hostage in the hand of military rulers, the gladiators (Oluoyo, 2014). The phenomenon can be generally seen in practice that entail the sustenance of the kind of social and political relationships that exist between the subordinates and the superior all for the propagation and fulfillment of certain roles, desires and interactions which bind both together or in which both have equal stake but with the superior determining what the subordinate gets in the process (Williams, 2004). In the realms of politics, godfatherism portrays power-based relationship. For instance, Ukhum (2004) emphasizes that implicit feature of godfatherism in power. He states that power is the determinant or the fundamental feature of godfatherism and the power could be economic, political and the spiritual voodoo, e.t.c (Ukhum, 2004) also sees godfatherism as a power relationship often skewed in favor of the godfather who can afford to lord it over the godson, if he so wishes owing to his super ordinate influence and affluence. The godfather settles to dictate who gets what when and how in the distribution of scarce resources after elections have been contested and won. Therefore, the role of Godfathers goes beyond the elections of one having the ability and capacities to manipulate the electoral process to the favor of his chosen godson (Chukwuma, 2008).

Political godfatherism also connotes the sponsorship of contestants in an election by wealthy or influential individual or group who in return expects protection and other

forms of reward and privileges. Kolawole (2004) therefore, sees godfatherism as “an institution of political king making through which certain political office holders of tenures political clout come into power” Hence , it is a relationship based on the political surrogacy involving financial and moral assistance where the godfather is the major donor and the godson the primary receiver. Godfatherism, in its simple form is a term used to describe relationship between a godfather and godson. Godfathers are slightly different from mafia and election sponsors. Mafians in politics consist of formidable powerful blocs that have tremendous influence in the society (Bala and Toyo, 1987). They comprise of a coalition of strong socio-economic and political elites that share similar value system, and under organized structure. In most cases, there are always godfathers who control the affairs of mafias. Godfathers are powerful individuals who determine “who get what when and how” in the corridors of powers.

### **2.2.2 godfatherism In Nigeria**

The political godfather phenomenon is not new in Nigeria. It started during the first republic when the foremost nationalists of the country (Zik, Awo, Tafawa-Balewa etc) influenced and controlled political activities in Nigeria. However, there are differences between the ideological godfatherism of the first republic and the crude form practiced presently (Alabi,2013).

The advent of godfatherism in the Nigerian partisan politics dates back to the first republic when the leaders of the three main political parties [Northern People Congress (NPC), Action Group (AG) and National Council of Nigerian Citizens (NCNC) carefully and meticulously cultivated godsons that they were convinced would advance the wellbeing of the citizens. According to Gambo (2007), Sir, Ahmadu Bello of the NPC, Dr Nnamdi

Azikiwe of the NCNC and Chief Obafemi Awolowo of AG were motivated to do so and not to use godsons as surrogates to promote their parochial interests, but to promote the developmental aspirations of the people. Unlike the present crop of political godfathers, the first generation of godfathers were essentially benevolent and progressive because they did not abuse their status as godfathers by making frivolous demands on their godsons as it is today. They served as huge reservoirs of wisdom and experience to be consulted in the business of governance. Indeed, in a relative sense, the first republic political godfathers were drawn by a community sense of interest in seeking to influence the electorates to vote for some candidates of their choice. It was enough satisfaction for them that they wielded tremendous influence in the society and this inevitably generated good will and reverence for them, as their views on political issues were scarcely contested in their respective regions in the country (Alabi, 2013).

According to Bennet( 1968) godfatherism exists in various forms and in different cultures of the world. It is known as “godfatherism” in Nigeria but in India the patron-client relationship is known as jayman-kamin relationship.

Many godfathers in present Nigeria operate like the mafia. They displayed similar violent schemes and aggressive “politicking”, coupled with manipulating devices of having their way by any means. They rely on the Machiavelli’s slogan, “the end justifies the means” (Onobi,2002).

The effects of political godfathers in Nigeria could be perceived as a political battle which the elite’s class has been wagging against democracy, the masses and the entire nation in order to fulfill their economic self-interest. In ensuring this evil desire, the reward systems are highly skewed in favour of the political class compared to salaries and allowances of workers in other sectors of the economy. Nigerian politicians have turned democratic

elections into ventures and battle fields where money, private armies and thugs are employed to create enabling environments that guarantee returns on investments and accelerated access to primitive accumulation of wealth (Agba, Achimugwu, Chukwuma and Agboni, 2012).

Indeed, the contest for supremacy between godfathers and their godsons lead to conflicts, which results in destruction of private and government properties. In most cases, lives of innocent people are terminated. According to Edigin (2010) conflicts arising from Godfatherism have become one of the greatest problems facing the Nigerian political system. The holder of the political position becomes a stooge to his godfather because he that pays the piper also dictates the tune. Anytime the godson refuses to meet the Godfathers demand, he is eventually removed from office. In the nascent political dispensation, several cases of such cases include the Saraki/Lawal face-off, the Nwobodo/Nnamani quagmire, the Adedibu/Ladoja cases, the Uba/Ngige saga e.t.c (Okafor, 2006; Ojo, 2006; Obey, 2009). The phenomenon of political godfatherism in Nigeria constitutes a great danger to our democratic experiments, and also to the very essence and validity of our existence as a nation (Edigin, 2010). It clearly undermines the process of development in an underdeveloped society like Nigeria. No meaningful development can be achieved in an atmosphere of wars of attrition, crisis and people who are perpetually and diametrically opposed to one another (Edigin, 2010).

In the course of conflict between the godfather and godson, Nigeria has recorded unnecessary breakdown of law and order, which could have been avoided if the problem of godfatherism had not been instituted. Whenever the nation witnesses such breakdown of law and order, some hooligans use the opportunity to unleash terror on the citizens. A cogent example is the outlawed Islamic sect Boko Haram, Niger Delta militants and some

isolated cases like the Yan hisban of Kano “,Yan Sarasuka of Bauchi and the Yan kalari of Gombe state(vanguard,2014). Given the above, Ikokwu and Epia (2003) link the phenomenon of godfatherism in Nigerian politics with youth delinquency. In the process of godfathers trying to settle political scores with their godsons, innocent youths are being used to perpetuate all kinds of evil. Apart from the above, the problem of godfatherism has resulted in outright exclusion of credible people from decision making process. Many political office seekers are often robbed of their independent and rational sense of judgment. When the right of choice is denied during elections, wrong person assumes leadership. Such persons are not materials for leadership. This usually results in maladministration and lack of accountability. This could be used to explain in the 21nd Republic, when Alhaji Shehu Shagari was imposed on Nigerians as the president and the nation was robbed of the wealth of the leadership experience of late chief Obafemi Awolowo, an agent of development. In the same manner, Olusegun Obansajo was imposed on Nigerians in the 4<sup>th</sup> Republic by his godfather (Ibrahim Babagida) and the better candidate, technocrat chief Olufalae was rejected. Consequently, the rule of law, due process, and transparency in the management of public affairs has all been abused, because credible persons are edged out of governance (Omonijo, 2011)

Godfatherism in political parlance first in relation to the activities of kingpins of criminal underworld prior to the second World War in the city of Chicago (Yahaya,2007).According to Osuntokun (2003:), the political relationship under successive government in Nigeria is a reflection of the international economic order, which facilitates the pursuit or regime change by various godfathers whose major pre-occupation is to perpetuate their hegemonic political influence for personal interest and aggrandizement. According to (Edigin 2010), the illegal use of money in politics belongs to the realm of godfather. Godfatherism has

become a factor in Nigerian politics such that very few politicians can achieve success without the stalwart support of godfathers. In Nigeria, the desire of individuals to rule at all cost has sold political leadership to the highest bidders, whopping sum of money are needed for electoral manipulation. Therefore, desperate politicians who wish to win election usually seek after godfathers. The implication of this in Nigeria politics is that the country is yet to make appreciable progress in transparent governance because godfathers usually create setback which hinders democratic growth and development in Nigeria.

Apart from being antithetical to democratic consolidation in Nigeria, godfatherism is an evil building block for corruption, retrogression, underdevelopment, mediocrity and backwardness. This view is quite revealing as it unveils the problematic dimensions that the phenomenon of godfatherism has assumed in Nigeria especially during this fourth republic. On this, Coker (2004) said that “godfather in Nigeria politics has always used their positions, power and influence for their personal aggrandizement to the detriment of the poor masses. Irrespective of the definition and explanation given by various scholars and authors on godfatherism one thing is fundamental that is the concept of godfatherism is firmly establishing itself as a scourge in contemporary Nigerian politics. The godfatherism phenomenon is an aberration to the practice of democracy in most of the developing countries.

According to Egwemi (2007), the phenomenon of godfatherism has been one of the factors that have impeded political representation in Nigeria. The scope of godfatherism is quite wide in Nigeria. Godfather has manifested in many states in Nigeria e.g Kwara, Borno, Oyo and Anambra states. The import of these godfathers installing their godsons is that those the people want to represent them may not have chance even in the electoral contests. As argued elsewhere in any polity where godfathers hold sway, the first casualty is free choice



Egwemi (2009). This is the extent that people are not in a position to determine those who represent them since this is at whims of the godfather. For avoidance of any doubt, the godfather has a lot of resources which he uses to impose his will on the people. These include political connections, security, anti-social behavior and money or access to money (Ayoade, 2006). As argued elsewhere these resources give the godfathers the feeling that he is above the law and becomes daring and unrestrained (Egwemi; Omodia, 2007). The attitude of godfather seems to have been encouraged by the then ruling party PDP in all the states in the federation.

In Nigeria, political godfathers are rich men and highly placed bureaucrats who through various means and actions contribute to the placement of individuals into public offices, mostly during election period by heavily investing into the campaign process of such individual and sometimes see to it that such individuals win the particular elections. This is who participate in politics make the benefactors of such favor to the tunes indebted to their newly acclaimed godfathers and in most time dances to the tunes of such fellows who were

### **2.3 Concept of Political Party**

In every democratic setting, democracy rest squarely on certain foundation and that foundation is the political party that means political party is the road map to democracy, without political party there is no democracy. Political parties are the principal mechanisms for enhancing citizens participation and representation in public policy and in facts through which an individuals share democratic value. Party politics is the politics engage in by expressing through the channel of land or considered from the ideal of political parties as opposed to national interest (Nwankwo,2001).

Azeez (2009) also see party politics as activities of political parties in a democratic environment to dominate polity through democratic institution. To this end, party politics

exist when elective ideas are present in a democratic system and the views, opinions or political philosophies are debated with the consciousness of promoting and protecting the interest of the party in power.

A unique aspect of every sovereign state in the World is the nature of politics and character of the state. Politics according to Laswel (1936) is ‘who gets what, when and how. ‘At the level of society, politics is the various activities that involve the relationship between and among individuals and coalition of actors, the means by which access to scarce, social and economic values are mediated and determined (Olaoye, 2006). However, the institution of government acts on behalf of the state, and through its structures, institutions and agencies, government enacts and express the sovereign will of the state.

Political parties in Nigeria today have strongly influenced and promoted elite in Nigeria. They have also been instrumental in shaping the political institutions and in the like manner the values and interest of political actors. Based on this, Henry(2011), argued that Nigeria that political parties may be weakened by the special elite’s interest in Nigerian polity. Political parties are subjected to some state control as the major national economic resources and as well as political elite who constitute governing class in modern society. Though, with varying degree acceptability due to human, group and organization flaws, the political elite determine the political fate of other and indeed, the non elite. The preminent roles of political initiators and decision makers place them on a pedestal far above the rest of society (Odubajo and Alabi: 2014). Political elite largely impact governance through enabling (or failing to enable) an achievement of political consensus. They shape the political environment and institutions of the society which are critical elements of stability and respect for property rights that affect investment and innovation (Andre and Diego: 2010). In like manner, political elites are those who have decision making power in the

state resulting from their statutory or institutional position, or who have influence on policy decisions as a result of their status in their ruling coalition (Bariledum, 2013). In Nigeria today, political parties has been infected by godfatherism majorly caused by the need to control state apparatus and to maintain their dominance to influence the government policies which is often orchestrated and reflecting the desire on their elite founders. This is an evident in the various political parties ranging from the People's Democratic Party (PDP), Action Peoples Congress (APC) which are presently the two leading parties in Nigeria today characterized by series of vast multi coalitions and this has caused various disagreement between political elites, godfathers and godsons, series of nepotism and favoritism, lobbying and constant trend of survival of fittest. Political parties in Nigeria today are being transformed into what scholars call fighting parties (Azeez,2014).

In most of the developing countries, state is the major centre of politics. Expressing this view, Claphan (1985) assert that, "the state emerged as the key structure of the third world politics". Olufemi, (2003) also affirmed that despite the divergent conception of politics, there is a common ground in the centrality of the state to the political process.

More so, party politics are activities of an organization which compete through electoral mechanism to influence the people policies and program as well as allocation of public wealth through a stipulated and articulate procedure (Okoye,1982). Though, party politics is ordinarily directed towards check and balances in governance, strengthening the democratic institution and serve as a feedback mechanism, however, its activities have been extremely abused by political godfathers through political rivalry, ethno-religious sentiment thereby making it undemocratic.

## **2.4 Concept of Democracy**

Democracy as a concept is one of the fundamental features of the contemporary politics. There are few people or nation- state nowadays that did not practice democracy and claimed democratic. However, in an attempt to explain the concept, it should be appreciated that democracy is a very loaded concept which the entire essence cannot be capture by a single school of thought (Abiola and Olaopa, 2006), democracy is a set of institutions that fulfill at least two essential requirements. First, it must elicit as accurately as possible the opinion of many people as possible as who shall be their representatives and how the country out to be governed. This means minimum universal suffrage, political parties, and organization of voting in acceptable elections at a relatively frequent interval.

Secondly, it should provide some ways of ensuring that those chosen by the public do what the electorates wants them to do or that they can be replaced if they do otherwise even between elections. This means that the process of government in a democracy is essentially dialogue between the rulers and the ruled.

Sergeant (1975) viewed democracy with the following options

- 1 Citizens involvement in the political decision making
- 2 Some degree of equality among citizens
3. Some degree of liberty, freedom granted or retained by citizenry
4. A system of representative
5. An electoral system of majority rule

In spite all the differences in conceptualization of democracy, Ojo (2006) notes all the versions,( whether liberal or capitalist, socialist and African brand), shared the fundamental objective of how to govern the society in such a way that power actually belongs to all the people. Similarly, Chafe (1994) contends that democracy means among others, the

involvement of the people in the running of the political, socio-economic and cultural affairs of the society. Perhaps, the most basic idea in democracy is that people are essentially equal, and thus each person has a right to have a say in who governs and how they do so. Hence, legitimate political power comes from the people, and government, therefore, is legal only when the governed consent.

Democracy as a concept is enmeshed in a plethora of definitions. As common to all social science concepts, scholars have examined democracy at different historical epoch (Salwu, Muhammed, 2005:). It has been attempted by various persons from time to time. Hence , it was argued that the contending views on democracy reflect deeply rooted conflict about whether should mean some kind of popular power which citizens are directly engage in self government and self regulation or be conceived as a means of conferring authority on those periodically voted into office( Held,1993). The Greek Philosopher, Cleon defined it in 422 B.C as, ‘that shall be democratic which shall be of the people, by the people, for the people; likewise, Abraham Lincoln of United State of America in famous war speech in 1863 described it as,” government of the people, by the people and for the people. Mahajan(1988). This disagreement gave rise to three variant of democracy–Direct or participatory democracy in which citizens are involved as ancient times; Liberal representative democracy which views democracy as a system of rule embracing elected officials who undertake to represent the view of the citizens within the framework of the rule of law; and Marxist tradition, also sometime referred to peoples democracy (Anifowose and Enemo, 1999:143). Democracy in ancient Greece meant direct and active participation of the citizens in the affairs of the polis or city state. The citizens were therefore, subject to the political authority and the creator of public rules and regulation (Held, 1993:15). Democracy may be described as a system of government under which the

people exercise the governing power either directly or through representatives periodically elected by them (Appadorai, 1974).

Democracy can therefore mean that; governments are established with the consent of the people, almost always by the constitution; the people choose their leaders in free and fair elections, and the government and its leaders must ultimately obey the will of the majority of those who elected them to make law (Richard, 1986). Despite these definitions, Epelle (2003) averred that the long history of the concept does not convert to unanimity in its meaning by political scientist and politicians; not surprisingly, Thorson (1962:) enjoined anyone who under undertakes the writing of any essay on democracy to make clear from outset the way in which he plans to approach this vast and complicated subject.

Consequently, the effects of godfatherism on Nigerian's election were The clamor for democracy in Nigeria is to improve both political and economic situation of the country through massive involvement in the policy making, but today the reverse is the case as those that attained political power in both legislative and executive arms of government got to the seat of power through the support of some political godfathers in various states, however, the desire for political godfathers is to hold political and economic powers both at the center cum the component units as a mechanism to politically influence the activities of political office holders (Alabi, 2013).

Unprecedented Godfathers are those who have security connections, extended local links, enormous financial weight to plot and determine the success of power seeker at any level of a supposedly competitive politics. Although, godfatherism has an institutionalized feature in Nigerian politics over the years, its contemporary manifestation suggest that it has assumed the highest proportions, becoming one of the greatest threat to democratic consolidation in Nigeria Omotola, (2007:). The recent activities of some Nigerian

godfathers could be linked to attributes of mafianism; however, some still see the existence of godfathers as a balancer of power in democracy. Akinola (2009) believes in the need to have good-hearted individuals (people's heroes) at the sole realm of absolute power, godfather distributes power as he dims, and anoints who rules. But godfather has taken strange dimensions in Nigerian political environment. It has become a menace pooling down the foundations of the masses-driven governance, thereby denying Nigerians the much deserved dividends of democracy.

Ademola (2004) added that since 1999, when Nigeria joined the committee of democratically governed countries, it has continued to experience an unprecedented rise in political violence ranging from increased crime wave, armed robbery, political assassination and religious riots as a result of crisis between godfathers and godsons which reached its climax during the wanton destruction of lives and properties that witnessed the violent confrontation between a godfather (Chris Uba) and governor of Anambra state (Chris Ngige) and Dr. Olusola Saraki and his godson Late Admiral Mohammed Lawal in 1999- 2003 administration in Kwara State which witnessed various political dimensions ranging from destruction of lives and properties, electoral malpractice/violence, disenfranchisement of many qualified electorates through engagement of thugs and lastly the invitation of votes buying system between godfather (Dr. Olusola Saraki) and his godson (Late Admiral Mohammed Lawal) who want to become political dictator in the state.

There is hardly any state that is devoid of the existence and operation of godfathers though, their method of operation differs. In America, the political candidate wiggles around seeking individual endorsement for their candidacy could be more valuable than a powerful individual (Akinola, 2009). In essence, godfatherism is a threat to Nigeria nascent

democracy. The history of godfatherism in Nigeria is traceable to colonial epoch through the independence era, military interregnum and towards the restoration of democracy in what came to be known as the fourth Republic in 1999 following the military intervention. The staggering posture of godfatherism in Nigeria democratic experiment leaves much to be desired. This stem from the fact that the adumbration of this nascent democracy on 29 May,1999,Nigerians have witnessed uncontrollable political insecurity, which has threatened participatory democracy , peace, political insecurity and the consolidation of democracy as a result of the activities of the political godfatherism(Ajedike,2010).

According to Audu (2014), in developing societies, the well being of the citizens largely depends on the extent to which the democratic institution is strengthened and sustained. This according to Bonnie and Kehinde (2007) is because good governance, selfless leaders and mutual trust between the leaders and the led could be guaranteed if choice of who should govern the society at any given time is solely engineered by the citizens on one hand and on steady and sustained democratic machinery on the other hand

The concept of democracy has become so popular that more than 20 percent of political parties' world over contained the variable democracy. Though, its origin comes from the ancient Greek political thoughts; Greek philosophers classified governance based on the number of citizens involve in such process (Richard and Fred 2002). Democracy according to Ademolokun (2000) is an idea targeted at enhancing a sound and egalitarian society through an integrated effort of the masses towards a better society. Though, every nation has embraced the principle of democracy because it is the only mechanism through which the interest, well being, rights and lives of the citizenry could be unquestionably protected and guaranteed, however, its practice has taken different dimension across the globe. In developing nations for example, it has been characterized with godfatherism, party politics,



tribal, religious, and money-bag politics. Though, godfatherism in Nigeria politics is not new, the phenomenon of political godfatherism gained more prominence in the fourth republic as it has helped many to ride into political power (Joseph, 1991). More so, the political kingmakers cut across party line and even though it was more celebrated in some states in Nigeria such as Anambra, Kwara, Oyo and Borno. In recent time it has become a common phenomenon in the entire country including Kogi State. The imposition of candidate on the choice of the people has become a threat to democratic institution in Nigeria thereby undermining the sanctity of the system and the wish of the masses (Champion, 2003). According to Dahl (1971),“ a key characteristic of a democracy is the containing responsiveness of government to the preference of its citizens, considered as political equals. The notions of oligarchy has three principal elements: competition for government power, political participation in the selection of leaders and policies, civil and political liberties. For (Sorensen 1999), the actualization of this element is the attainment of what we call “real democracy”. In like manner, Catherine Newbury (1994), tagged it “Formal democracy” with emphasis on institutionalized mechanism, means and procedure for changing government personnel; respect for the rule of law, accountable governance and protection of citizenship, human and civil rights.

For Diamond (1988), democracy is the system of government that meets three conditions: meaningful and extensive competition for the selection and removal of personnel excluding the use of force; a highly inclusive level of political participation for the selection of leaders and policies among the citizenry; and a high level of civil and political liberties sufficient to guarantee the integrity of political competition and participation.(Schumpeter,1992) concede the democratic method to consist that “institutional arrangement for arriving at

political decisions in which individuals acquire power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for peoples vote.

Democracy in Nigeria has a check history. From the wild-wild experience of the First Republic through prolong autocratic military regimes and truncated second and third republic to the present democratic dispensation, democracy has suffered debilitating experiences in the country. The perennial travail of democracy is predicated on the number of factors, including ineffective structures and institutions, the foreboding presence of military, corruption, money politics and godfatherism (Said and Kehinde, 2007).

### **Nature, Objectives, and Purpose of Democracy**

To think of the nature of democracy is to think and reflect on the very things that make democracy strong, what it is, without which it would be no more democracy.

Democracy is a social and political philosophy, a system of government and a form of government. It has three aspects: social, economic and political. The social aspect deals more with 'unfreedoms' that is concerned with freedom from discrimination, in order to enhance the chances of all to take part. The economic aspect has to do with abolition of disparities, which are to clear, glaring on the bases of wealth and ensuring through social justice to distribute wealth equitably. The political dimension thinks of safeguarding the rights of the masses with regard to politics (Diamond,1988).

One cannot said to have meaningful nature of democracy without pointing out that freedom(liberty) , majority rule ,constitution, constitutionalism, human rights and democratic structure are really part and parcel of it nature. Even by way of proper articulation and extension into the spirit of democracy, political participation and accountability which are necessarily principle of democracy cannot be left out without leaving the tripod above unbalanced. One could quickly say that it is geared towards

establishment of an efficient form of government ;assurance of equality of persons by upholding the right of individuals; promotion of patriotism through education of the masses and demanding their participation in the affairs of the state; putting in place of order and progress geared towards having stable government ( Ademolokun,2000)

With regard to purpose, end, one could summarily say that it is geared towards putting in place an ideal society, a peaceful society will be anchored on justice which is the chief virtue of the state , and satisfaction of the common good. All these elements mentioned above which would have make democracy the prominent instrument of development has been affected due to the parochial interest of the political godfathers.

#### 2.5 Concept of Internal Democracy

There is no universal definition of the concept of internal party democracy, although many scholars agreed on some basic principles of electivity, accountability, transparent, inclusivity, participation and representation. According to Susan (2004) internal democracy is a very broad term describing a wide range of methods for including party members in intra-party deliberation and decision making. It is a democracy within the party and the extent to which a party subscribes to and abides by the basic democratic tenets.

Despite the increased attention on intra-party democracy, the concept of what is intra party politics remained ambiguous. The main line of contradiction stem from the differential perspectives on the long standing question of whether internal party democracy refers to participation and voice of the parties rank and file or to the responsiveness of parties in the large electorate. Rahat and Hazan (2001) traced this distinction back to the classical writings of Duverger (1954), Robert Michel (1965) however, conceptualized internal party democracy interms of processes exclusively within the parties. For him, internally democratic parties would give substantial decision making power to their members and this

grant them the capacity to control through organizational mechanisms of the party leaders and parliamentarians.

Internal party democracy can be seen as a struggle for power and relevance within a political party in order to effectively enhance party institutionalization, candidate selection methods, leadership nomination procedure, decision making and other activities of party affairs and enforce the transparency and accountability of office bearers to rules of its governance. According to Norris (2004), the challenge of intra party democracy is that party nomination processes are not democratic in the selection of leaders.

According to the comparative analysis of intra-party democracy regulation by Ganja(2006), countries such as the United Kingdom, the United State and Australia have been reluctant to expose internal regulation on political Association due to strong liberal traditions.

As Tyoden (1994), political parties are major vehicles for the expression of essential features of democratic process. In this case, inter and intra party relationships are vital because they determine the smooth operation of the party system and extension of the fate of democracy and the nature of political system itself. In similar vein, Mersel (2006) asserts that various democracies in recent times are faced with the problem of non-democratic political parties, a situation where most parties only focus on external activities, neglecting internal planning and organization. He argues that in determining whether a political party is non-democratic, attention should be given to party goals and practices. This is so because some parties ignore essential conditional elements such as their internal structures.

The interplay between parties and democracies should reflect the parties' adherence not only to democratic goals and action but also internal democratic structure ((Mersel, 2006). Internal democracy aims at developing more democratic, transparent and effective political parties. It identifies specific challenges in the internal management and functioning of

parties and party systems. These include: candidate selection, leadership selection, policy making, membership relations, gender, minorities, youth and party funding. All these pose some critical questions (Mersel,2006).

Intra-party democracy suggest a bottom-up approach in building of the party structure and organizations in a manner that ensure internal distribution of power and dispersion of authorities at different level rather than concentration of power in one organ(Cular,2004).

When it exists, it help to nurture citizens political competences and producing more capable representatives which in turn ensure that the party produces better policies and political program .The concern about internal democracy in political parties arise from the centrality of political parties and party system for a functional democracy capable of advancing good governance . Parties play essential role not just in representing interests, aggregating preferences, and forming governments, but also in managing conflict and promoting stable politics (Egwu, 2014).

Mainwaring and Scully (1915) in their studies of Latin American Countries examine ingredients of internal democracy or party system institutionalization.These are:

1. When the rules governing party competition are commonly observed, widely understood and confidently anticipated.

11. When there is stability in the number of candidates as well as party competing for office.

111. When parties have strongly rooted in society, affecting political preference, attracting stable electoral support and demonstrating continuity in ideological terms.

V1. When political elites recognize the legitimacy of the electoral competition as route to office.

V. When party organization exists independently of powerful leaders with well resourced nation wide organization and well established internal procedure for recruitment to party office.

Penning and Hazan (2001) contend that open candidate selection methods some times actually increase the power of small elites, the political up-starts. It enhances a necessary viable democratic culture within the party as well as society at large. Again, internal democratic procedures may have positive effects on the representation of ideas of the electorates and may strengthen the organization by attracting new members and creating space for new ideas. It can as well provide necessary vertical linkages between different deliberating spheres and also a horizontal linkage between competing issues (Teorell, 1999).

### **2.5.1 Challenges of Internal Democracy**

There is no doubt that internal democracy has some challenges. These include:

1. Poverty of party ideology: Ideology is one of the ingredients that consolidate any political party. It is like a superstructure upon which every thing is built on. Party ideology precedes party structure, manifesto, and organization. By party ideology, it meant a set or body of ideas, representations and beliefs common to a specific social group. It consists of ethical interpretations and principles that set fort the purposes, organizations and boundaries of political life. In other words, it guides, supports, retrains and rationalizes political action (Mbah, 2006)

11. Candidate selection: The question is that who select the party members that desire to contest for election? What are the laid down processes for selecting a candidate in a party? Is the selection based on their credentials and loyalties to the party or based on their deep pocket or popularity of the godfather? As Scarrow (2005) notes, recruiting and selecting

candidates is a crucial task for parties, because parties profile during elections and while in office are largely determine by which candidates are chosen and where their loyalties lie. In other words, selection of candidates should be devoid of prejudice, class and ethnic affiliation. This is a serious problem in People's Democratic Party (PDP). Anyaoku (2010) argues that "to ascribe undue influence, especially self- serving influence to the parliamentary group of the party in the selection of candidates would seriously undermine the democratic process".

111. Party funding: What makes any political party solid is funding, that is the amount of financing backing it enjoys from members. That is why most times founders of political parties are more interested in attracting members who have economic power than those who have the intellectual capital.

As Griner and Zovatto (2005) advance, money and democracy have a complex relationship, especially since the affluent role of money in politics can have many distorting effects such as corruption, buying of votes by the godfathers. In 2002, preparatory to the 2003 general elections, People's Democratic Party (PDP) campaign team organized a launching to boost the campaign. This attracted a wide range of technocrats, captains of industries, political elites and bureaucrats.

V1. Zoning Formula: The issue of zoning elective position has posed serious challenge to internal arrangement in many political parties especially People's Democratic Party (PDP) between the North and South. The worry is not only that the issue has succeeded in heating up the polity and fanned embers of ethnicity but also portrayed a great challenge to internal democracy.

V. Conducting primaries: Conducting primary elections, no doubt is one of the means of testing the tenacity and authenticity of any party's internal democracy. It has been proven

from many studies that some primaries conducted in some political parties are sheer promotional agenda as they do not contribute positively to empowerment of rank and file in those parties. Consensus exists only when people agree on something and they are more likely to agree when they share the same facts(Adeyemo,2006)

### **2.5.2 Godfatherism and Internal Democracy**

The concept of godfatherism and internal democracy are anti-thetical to each other in many democracies in the World. The phenomena of godfatherism can be generally seen as a practice which entails the sustenance of a kind of social and political relationships that exist between the subordinate and the superior for the propagation and fulfillment of certain roles, desires and interactions which binds both together or in which both have equal stake but with superior determining what the subordinate gets in the process (William, 2004). In the realm of politics, godfatherism portrays a power –based relationship. Ukhum (2004) see godfatherism as power relationship that often skewed in favor of godfather who can afford to lord it over the godson. The godfather settles to dictate “who gets what, when and how” in the distribution of scarce resources after the elections have been contested and won. There, the role of godfathers goes beyond the elections of one having the abilities and capacities to manipulate the electoral process to favor his chosen godson (Chukwuma,2008).

In contrary, internal democracy or intra-party democracy refers to the extent to which the conduct of internal party affairs embodies the principles of electivity, accountability, transparency, inclusivity, participation and representation (Mimpen, 2011). It is a recurring decimal in the standard lament about the political parties across established and struggling democracies(Carothers,2010) The challenges posed by lack of internal party democracy for the integrity of the electoral process and survival of democracy is mostly link to the



phenomenon of godfatherism. The most debilitating aspect of lack of internal democracy is that party financiers and godfathers select candidates who are beholden to them for elective positions at expense of the party membership, making elections and electoral process a mere sham (Egwu, 2014).

However, the most fundamental point regarding to the meaning of party's internal democracy to the legitimacy of the entire democratic process arises from the critical role parties play in the recruitment of party leadership both within the party and for elected public officials. If the candidate selection is through godfatherism and not through the internal arrangement of the party members it means the guiding principle of internal party democracy is compromised and criminalized. When the integrity of the process of choosing a leader is compromised in any political system, it widens rather than narrows the range of conflicts in any given political party because some people feel excluded from decision making process.

## 2.6 Godfatherism and Regional Politics in Nigeria

The earlier Nigerian republic in this section refer to first (1960-1966) and second (1979-1983) republics. The two republics are brought together under this discussion because they look alike in many circumstances in terms of their actors and in relation to the phenomenon of godfatherism.

**The First Republic:** The issue of godfatherism was based on achievement, ideology, and background and sometimes sectional or ethnic consideration. At that time, there were three regions; East, North and West in 1963, a fourth was carved out from the Western region; the mid-Western region. The National Council of Nigeria and Cameroon (NCNC) which later became National Council of Nigeria Citizens (CNCNC) after 1963 was the dominant in the

Eastern region, the Northern People Congress (NPC) dominated the Northern region while Action Group (AG) was dominant in the Western region (Kirk Greene and Rimmer, 1981). From the onset, the motive of Nigerian founding fathers in forming political parties was not far from protesting against the colonial rule. This was effectively carried out with a unanimous decision. But shortly after this mission was accomplished; these founding fathers could no longer act with one voice. 'Contradiction on Nigerian system as Sklar (1968) perceived it. The first of such contradictions, which best suited our consideration of Nigeria politics is that of the machinery of government which became basically regionalized ever since.

The leadership of the then popular political parties was dominated by the three largest ethnic groups. The Northern People's Congress (NPC) by Hausa – Fulani, National Council of Nigerian Citizens (NCNC) by Igbo while Action Group (AG) by Yorubas. This pattern of politics repeated itself among Nigerian students abroad. Each of these tribal groups acted as godfather for their tribes in terms of political recruitment. Within the Action Group were Chief Obafemi Awolowo and his political stalwarts like to Bode Thomas who believed that 'each linguistic group in Nigeria should have high degree of autonomy as possible in the conduct of its internal affairs Joseph (1991). It was on the basis of this that Action Group (A.G) wielded support having canvassed for votes among people of the same.

It was not only this alone, to dictate the party leadership within the Action Group as well. For instance, it should be recalled that Chief Obafemi Awolowo who was the premier of Western Region having gone to Lagos pre 1959, election still wanted to be controlling the party leadership in the West. It was this godfatherism style that Chief S.L Akintola rejected as he hated the leadership style 'serving in Lagos and Ruling in Western Region

Oluleye(1985). This led to intense disagreement between ObafemiAwolowo and Chief S.L Akintola, a situation that led to the breaking away of Chief S.L Akintola's faction from Action Group. The National Council of Nigeria Citizens too could not escape from the principle of Godfathers. Azikiwe's godfatherism in the party led to the expulsion of many National Council of Nigerian Citizens(NCNC) leaders including EyoIta. These People later formed the United National Independence Party (UNIP)

The Northern People's Congress (NPC) could not be exonerated from this kind of politics as most of those that the party wanted to stay within the party were retained while a number of party members ofNPC were expelled including Aminu Kano and Saadu Zungur. It was these are people that formed the NorthernElement Progressive Union (NEPU) on January 15, 1966. However, the Nigeria first Republic was swept into oblivion. The Murtala's regime was willing to handover to the civilian government but was cautious in addressing the constitutional Drafting Committee in 1975 that:

"If drafting the cause of your deliberations and having regard to our disillusion with the party politics in the past, you should discover some means by which government can be formed without the involvement of political parties, you should feel free to recommend" Bamgbose (2001).

Similarly, at the lifting of the ban on politics in 1978, Obasanjo in his address warned Nigerian politicians to desist from the politics of the past he said: "Political recruitment and subsequent political support which are based on tribal, religious and linguistic sentiments contributed to our past misfortune. They must not be allowed to spring up again.

**The Politics of the Second Republic:** This look like that of the First Republic because there appeared tripartite system of power – sharing with the dominant party in the

federation being strongest in the Northern States, the Second -placed strongest among the Yorubas peaking and the third- placed predominant among Igbo the speaking people. Each of these regions has favorite Sons which some clicques within these regions succeeded in imposing upon the people. This pattern of politics was found in all three tiers of government. It was godfatherism in display that made it extremely difficult for each of these political parties which had strongholds in their respective regions to have bases in their regions.

The National Party of Nigeria(NPN) though, had much base in the North could not have the same in the South. Both the National People's Party (NPP) and the Unity Party of Nigeria(UPN) had stronghold in the East and West respectively but none of them had a considerable spread in the North.

**The Third Republic:** With the transitional party politics of the Third Republic, the old syndrome of oligarchic tendency whereby the few elites impose politicians on the populace was revisited. Thus, within May 3, 1989, the day when the ban of partisan politics was lifted for the Third Republic July, 1989 which was the deadline set for submission of necessary papers and documents by the political associations, 88 political associations sprang up. It appeared that every formed caucus was interested in imposing their candidates on the people otherwise how come 88 political associations knowing fully well that decree Number 23 of 1987 had mandated the National Electoral Commission(NEC) to provide criteria for the emergence, recognition and registration of two political parties. It was a dangerous trend towards the Nigerian politics that resulted into the imposition of two political parties, the National Republican Convention (NRC) and the Social Democratic Party (SDP) by military government. Rather than not sensing this type of politics during the

Fourth Republic, every money bags was interested in forming political party and wanting to gain support from its tribe.

#### General Effects of the Practice of Godfatherism in Nigeran Politics

Thepracticeofgodfatherism is not recognized by the Nigerian constitution. It is an aberration to the presidential system of government that is being practiced in the country. In view of this, it had created numerous problems to the nation. It will be worthwhile to enumerate some of the impediments to the proper functioning of the political system. (Henry,2004).

I. Godfatherism has affected the critical and normative culture of internal party democracy and democracy in general, consensus, openness and inclusivity which are the hallmark of responsible and transparent governments are no longer effective. This is a system that is not recognized as part of a democratic system of governance, yet it has become an appendage to the system as practice in Nigeria. But godfatherism is visibly manifested and manipulated in the practice of democracy in Nigeria. It has therefore not only affected the critical and normative culture of the practice of democracy but has also made the implementation of viable democracy impossible.

II. The godfather and godson relationship tend to encourage political corruption and lack of accountability within the party structure. Most of the godfathers regard the sponsorship of the godsons as a business venture. Whatever they had spent on their godsons would be paid back with interest. As earlier mentioned, the godfather was also entitled to some inflated contracts as a reward. The godsons had to fulfill their contractual obligations by tempering with the government treasury. This has resulted in political corruption, and had discredited government officials and politicians. It is often said that he who play the pipe controls the

tune. The aforementioned statement is applicable to the relationship between a godfather and godson in the Nigerian political system. Some of the godsons are gradually becoming political figureheads as a result of their contractual obligations to their sponsors. It is the will of the godfather that is being implemented and not the mandate of the electorates. This is not a healthy situation in a democratic setting. It tends to frustrate the electorates and hinders political and economic development of the nation.

III. In view of the huge investments that the godfathers make on the godsons during election, the former tend to regard the conduct of elections as a “do or die” affair. They are determined to gain from their investments. As a result of this, the godfather hires thugs for their godsons, bribe electoral officials and temper with electoral result to ensure that their godsons win the election. The outcome of the negative activities is the election is neither free nor fair.

IV. The activities of the godfathers would be described as criminal. Godfathers have hindered the development of internal party democracy as a fundamental ingredient of any democratic system and created some measures of political instability into the political system, frustrated and discourage some of the electorates during election.

Electorates tend to feel that their votes are not taken into consideration while candidates are being declared as winners. This is in view of the obnoxious activities of godfathers and godsons in the Nigerian political system. This has greatly discredited the Independent National Electoral Commission in Nigeria. This important institution is no longer held in high regard by many electorates.

One of the prime responsibilities of the government in any democratic setting is to create an enabling environment for justice and equity to prevail. No economy can function

efficiently without transparency and accountability. In a democratic society, public officials must carry out their delegated responsibilities with trust and confidence.

However, healthy developments as government around the world had in recent years have been paying considerable attention to accountability and observance of ethical standards (David Murray 1993: 153). But the recent developments in Nigeria, the political terrain at Federal, State and Local Government levels show that high ethical and moral standards have not been followed in conducting elections and other affairs of government. The consequence is that many political office holders are not able to deliver the much desired dividends of democracy without satisfying the desires interest of their sponsors and political godfathers. (Joseph, 2004).

Those who had properly known that their interest was at stake, so they had to penetrate society, look or who could be loyal to them and sponsor them into politics so that they will in turn protect their prosperity. It happened in Europe: Britain, Italy, Germany, where the property clan controlled politics, pick individual, sponsor them to protect property (Brown, 2003 :), Brown's position raises two fundamental issues.

According to Browne (2003), the activities of the godfathers in democracy cripple democratic Choice, which subsequently shrinks democratic space. This often creates serious electoral problems as the godfathers employ all legal and obnoxious means to win elections. Anarchy, insecurity, chaos and violence become the order of the day. This is the picture dominating Nigeria political space. The effects of this on the democratic development and future of Nigeria is disastrous. The foundational principle of democracy is uprooted. The choice of the people, which confers legitimately on the elected are thrown-overboard as election are rigged with impunity and disregard for peoples sovereign right.

Rather than having a democracy, the activities of the godfathers confer on the polity an era of oligarchy. In addition to the effects above, the following are some of the specific effects to the political system in Nigeria. Since 1999, when Nigeria regained her legitimate political power from military administrator under the leadership of General Abdulsalam many cases of political problems from North and South poles of the country have become the order of the day which characterized the effort of the godfathers and some godsons in various state. Below are some of the effects in 2011 election in Nigeria.

- I. Massive Destruction of Lives and Properties: In the beginning and post elections of April, 2011 in Nigeria, there are many cases of massive destruction of lives and properties as a result of the instructions given by the godfathers to their supporters in various state of the federation. In Kano state, some unspecified number of people died, non-indigenes fled Kano as the violence spread. Despite the indefinite curfew imposed on the city to dense tension, non-natives still live in fear of attacks, several place of worship were burnt down by youths. Thousands of non-natives were seeking refuge in military and police barracks, sleeping in the open without essential facilities (The Nation Wednesday, April 20, 2011: 7). Bauchi state was also a place of crisis where many lives and properties were lost, five Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) offices were burnt and property worth millions of naira destroyed in five local governments, more than 500 laptop computers and it generators were burnt and windows and doors were stolen by hoodlum after post presidential poll in the state. Also many lives of leaders of tomorrow “Corp Members” were killed by some groups of people before and after the presidential election in Bauchi, Niger, Kogi and some other states.



II. Turning Young Citizens into Hooligans and Thugs: In the 2011 April polls, cases of suspected thugs were reported in some states. In Kwara state, the state police arrested 23 persons suspected to be political thugs during the 16<sup>th</sup> April, 2011 election. In his remarks the police commissioner, Mr MammanTsafe stated that a political party imported thugs from Lagos to disrupt the election in the state. Also, an Ilorin magistrate court in Kwara state remanded 14 supporters of ACN in prison custody on alleged public disturbance. The accused were arraigned on a court charge of criminal conspiracy inciting disturbance, mischief and causing injury contrary to section 97, 114, 327, and 246 of penal code. The charge sheet said Otunba Bode Oyedepo of No.16 Adebayo Avenue Oro, told the police how he was attack at Iludu-Oro with his fellow PDP members by the thugs allegedly sent by ACN senatorial candidate for Kwara South. AnuIbiwoye Oyedepo further explained that the thugs allegedly came in vehicle and attacked them with bottles and guns (The Nation Monday, April, and 2011:3).

III. Proliferation of Arms and Ammunition: The clash between factions in the Oyo state branch of the National Union of Road Transport Workers (NURTW) claimed many lives and let several other injured and some properties reportedly damaged in Ibadan, the state capital. The slain victim, identified as Dele Ayegbo, was said to be a member of the action loyal to the reinstated chairman, Late Akinsola Oloruntoki (Tokyo). The conflict was sparked off by the Tokyo faction to takeover some motor –parks hitherto controlled by the other faction who had taken over reign since the relationship between him and the former governor, Adebayo AlaoAkala, got strained.

The urge to take over the park was reinforced by the de-proscription of the union by the last regime, as well as the emergence of new government in the state.

IV. Manipulation of Policies: Most of Nigeria policies are usually bent by political godfathers to enable them fix their candidates to the corridors of power.

From the forgoing, it seems that godfatherism is not only in conflict with the practice of democracy but also hindered its development. It is an aberration to the system and should not be associated with democracy. And it has discredited some politicians, institutions and created unhealthy atmosphere for the political system to grow in Nigeria. The urgent and total removal of the practice of political godfatherism from Nigeria political system is necessary for the survival of democracy in Nigeria. A system that is neither recognize by law nor by convention should not be allowed to exist in nation. However, its abolition would be extremely difficult in Nigeria. This is because it is the rich and the most powerful people in the society that play the role of the godfathers. They have use the system to maintain the status quo in the political system, and to enrich themselves. It was John Bennet who highlighted the fact that: The question of trends towards disappearance or persistence of godfatherism relation is difficult to answer (Bennet, 1968:476)

### **2.7 People's Democratic Party and Internal Democracy**

One of the main reasons for the decline and defeat of the PDP in the 2015 general elections was it lack of internal democracy, candidates were imposed and the space was restricted for potential aspirants to try their luck. Delegates were imposed through the whims and caprices of the powerful chieftains, especially governor of the party. There was justification revolt which led to the defeat of the (PDP) in the last election (leadership, 2017).

The first step to failure is to deny the people their right to choose who they want to govern them, the first-step is to allow free democracy in the party to bring up democratically elected party leaders and delegates. If the leadership crisis continues in their plan to impose

candidates against people's choice without following their party's constitutionally laid down procedure, the destruction will still continue or will be even worse than 2015. By virtue of the People's Democratic Party (PDP), guidelines under whose platform the political exercise took place, PDP state primaries were patently illegal. The constitution of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) for the nominations of candidates for public offices, specifically states that the national electoral officer shall be appointed for each state by the national executive committee, NEC and that whosoever shall supervise the conduct of party's elections in the state, compiled primary reports and submit the same to the State Executive Committee, SEC, and the NEC, which has the power to announce the outcome of all the nomination exercises supervised. Contrary to the terms of guide lines, the state chapters of (PDP) hijacked the functions of the national officers, by conducting the elections, collating and announcing results (Leadership, 2017).

This assertion is predicated on the fact that the People's Democratic Party (PDP) primaries across the country was conducted under the supervision of their state party chairmen across the country for the past 16 years of political mass dominant party politics in Nigeria, instead of the accredited persons (Victor, 2016).

The issues of lack of internal democracy affect the level of transparency and the faith as well as the constitutional and democratic right of the ordinary person in the country that claims to be the largest democratic network in Africa. The effect of this development is that candidates are not allowed to sell themselves to the electorates, and thereby undermining democracy (Udo, 2016).

The poverty of ideology is further complicated by the deficit of internal democracy in Nigerian political parties. The wisdom in the idea of internal democracy in a political party

is “creating a level playing field for the active participation of every member in the party affairs and to build a cohesive party that is vibrant enough to win elections (Moomodu and Majuudi, 2013:). The Nigerian experience, however, shows a culture of personalization of power of party. The syndrome of godfatherism, monetization of primary elections and imposition of candidates are the forces that make intra-party grievances in Nigerian politics. Most regrettably, the influence and power of incumbency continue to shape and reshape the nature of internal democracy within the political parties. This account largely for the series of intra-party crisis recorded during the fourth Republic and the dangers they pose to the democratization process.

For instance, the impunity in the nomination of candidates for electoral offices assumed a worse dimension in preparation for the 2015 general elections and this has “created huge tension for parties heating up the polity and endangering the entire electoral agenda and prospect for the consolidation of democracy” (Alli, 2015:6). Shale and Matlosa (2008) identify the general causes of intra-party conflict and categorised them into four, viz: favoritism, promoting one’s kith and kin; unequal sharing of resources (leaders get a kin share from the advantage of power) lack of regular meeting and centralized authority (concentration of power at the top).

Moreover, Aleyani (2013) also opine that the process of nomination and imposition of candidates lead to intra-party squabbles over nomination of candidates at the primaries. For example People Democracy Party (PDP) suffered from internal squabbles in different states and at the national level because of nomination of candidates. The series of reactions that trail the conduct of primary elections in preparation for 2015 elections (most especially by the PDP) in most of the states of the federation and the emergence of President Jonathan as

the sole presidential candidates of the party attest to lack of transparency and lack of internal democracy in most of the political parties (Abubakar Yahaya and Bashiru Sa'ad Ibrahim, 2015)

### **2.7.1 Principles adopted by PDP to promote internal democracy**

Some of the principles are:

The first and the major principle is equal participation of all members and groups in the democratic process of the party. This emphasizes the involvement of rank and file in the party's policies, as well as representation at party activities and in party bodies. Democratic policy-making involves a participative process of policy development in debates, consultation meetings and other platforms, and it decentralizes the mandate of decision – making to the rank and file of the political parties (Salih, 2006)

The second principle is inclusiveness. Democracy is all about inclusiveness. If there is no provisions for people's inclusion in the party. There may be little participation in the political system. Inclusiveness stresses how wide the circle of party decision makers is. Scarrow (2005) opines that in the most inclusive party, all members, or even all party supporters are given the opportunity to decide on important issues, such as choice of party leaders or in the selection of party candidates. Due to the fact that inclusiveness is a matter of process and formal rule, more inclusive party will offer more opportunities for open deliberation especially in the selection of candidates for election. As it were, this particular condition (inclusiveness) in practice this principle is seriously and visibly lacking in the People's Democratic Party (PDP).

The third principle is party institutionalization. Institutionalization demonstrates the degree to which internal decisions and procedures are formalized and the extent to which the party has coordinated structures through its target constituency. It is believed that parties with high

degree of intra party democracy are generally institutionalized because they need rules that define who is eligible to participate and what constitute victory in internal contest (Chris, 2011)

### **2.7.2 People's Democratic Party (PDP) Constitution and Internal Democracy**

The constitution of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) 2009 (as amended), in Article 17 make elaborate provision for the nomination of candidates election into public offices. The National Executive Committee of the party is charged with the responsibility for the formulation of guidelines and regulations for the nomination of candidates for election into public offices at all levels and it shall be the final authority for resolving all disputes relating to the choice of candidates for the part for any election and for confirming the names or list of names of candidates for the party in any elective public officein the Federation. Article 17.1 contained the procedure for the selection of the party's candidate for election of office in the following:

- (a) In the conduct of primaries for the party's candidate for the post of the President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, primary shall be held at the National Convention of the party specially convened for that purpose
- (b) In the conduct of primaries for the party's candidate for the post of the Governorshipof the State, the primary shall be held at the State Congress of the party specially convened for that purpose
- (c) In the conduct of the primaries for the party's Candidate for the post of local government Council Chairman and House of Assembly, the primaries shall be held at the local government constituency headquarter
- (d) In the conduct of primaries for the party's Candidate for the post of member of the House of Representative, the primaries shall be held at the constituency headquarters.

- (e) In the conduct of primaries for the party's candidate for the post of Senator, the primaries shall be held at the Senatorial constituency headquarters.
- (f) Congress for the election of wards officers, Councillorship Candidates and the three(3) delegates to Local Government Congress and the State Congress out of which at least one (1) shall be a woman and shall be by direct primaries, in which all the card carrying members of the party at ward level shall participate. The constitution further placed a minimum of two years membership span for any member to be eligible to stand for election into any of the party or public office unless the appropriate executive committee rules to contrary ( Babalola,2007).

People's Democratic Party (PDP) Constitution vested the power to organize the party's National Convention with the National Executive Committee. Other functions of this organ are to implement decisions of the National Convention and to supervise other party's organs at all levels. It comprised 25 elected officials and four (4) ex-officio members. Other members were the president and his deputy, BOT, Senate president and his deputy, Senate Leader and his deputy, Senate Whip and his deputy, House Whip and his deputy and three(3) members of the House of Representatives from each of the six geo-political zones. The rest were the state governors, state party chairmen, and all formal national chairmen, chairmen and secretaries of BOT (PDP, 2009, Act 12, Section 71-75). The other two national organs of the party were BOT and the national convention. Membership of the BOT was confirmed to members who have attained 50 years of age and had served or were serving in an elective capacity such as president, vice president, national chairman, deputy national chairman, national secretary, senate president, speaker of the House of Representatives, Additional members included two women and the three(3) other members selected from each of the six geo-political zones BOT is responsible for ensuring highest

ethical standard for the party, advising the party on appropriate policies, and sourcing funds for party (PDP,2009,Art.12,Sections 76-83).

Looking at the elaborateness of this structure, there is the tendency to believe that it succeeded in accommodating conflicting party's interests within its fold and strengthened its support based. However, because from the inception PDP depend heavily on the support and the patronage of rich benefactors, control of the party structure gradually passed into their hands. This greatly affected internal democracy of the party, promoted the ascendance of rich interest groups and the dominance of elected and appointed party members. From 2006, People's Democratic Party(PDP) began to witness mass defection as a result of internal disagreement from its rank to other parties. To properly appreciate how this situation affected internal democracy of the People's Democratic Party (PDP), this situation eventually led to its defeat in 2015 general election in Nigeria(Egwemi,2007)

Peoples Democratic Party more often than not goes contrary to guiding principle of internal democracy. It is biased in terms of nomination process based on the constitution of the party, underrating all the principles of internal arrangement of the party during the primaries election. They engage in anti-democratic element which is a great problem for the smooth operation of internal democracy within the party in term of choosing candidates for election. This is an indication that political godfathers in the party do not believe the party ideology of internal democracy in conducting free, fair and transparent primary election which is the instrument that promotes internal democracy (Abubakar,2013)

## **2.8 Fourth Republic Experience (1999 – 2015)**

The transition to democracy in May 1999 tempts one to conclude that Nigerian politicians have learnt great lesson from the previous republic in terms of adherence to the principles of



internal democracy in the management of political parties. However, all major political parties in this republic are afflicted with the virus of internal crisis. In recent years, the magnitude of crisis within the then ruling party PDP is intense. The party is composed of different groups each with its initial goals (Alayemi, 2013). The magnitude of the intra-party conflict depends on the strength and size of the party in Nigeria. Hence, intra-party conflict in the PDP is not unexpected as it comprises different groups with different interest. The party however aggravates the problem by its failure to accommodate certain democratic principles that would uphold and unite the party.

Consequently, the (PDP) has had to contend with series of intra-party crisis in the past sixteen years. Some major cases of internal crisis in the party include the internal division within the party in 2000 when it was divided into two camps one led by chief Sunday Bolorundoro Awoniya and the other headed by chief Ume Ezeoke; the Anambra State internal tussle between former Governor Chris Ngege and his godfather, Chief Chris Uba; the crisis in the cross River state that led to two factions; the Imo state crisis that led to the defection of senator Ifeanyi Ararumme to Action Congress of Nigeria (ACN) and now back to PDP; the Ogun state crisis that led to the defection of senator Ibikule Amosum to ANPP later to (CAN); the Ekiti state case that led to the defection of former Governor Segun Oni to (CAN) later to (PDP); the crisis in Ondo State that led to the defection of governor Segun Mimiko to labour party; now back to PDP; the crisis in Abia state PDP that led to the defection of the former governor Orji Uzor Kalu to the progressive People Alliance, now back to (PDP) and the Bayelsa state crisis that led to the defection of former governor Timipre Silva to the All Progressive Congress (APC) in addition, internal crisis within PDP led to the defection of the former Vice President, Alhaji Atiku Abubakar to (ACN) in 2003: former senate president late Chuba Okadigbo and late Henry Marshall to (ANPP). The list

is endless as there is no state controlled by PDP where party did not record intra-party crisis (Chukwuma and Ali, 2014 and Junaidu,2011).

The prelude to the 2015 general elections experience is even more worrisome as the lingering intra-party conflict in the PDP tore it into two camps on August 31, 2013. The crisis ensued with the airing of grievances by some members who were not pleased with the leadership of the party. Some of the grievances, as ( Chukwuma and Ali, 2014) highlighted include the increasing repression and arbitrary suspension of members as manifested in the suspension of Governor Rotimi Amechi, the dissolution of the executive of Adamawa state chapter and other violation of democratic principles by the party under the chairmanship of Alhaji Bamaga Tukur.

The 2015 re-election bid of President Jonathan also contributed to the crisis. Some of the aggrieved members were against the president's second term ambition. All these contentious issues were breeding up till August 31, 2013 when the party had the special convention where the dissident party members stormed out of the venue and later called their faction the "new PDP". The disgruntled members were Engineer Rabi'u Musa Kwankwaso, governor of Kano state. Mr Chibuike Rotimi Amechi, the governor of River State, Alhaji Ahmed Abdulfatah, Governor of Kwara state, Alhaji Mutala Nyako, governor of Adamawa State, Alhaji Aliyu Magatakarda Wamako governor of Sokoto state, Alhaji Sule Lamido, Governor of Jigawa state and Alhaji Babangida Aliyu Governor of Niger State. They were led by Alhaji Atiku Abubakar, former Vice president, Alhaji Abubakar Kawu Baraje, former acting national chairman of the party and Chief Olagunsoye Oyinlola, former governor of Osun state and the then secretary of the party.(Chukwuma and Ali,2014).

The inability of the party leadership to resolve the crisis led to defection of five out of seven aggrieved governors and some senators and house of representative members to the then OpposingAll Progressive Congress (APC) in November 2013. The climax crisis was the defection of the speaker of the house of representative, Alhaji Aminu Waziri Tambuwal, to the APC in 2014. The persistence of internal crisis within the PDP and the Subsequent defections of the aggrieved members of the party to opposing party is a culmination of the perennial subterranean wrangling in the party which stemmed from desperate ambitions, lack of party ideology attachment to party system and crass partisan opportunism” (Chukwuma and Ali, 2014). This accounts for the reason why between (1999-2013) they had changed its national chairman for ten times.

This is not a healthy development in Nigerian politics; it shows that Nigerian political parties have fallen short of the expectations of competitive party and internal democracy as a mechanism for the positive management of diversity and therefore, for strengthening democracy and development (Ali, 2015).

### **2.8.1 Implications of Intra-party Conflict on Democracy and Democratization in Nigeria**

Intra-party conflicts in Nigeria’s democracy with particular reference to the fourth Republic have numerous implications. It truncated the development of political parties and democratisation process in the country. Saka and Abubakar (2013) noted that the Nigerian Fourth Republic has been characterised by political violence (intra-party violence inclusive) which portends great danger for democracy and undermine the democratic governance and its process. The conflict also discourages qualified and active citizens from participating in the party’s activities and other political processes that would enhance the democratic sustenance. Intra-party conflict just like other conflict or violence has negative implications

on democratization process in Nigeria; it affects the nation's effort on consolidating its nascent democracy. This is because the imposition of candidate's supporters might not take legal course in seeking justice. Thus, the emergence of conflict in some political parties leads to division or faction among members of such parties and limit the capability of the party in discharging its primary role of interest articulation and aggregation as a necessary input for political process and democratic consolidation (Shea *et al*, 2009).

Apart from fueling violence within the party, intra-party conflict also induces politically motivated assassination. For instance, the assassination of Engineer Funsho Williams, a Lagos state PDP Gubernatorial aspirant and Professor Ayodele Daramola, Another PDP Gubernatorial aspirant in Ekiti state was linked to the conflict (Nigerian Tribune 2006; Sunday Trust 2006; the Nation, 2006).

Intra-party conflict also has an adverse impact on parties finance and their effective operation, most especially in a country where party rely on some wealthy members for survival. The implication of this is that whenever there is internal crisis, some aggrieved state governors and members of parliament may not fulfill their financial obligation thereby jeopardising the effective functioning of political system. Unfortunately, in Nigeria, the culture of having a few number of party financier experienced by PDP in 2013 when some aggrieved governors decided to withdraw their support and finance at the height of the intra party challenges adversely affected the finance of the party (Nwanegbo, Odigbo and Nnorum, 2014).

In the same vein, Sani (2013) pointed three implications of intra-party conflict within PDP. The first was that the frequent of party leadership has affected its stability. The second implication is the destruction of internal party democracy and the third implication the

dominance of private cliques in the party which to some observers influenced the emergence of President Jonathan as the sole presidential flag bearer of the party in the 2015 election. Hence, the consolidation and sustenance of democracy is in danger when PDP, the acclaimed largest party in Africa, does not adhere to the principle of internal democracy. This unhealthy intra party conflict is against the development of political party as catalyst of democracy in Nigeria.

In conclusion, lack of internal democracy or inter-party conflict has been a worrying threat to democratic survival in Nigeria since the colonial period. The first generation of political parties in the country despite their national aspirations, failed to survive mainly due to intra-party crisis fuelled by tribal, religion and regional sentiments. The same affliction affected the major political party in the first and second republics which partly explained their collapse. However, political parties are pillars on which representative democracy, rests and should serve as a compass for construction of healthy democracy. It is regrettable that the experience in Nigeria, most especially during the fourth republic, portrays political parties as cogs in the wheels of progress of democracy and its consolidation. It is argued that intra-party conflict assumes a destructive dimension in Nigerian politics mainly due to poverty of ideology and absence of internal democracy on the part of political parties.

To reverse this ugly situation, there is an urgent need for ideological revamp among Nigerian political parties. Ideological conviction on the part of Nigerian politicians and internal democracy within the parties are highly imperative as it will be a guiding mechanism for the existence of political party to deliver the motives of their establishment.

### **2.8.2 Challenges of Candidates Selection and the People's Democratic Party (PDP)**

The major question here is that who select the party members that desire to contest for election? What is the normal procedure or process for selecting the candidate of the people choice for the party? Is the selection of the candidate based on his popularity among the electorates or loyalty to the godfather of the party? As Scaro (2005) notes, recruiting and selecting is the fundamental task for the parties, because parties profile during elections and while in the office, are largely determined by which candidates are chosen and where their loyalties lie. Whatever procedure that is adopted will be the responsibility of the party to decide who is eligible to contest or participate in the election. The basic assumption here is that selection should be based on good standing of the members. In other words, selection of candidate for election should be devoid of using godfathers influence. This is a serious problem in People's Democratic Party (PDP). Amusan (2010) argues that the undue influence especially self serving influence of the parliamentary group of the party in the selection of the candidates would seriously undermine the internal democracy of the party.

Haruna (2007) made a comprehensive study of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) and democratic process in Nigeria where he observed that the party has grappled with the problem of conducting free and fair intra- party elections which to him is one of the hallmarks of democracy. According to Haruna (2007), the primary elections of December 1998/1999 were plagued with a lot of contentions that made the party to lose many states as a result of frauds that were perpetuated. For example, the loss of governorship position in Jigawa, Kebbi, Zamfara and Kogi State for the party were directly attributed to improper conduct of governorship primaries in those States as well as inability to manage the internal disagreement of the party leadership to bring fundamental harmony.

## **2.9 Gap in Literature**

A lot has been written on internal party democracy and its consequences but scanty on the specific effects of godfatherism on internal democracy of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) since 1999 i.e the work of Odumakin (2009), Haruna (2007), Udoh (2011), Kamal (2011), Azeez (2014), Hazan (2001), Egwu (2014), Ume (2004), Victor (2015), Audu (2014), Scarrow (2005), Salih (2006). Other empirical literature reviewed examined godfatherism and its effects in Nigeria fourth republic. For instance, Osakede and Ijimanwa (2016) argued that the fourth republic in Nigeria has witnessed the phenomenon of godfatherism right from the inception as soon as after the governors were sworn in 1999. The political actors and political godfathers were in the verge of “who is who” in the state. Prominents among kingpins are Modu Alih Sheriff vs Mala Kachala of Borno; Olusola Saraki vs Muhammed Lawal of Kwara State; Jim Nwobodo vs Chimaroke Nnamani of Enugu State; Lamidi Adedibu vs Rachidi Ladoja of Oyo State; to mention a few. To the best of this researcher’s knowledge, no such study has been conducted in Ankpá, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District (2011-2015). Therefore, the study has come to fill this academic gap. This constitutes the point of departure from the existing literature on effects of godfatherism on internal democracy and also serve as a contribution to the body of knowledge.

## **2.10 Theoretical Framework**

Different scholars have postulated different theories on godfatherism. For instance, decision making theory, political economy theory, rational choice theory, political culture theory, conflict theory and elite theory. Although some of them are relevant, however this study is anchored on elite theory.

## **Proponents of Elite Theory**

The following are some of the proponents of the political elite theory who had contributed immensely to the theory: Vilfredo Pareto(1848-1923), Gaetano Mosca (1858-1941), Robert Michels (1876-1936), James Burnham (1905-1987), Floyd Hunter (1912-1992), C. Wright Mills (1916-1962). Others are: Thomas R. Dye (1935 till date), G. William Domhoff (1936 till date) and Robert D. Putnam (1941 till date).

## **Basic Assumptions**

The following are the basic assumptions of the elite theory:

- 1 The elite theory stipulates that overriding and ultimate power can be found among the people who hold key positions in the economic, political and military institutions in any society.
2. The theory assumes that all men love power. Hence, through the elite theory we are able to understand that those in power do not want to surrender power easily but to hold on to it tenaciously and through any means.
3. The theory states that all men are not all endowed alike. Hence, the emphasis on the psychological and intellectual superiority obtained by the elite. It further reinforces the psychological, intellectual and other differences that set apart the political elite from the non-elite.
4. The theory emphasises inequality rather than equality in the society. It stresses the belief that the elites are the highest accomplishers in their fields and that the political elite are imbued with personal resources such as social skills, intelligence and special interest in politics.
5. The theory divides the society into two different groups because politics is essentially, a relationship between rulers and the ruled and it is defined in terms of



power. It is the ruling class that produces the power elite, the power wielding minority group, in any society.

6. The theory emphasises the rule by the minority over the majority in any society. The society is usually ruled by the political elite, a minority group of achievers in politics who are highly organised, cohesive and will do everything to secure, conserve, preserve and perpetuate its power over a majority that is largely unorganised.

### **Strengths of Elite Theory**

The following are some of the strength of elite theory:

1. Elite theory increases and extends awareness of the masses and scientist against the government and the ruling class. As a result, many researches have been conducted on the application of democracy in an organisation.
2. Elite contribute better understanding of social and political life of the societies. The key concept is power and who has the power she/he is the leader of the society.
3. Elite theorist contributed to the development of democracy by showing the differences between theory, constitution and practical application of democracy that have led to the creation of more viable and applicable theories of democracy in many societies.
4. Elitists theories analysed the structure of elites, social stratification in society, social mobility upward and downward, relation among the elite strata and relation between elite and non-elite classes

### **Weaknesses of the Theory**

The following are some of the weaknesses of the elite theory:

- 1 The theory is opposed to pluralism and also contradicts state autonomy theory.

2. Elite theory is anti-democratic and views democracy as a fraud and utopian ideal. It does not depend upon the majority or the willingness of a sufficient part of the citizenship to ensure accountability and transformation of the political elite through free and fair election. Rather, it relies upon the virtue and other standards of self-appointed political elite for securing responsible conduct to perpetuate or maintain power.

3. The theory postulates that political elites devise a variety of methods for maintaining themselves perpetually in power through re-cycling of leaders, elite circulation or perpetuation of regimes, contrary to the belief or assumption that there is the possibility of a gradual and continuous expansion of the political elite.

3 The theory is oligarchical and has been severally and severely criticised for its tacit support for selfish use of power by a few. Only the minority elite group is favoured by the theory at the expense of the non-elite majority.

4. The theory does not believe equality and thrives more on inequality. It is therefore predicated on the inequalities that exist among the people and in the various segments of the societies.

5 The theory has been criticised as more normative than empirical in content and intent. It therefore does not easily lend itself to empiricism and science of politics.

This theory is justified for this reason, Nigerian elites whenever they are, generally come from the same group, those of wealth or intelligent. Political parties in Nigeria whether PDP, APC and APGA are usually control by few individuals in the party. These few influential and powerful individuals who are the minority make all decisions while the majority follows. They are elites

#### **Application / Relevance of Elite Theory**

In spite of the foregoing analysis on the weaknesses of the elite theory, the relevance of this theory to the problem under study cannot be overstressed. This is because of its interconnectivity to the explanation of effects of godfatherism on internal democracy.

Elite theory is relevant to the study at hand under study because it provides a better perspective of the relationship between the godfather and godson which affects the internal democracy of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District in (2011-2015)

The relevance of the elite theory to the problem of the study can also be appreciated based on the fact that it provides the suitable framework for the analysis that take into consideration of the key concepts and variables that this study is concerned with ie, godfatherism and internal democracy. These two variables combined within the theoretical framework and served as a tool of analysis of the effects of godfatherism on internal democracy of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) in the study area that determined the data gathered and the method of analysis and discussion, leading to the conclusions.

The elite theory as a framework is relevant in analyzing party politics and other related concepts such as elite circulation, re-cycling of leaders and regime longevity in Nigeria. Through the elite theory, it becomes clear that those in power do not want to surrender power easily but to hold on to it tenaciously, whereas, some are also out there, struggling fiercely, to gain or hijack power.

### **2.11 Review of Empirical Studies: A study of Kwara and Oyo**

Several empirical studies have been conducted on the effects of godfatherism in Nigeria politics. For instance, Osakede and Ijimanwa (2016) argued that the phenomenon is not new to Nigerian politics as some of the nationalist and freedom fighters such as Nnamdi

Azikiwe, Obafemi Awolowo, Ahmadu Bello, etc, are some how related to the modern day operation of political godfathers but not the same. The fourth Republic in Nigeria has witnessed the phenomenon right from the inception as soon as after the Governor were sworn- in 1999. The political actors and their political godfathers were in the verge of contending “ who is who” in their states Prominents among kingpins in the states are Modu Alih Sheriff ( Senator) vs Governor Mala Kachalla of Borno; Olusola Saraki vs Late Muhammed Lawal governor of Kwara State; Jim Nwobodo ( Senator) vs Governor Chimaroke Nnamani (Enugu State); Chief Emeka Okafor (Chief) vs Governor Chinwoke Mbadinju (Anambra State); Abubakaru Rimi (Alhaji) vs Governor Rabiul Kwankwaso of Kano State and Lamidi Adedibu vs Governor Rachidi Ladoja of Oyo State to mention a few. These are various political godfatherism climax down the democratic institution of their states to wars. Prominents of which are emphasised below.

### **The Kwara experience**

The Kwara started between 1999-2003, the battle line in Kwara politics was Saraki former Senate leader and political kingpins, was in contest for relevance with Muhammed Lawal, a retired Navy Commodore, who was the governor of the state then. Saraki, who has installed not less than four (4) Governors in the state, including Lawal himself, fell out with Lawal on the sharing of political benefits and commissioners. But Lawal did not compromise and this led to serious crisis between the godfather (SARAKI) and godson (LAWAL) which culminated into the expulsion of Saraki from All People’s Party (APP) and Saraki teamed up with People’s Democratic Party (PDP) in the state.

Then, the 2003 elections to both men was the ultimate battle to determine the political grandmaster of the state. They deployed their vast resources to prosecute the “war”. During

this “war,” bomb blast shattered the peace of Ilorin, this happened at the premises of National Pilot owned by Saraki. A lot of people were assassinated, many injured. Notable among those assassinated was the Chairman of PDP in the state, Shemed Patigi, who was brutally murdered in August 2002. Supporters of two (2) camps openly confronted each other with dangerous weapons. But this was put to end when the junior Saraki won the Governorship election in the state in 2003 and the rest became history.

### **The Oyo Experience**

The battle line in Oyo State was drawn between Lamidi Adedibu the political kingpin of Ibadan politics (godfather) and the (godson) governor of the state, Rashidi Ladoja. Adedibu claimed to have contributed financially in “installing” Ladoja as the governor, with an agreement that the governor will be loyal and submissive, taking order from him and to subject public resources, to his private whims and caprices. However, Ladoja reneged and refused to play according to the rules of the game. This culminated into crisis in Ibadan after 2003 elections till January 2006. Many lives and properties were lost. The State House of Assembly was divided into two (2) camps and led to the suspension of fourteen (14) members out of thirty two (32) members Assembly. This led to the impeachment of Ladoja within 25 minutes in January 2006 to pave way for his deputy, Alao Akala, another willing godson who is eager to serve the godfather better. The situation was maintained till December 7<sup>th</sup> 2006 final ruling of apex court (Supreme Court) that his removal was illegal and was reinstated after eleven (11) months out of his office. His coming back to office was faced with serious resistance from his former godfather’s Adedibu camp, which led to the

breakdown of law and orders in the state capital in few days and living many innocent citizens with various kind of injuries (Azeez,2014).

The emergence of godfatherism in the fourth republic (1999-2015) empirically posed a great threat to democratic dividends and to socio- economic development and stability of good governance. Perhaps, one of the most disturbing and damaging influence of godfatherism in Nigeria's fourth republic was canvassing for a truly free, fair and credible electoral process in which the electorates by right are expected to freely elect who govern them and represent their interest. Indeed, the privilege of electing people of their choice to govern them was denied given the situations in which godfathers foisted candidates of their choice on the generality of the people. This is to say it is very inimical to the tenets of democratic rule (Chukwuemeka,2012). This scenario is also inimical to good governance and political stability which are predicated on the rule of law, due process, accountability and transparency in the management of public affairs.

The emergence of godfatherism has also rob the citizens the privilege of enjoying the dividends of democratic governance in the sense that government has become reluctant to initiate and implement policies that will advance the well being of the generality of the citizens. This is a result of the fact that godfatherism in Nigeria is predatory in nature. The primary aim of venturing into politics was born out of the need to acquire wealth from the coffers of the government to which their godsons held sways (Chukwuemeka, 2012).

In case godsons refuse to settle their godfather as agreed, he will let loose. The recorded in Oyo State between Senator Rachidi Ladoja and Alhaji Lamidi Adedibu (2003-2007), Alhaji Olusola Saraki and retired Navy Commodore Muhammed Lawal between (2003-2007), also the experience recorded in Abakaliki Local Government Area, Ebonyi State, between

the former Chairman, Hon. Emma Uguru and Mr. Mathew Uguru (incumbent),(2007-2011) (Joseph, Ibeogu and Nwankwo,2014).Basedon the study of Osakede and Ijimakinwa (2016). Gofatherism and democratic consolidation in Nigeria, empirical evidence from Oyo and Kwara State, their study employed descriptive statistic survey research, forty three(43) people were interviewed at mile 2 Lagos, Oyo State motor park with people living at Oyo State at the same, thirty(30) indigene of Kwara State also interviewed at Ijora Lagos, Kwara State with people residing at Kwara. The coded data were analyzed using simple percentage method and chi-squire techniques. The result revealed that godfatherism has become of the greatest problem to Nigeria democratic consolidation.The study concludes that political gladiators (political godfather and godson) have denied the citizenry the right to elect their prefer candidates as their leaders. The study recommends that democratic institution should be strengthened to save the system from godfatherism in order to allow credible people to participate in politics and also allow the masses who are the driving force behind democracy to elect their prefer candidates

This chapter reviewed literature related to the study on the effects of godfather on internal democracy of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) It was clear that godfatherism has become a threat to democratic consolidation in Nigeria. The findings of this empirical study indicated that godfatherism has threatened the country's nascent democracy. It is this position among other things that the competition among the godfathers to control the state powerand resources through their favoured godsons have denied the electorates the right to elect their prefer candidate.

Theoretically, elite posits that in every society there is, and must be a minority which rules over the rest of the society, and this minority forms the political class or the governing elite

composed of those who occupy the posts of political command and more regularly those who can directly influence political decisions

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

This chapter provides a detailed description of techniques adopted for the data collection and analysis of the study. This entailed the description of research design, the location of the study, types and sources of data, population of the study, sampling techniques, sample size and method of data analysis.

#### **3.2 Research Design**

The study adopted a survey research design to examine godfatherism and internal party democracy of the People's Democratic Party (PDP): A Study of Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District (2011-2015) elections. This method seeks the opinions of the key stake holders of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) such as local government party leaders, Secretaries of the party, Public Relation



Officers, Former Councillors, Wards leaders, Treasurer, Financial Secretary, Women leaders, former Chairman of (PDP) and youth leaders on the phenomenon of the study, from which generalizations are made.

### **3.3 Location of the Study**

The location of the study is Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency. These three(3) local government areas were created in different years, Ankpa 1968, Omala 1996, and Olamaboro 1991. This Federal Constituency has a total number of thirty four (34) political wards with the total population of (532,778) National Population Commission (NPC, 2006). The constituency is located in Kogi East Senatorial District

Among the three local governments that made up the constituency, Ankpa, has the highest population with thirteen(13) political wards: Ankpa I; Ankpa II; Ankpa suburb I; Ankpa suburb II; Ankpa township; Enjema I; Enjema II; Enjema III; Enjema IV; Ojoku I; Ojoku II; Ojoku III and Ojoku IV, with the total population of 266, 176 (NPC 2006). And this followed by Olamaboro with ten (10) wards which are; Imane I; Imane II; Ogugu I; Ogugu II; Ogugu III; Olamaboro I; Olamaboro II; Olamaboro III; Olamaboro IV; and Olamaboro V with the total population of 158,634, and Omala with eleven (11) wards; Abejukolo 1; Abejukolo 2; Akpacha; Bagaji; Bagana; Icheke Ajokpachi; Ogodu, Oji-Aji; Okpatala; Olla; and Opada Ofeji with the total population of 107,968. (NPC, 2006).

This constituency is multi- religious and mono-ethnic. The population comprises of both Muslims and Christians with Igala being the dominant ethnic group. The major occupations of the people of this constituency are farming, trading and civil service.

### **3.4 Sources of Data Collection**

The study relied on both primary and secondary sources of information. The respondents are members of Peoples Democratic Party in the study area.

- **Primary Sources:** are data collected directly from the field to address a research problem for which it was designed for. Primary source was used because the researcher believe it is capable of providing first hand information require to address the phenomenon under study, Data was collected from respondents who are the key stake holders of the People's Democratic Party in the study area
- **Secondary Source,** data were generated from existing literature documented in books, journals, internets, magazines and published articles. These were accessed and collected from Kashim Ibrahim Library (KIL) ABU Zaria, Postgraduate Library of the Department of Political Science, ABU Zaria, Faculty of Social Sciences Library ABU Zaria, Kogi State University, Anyigba (KSU), and Department of Political Science Lagos State University, (LASU). The internet was used extensively to get online journals and reports

### **3.5 Population of the study and Sample Size**

The Population of this study comprised male and female key stakeholders of the People's Democratic Party in the study area. The choice of these categories was influenced by the fact that the researcher believed they have are familiar with the activities of godfatherism on internal party democracy of the Peoples' Democratic Party (PDP) in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency (2011-2015). As such, they could contribute meaningfully in terms of information needed to address the problem of the study.

### 3.6 Sample Size Determination

For questionnaire, the formular developed by Yamane(1967) was used in determining the sample size for this study. The formular is:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where:

n= the sample size to be determined

N=Total number of key stake holders in 34 political wards 238

E=margin of error 5%

Confidence level 95%

In this case:

n=sample size149

N=238

Therefore:

$$\frac{238}{1 + 238(0.05)^2}$$

$$\frac{238}{1 + 238(0.0025)}$$

$$\frac{238}{1 + 0.595}$$

$$\frac{238}{1.595}$$

n =149.22

Based on this, the study sampled 149key stakeholders of the PDP in 34 political wards in the study area.Each of the wards in the study area comprises of seven (7) key stakeholders: Ward leaders, Secretary, financial secretary, public relation officer (P.R.O), youth leaders, women leaders and Treasurer. Four key stakeholders were randomly selected out of the seven stakeholders in each of the wards and also thirteen(13) former Counsellors at the ward level were randomly selected in the study area. The selection was done based on balloting system where by their names were writing in a pieces of papers after which they were selected.149sample size was arrived. The sample size therefore stood at 149 questionnaires.

### **3.6.1 Sampling Technique**

For the purpose of convenience and accuracy in the selection of respondents, the researcher employed probability sampling to draw the sample from the key stakeholders of the Peoples Democratic Party at the ward level in the study area. This is because probability gives equal chance to all the keystakeholders in the study area to be selected into the sample. Under probability sampling, simple random sampling was adopted to select the key stakeholders for the study. The selection of the key stakeholders was done through balloting system where the positions of all the key stakeholders and the names of the former Counsellors who are still strong members of the party in each of the wards in the study area were written in the pieces of papers and folded into a container, shuffled thoroughly after which they were picked one after the other in each of the 34 wards in the study area.

## **Key Stakeholders Interviewed**

Face to face interviews were personally conducted by the researcher with the help of research assistants. Relevant questions were raised on godfatherism and internal democracy of People's Democratic Party (PDP) in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro of Kogi East Senatorial District, during the interview to seek the information from stakeholders at the local government level.

## **3.7 Method of Data Collection**

In order to collect reliable data and capture the range of information needed to arrive the research objectives, both quantitative and qualitative method of data collection were employed in this study. The two methods were used for the purpose of complimenting the weakness of each other.

### **3.7.1 Quantitative Data**

The quantitative data collection involves the use of collection of mass data from the large number of respondents with questionnaires being the major instrument of data collection. The questionnaire was divided into two (2) sections, A and B respectively. Section A contained the Bio- data of the respondents; section B addresses the questions on the effect of godfatherism on internal democracy of the Peoples' Democratic Party (PDP). At the ward level, questionnaires were distributed to ward leaders, women leaders, youth leaders, party secretary and Public Relation Officer (PRO), Financial Secretary and the Treasurer of the party and the formal Councillors under plat form of PDP in the study area.

The questionnaire was designed in English language. For the respondents that do not understand English, the questionnaire was translated in their native language and

was guided by the research assistants that were hired to assist the respondents on how to answer the questions.

### 3.7.2 Qualitative Data

The qualitative data collection is concerned with the collection of in-depth information from relatively few respondents who are key stake holders of People's Democratic Party (PDP) in the study area. The technique of data collection used was in-depth interviews (IDI). The IDI guide contained a set of questions which were directed to the key stake holders of the party at the local government level, that is, local government party leaders, women leaders, party Secretary, the party youth leader, Kogi East PDP party leader and former chairman of the Local Government under the platform of PDP were interviewed. This enable the researcher to get in-depth information that could complement the data collected through questionnaires.

### **3.8 Method of Data Analysis**

The data collected from the field through questionnaires were cross checked one after the other to minimise error and coding was done after which data was analysed. The findings were presented in the tables, frequencies and simple percentages for clear understanding. Interpretation and conclusions were drawn based on the findings.

Data obtained through In-depth interviews was audio taped for easy handling and interpretation, the data was first of all transcribed from the tape recorder to a written format and typed into computer and processed after which the transcribed data were incorporated into the data collected through questionnaires for the purpose of complementation.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **4.0: DATA PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION AND ANALYSIS**

#### **4.1 Introduction**

This chapter deals with presentation and analysis of data collected from the field through questionnaire administration and interview. A total of 149 questionnaires were administered to the key stakeholders of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) that cut across the 34 political wards in the study area. After concerted efforts, one hundred and forty five representing (97.3%) were completed and returned while four (2.7%) were not returned. Six out of returned one hundred and forty five questionnaires were invalid. The analysis was based on the valid one hundred and thirty nine (139) completed questionnaires using

simple percentage and were corroborated with qualitative data gathered from the nineteen (19) interview conducted with the key stakeholders at the local government level.

#### 4.2 Bio Data of the Respondents

**Table 4.1: Age Distribution of Respondents**

Age	Frequency	Percentage (%)
18-29	28	20.14
30-39	25	17.99
40-49	46	33.09
50 and above	40	28.78
Total	139	100

**Source: Field Work, 2019**

The table above shows that the age distribution of respondents thus; 40-49 represented by (33.09%), follow by 50 and above(28.78%), 30-39(17.99%), 18-29(20.14%) representatively. The table shows that the age range from 40-49 of the respondents are more interested in politics than other age categories in the study area.

**Table 4.2: Gender of Respondents**

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	110	79.14
Female	29	20.86
Total	139	100

**Source: Field Work, 2019**

The table indicated that (79.14%) of the respondents are males while (20.86%) represent female gender. Male gender dominates because most of the leaders of the party are male. This is an indication that male respondents are politically oriented than that of female counter part in the study area.

**Table 4.3: Marital Status of Respondents**

Marital status	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Single	40	28.78



Married	80	57.55
Divorce	10	7.19
Separated	9	6.47
Total	139	100

**Source: Field Work, 2019**

The table shows that the married respondents are more than other categories which is represented by the total of (57.55%). The single also have impressive percentage of (28.78)%, divorce is represented by (7.19%) while those that are separated from their home is represented by (6.47%). This is an indication that married key stake holders in PDP are more than single in the study area.

**Table 4.4: Occupation of the Respondents**

Occupation	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Civil servant	33	23.74
Self employed	82	58.99
Unemployed	20	14.39
Student	4	2.88
Total	139	100

**Source: Field Work, 2019**

The table shows the occupational distribution of the key stake holders of the PDP in the study area. The statistics from the occupational distribution shows that self employed are represented by 82(58.99%), civil servants are represented by 33(23.74%) unemployed are represented by 20(14.39%) and 4 represented by (2.88%) are students. The data shows that self-employed are more interested in politics than other categories in the study area.

**Table 4.5: Educational Qualification of Respondents**

Educational Qualification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Primary	10	7.19
O/level	45	32.37
Tertiary	75	53.96
Non-formal education	9	6.47
Total	139	100

**Source: Field Work, 2019.**

This table clearly shows that (53.96%) of the key stakeholders of the PDP attended tertiary institutions. O/level also have impressive turn out of (32.37%), followed by primary (7.19%) and Non formal education is (6.47%). From this, it shows that respondents who attended tertiary institutions among the key stakeholders are more than others. This is a clear indication that the level of education in the study area in terms of politics is very high and this contribute to the level of political awareness in the study area.

### **4.3 Godfatherism and Internal Party Democracy in the Study Area**

**Table 4.6: Did godfather factor affect the conduct of PDP primary election in your constituency in 2011?**

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	101	72.66
No	38	27.34
Total	139	100

**Source: Field Work, 2019.**

This table indicates that a total number of (72.66%) of the key stakeholders of PDP agreed that godfather factor affected the conduct of primary election in 2011 election in the study area while (27.34%) of the key stakeholders disagreed with the claim. From this, it means that the godfather factor affected the conduct of primary election in the study area in 2011 election. The submission of this sampled in table 4.6 is corroborated by the Chairman of PDP in Ankpa. An interview conducted with Mr. Haruna Muhammed. He disclosed that:

Godfather affected the conduct of primary election in the study area in 2011 election which has negative effect on our internal party arrangement. Godfather is one of the problems of the People Democratic Party because it deny many people the opportunity to pursue their political ambition and this affect the internal structure of the party in many ways especially in the area of decision making where only interest of the few is given much importance (Muhammed, Interview, 2019).

Similar assertion was maintained by Zainab Maha, PDP women leader in Ankpa in seperate interview, disclosed that:

Godfathers have no positive effect in building the party internal structure in my constituency because it denies many people especially the credible candidates the opportunity to contest election. She further maintained that unconstitutional imposition of candidates has rendered the party weak from the grass root level(Zainab, interview 2019)

**Table 4.7:What factor worked against your party in 2011 election in your constituency?**

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Imposition of candidates by the political godfather	85	61.15
Lack of credible electoral process	40	28.78
Taking decision outside the party	14	10.07
Total	139	100

**Source: Feld Work, 2019**

This table demonstrates that imposition of candidates worked against the party in 2011 election according to the key stakeholders which is represented by (61.15%) while (28.78%) said lack of credible electoral processes worked against the party and insignificant number of (10.07%) respondents said taking decision outside the party detrimental to the party. The analysis in this table shows that imposition of candidate is destructive to the party in 2011 election as indicated by the key stakeholders. Godfather

factors hampered the party in 2011-2015 elections in the study area. This is corroborated by

Local Government Youth leader in Olamaboro who disclosed that:

Towards 2011-2015 elections, the selfish interest of the dominant Individuals in PDP to impose their favourite godsons actually lead to the defeat of the party in 2015 general elections both in our constituency and the entire Nigeria. Also the party constitutional provision as regard to primaries were not followed (Mudi, interview 2019).

Similar submission was maintained by James Omede Local Youth Leader Omala who disclosed that:

According to the above informant, “godfathers in our constituency did not follow the party constitutional provisions as regard to primary election. Many of them did not regard the party constitution of internal democracy as an instrument that will build the party from grass root level (James, interview 2019).

**Table 4.8: Did the influence of godfathers affect equal participation by all PDP members in decision making in your constituency in 2015 elections?**

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	50	35.97
No	81	58.27
All of the above	5	3.60
Indifference	3	2.16
Total	139	100

**Source: Field Work, 2019**

This table shows that 81 respondents (58.27%) of the key stakeholders maintained there was no equal participation among all the PDP members in decision-making in the study area while (35.97%) members of the key stakeholders agreed that there is equal participation. Meanwhile, 5 respondents (3.60) of them opined that all of the above. Indifference (2.16). From this, the level of equal participation of all members is very low.

To corroborate these findings, another informant Atakpa John PDP Secretary Omala stated that:

Interference of state party excos and local government party excos during the conduct of primary election has become a challenge to the functioning of internal democracy in our party and this has made decision making unequal especially at the grass root level(John, interview 2019)

Similar position was maintained by Enemona PDP Chairman Olamaboro who stated that:

The principle of internal democracy which gives equal rights to all the members of the party to participate in decision making where not followed because dominants elements have hijacked the party structure especially when it comes to decision making. Thus, unequal decision making affected the party in many aspects due to the influence of the political godfathers (Enemona, Interview, 2019).

**Table 4.9: Were the rules and regulations guiding PDP primary followed?**

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	30	21.58
No	98	70.50
Indifference	11	7.91
Total	139	100

**Source: Field Work, 2019**

This table indicates that 98 respondents (70.50%) of the stakeholders in the study area conceded that rules and regulations guiding PDP primaries were not followed while 30 respondents (21.58%) of them said the rules and regulations guiding the primaries were followed and indifference represented by 11 respondents (7.91%). Arising from this, it

shows that PDP did not follow the rules and regulations guiding the party primaries. The submission of sampled in table 4.9 on the rules and regulations of PDP is corroborated by the submission of the Chairman PDP Kogi East; who submits that: Although imposition of candidates is not part of the party rules and regulations, the dominant elements use it as a principle in the party which did not give room for the party to build bottom-up approach that will produce better representatives (Faruq, Interview, 2019).

**Table 4.10 was the primary election of PDP in 2011 elections in your constituency free, fair and credible?**

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
To a lesser extent	40	28.78
To some extent	87	62.59
Non of the above	12	8.63
Total	139	100

**Source: Field Work, 2019**

A total number of 87 respondents (62.59%) of the key stakeholders in the study area admitted that primary election of the PDP in 2011 in the study area to some extent was not free, fair and credible; while 40 respondents (28.78%) agreed that to some extent it was free, fair and credible. Also, 12 respondents (8.63) said none of the above. This shows that PDP primary election was not free, fair and credible. This assertion is corroborated with former Chairman of PDP in Ankpa Local Government that:

That the primary election of PDP was conducted under the influence of godfather in the constituency for instance, the former governor imposed his Son on the people which is a bad sign in a representative democracy because free and fair elections has been thrown aside. The party constitution as regard to primary was not followed (Abubakar, interview 2019).

In separate reactions, Patrick Haruna PDP Chairman Omala maintained that: Undue interference by the state party exco during primary election has posed serious challenges to

the functioning of internal arrangement of PDP. It has a lot of effects in building the party structure at grass root level (Patrick, interview 2019).

**Table 4.11 Did PDP candidates in 2011 election emerged out of consensus or election?**

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Election	30	21.58
Out of consensus	35	25.18
By powerful individual in the party	65	46.76
Non of the above	9	6.47
Total	139	100

**Source: Field Work, 2019**

This table shows that 65 respondents (46.76%) of the key stakeholders in the study area submitted that candidates for 2011 election in the constituency emerged through the influence of powerful individuals in the party; while 35 respondents (25.18%) said out of consensus and 30 respondents (21.58%) agreed that is through election, 9 respondents (6.47%) picked none of the above. This shows that PDP candidate emerged through the influence of powerful individuals in the party. This is confirmed by Victoria Adujo PDP women leader Olanaboro that: Dominant elements known as godfathers in the party always go for consensus in order to satisfy their own interest of imposing candidates against people's choice and it worked against the party internal arrangement (Victoria, Interview, 2019)

**Table 4.12: Was the PDP primary election in 2015 in your constituency free, fair and credible?**

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	36	25.90
No	103	74.10
Total	139	100

**Source: Field Work, 2019**

This table above shows that 103 of the respondents (74.10%) of the stakeholders said PDP primary in 2015 was not free, fair and credible, while 36 of the respondents (25.90%) agreed

that there was a free, fair and credible election in 2011 primary election. This shows that in 2015 election, PDP did not conduct free, fair and credible election in the selection of candidates. The submission of this sample was corroborated by PDP PRO Olamaboro who maintained that:

Internal party democracy means interest of everybody in the party must be carried along without personal, religion or ethnic considerations, to allow free and fair election in order to produce good and capable representative in government but the reverse is the case, as the primary election conducted was not free, fair and credible in my constituency in 2015 election (Illemona, interview 2019).

**Table 4.13: Did the PDP primary election for the post of the House of Representative in 2011 election in your constituency held at the constituency headquarters or outside?**

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Constituency headquarters	44	31.65
Outside the constituency headquarters	95	68.35
Total	139	100

**Source: Field, 2019**

The primary election for the post of the House of Representatives candidate was conducted outside the constituency headquarters. This represents 95 of the respondents (68.35%) of the total number of the key stakeholders; while 44 of the respondents (31.65%) affirmed that it was conducted in the constituency headquarters. This shows that primary election for the post of the House of Representative was conducted outside the constituency headquarters which is against the constitution of the party. Benjamin Ijaja PDP PRO Olamaboro stated that: The primary election was held in Lokoja which is not even part of the constituency area. The party did not respect their constitution as a guiding principle of internal democracy and it is against the norms of internal democracy of PDP (Benjamin, Interview 2019).



**Table 4.14: Have the PDP leaders respect PDP constitution?**

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	57	41.01
No	82	58.99
Total	139	100

**Source: Field Work, 2019**

The table shows that 82 of the respondents (58.99%) of the key stakeholders in the study area believed PDP leaders did not respect the constitution of the party; while 57 of the (41.01) of the key stakeholder said the leaders of the party respect the constitution. From this, it shows majority of the party chieftains in PDP did not respect the party constitution which is against the party internal democracy. This was captured in the submission of PDP PRO in Ankpa Yahaya Suleiman that: Between 2011-2015, the party leaders deviated from the key ingredients of the party constitution that gives room for equal participation and representative in the constituency which affected the internal arrangements of our party in 2015 election in many levels (Yahaya, Interview, 2019).

**Table 4.15: Have inclusiveness of rank and file members in taking decision has effect on internal arrangement of PDP in your constituency**

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
To some extent	30	21.58
To a greater extent	67	48.20
To a lesser extent	42	30.22
Total	139	100

**Source: Field Work, 2019**

This table clearly shows that inclusiveness of rank and file members has great effect on the internal democracy of PDP in the study area as statistics shows which are represented by 67 respondents (48.20%); while to some extent, is 30 respondents (21.58%) and to a lesser extent 42(30.22). This analysis shows that the inclusiveness of rank and file members has lesser effect on the internal democracy of PDP according to the key stakeholders. This

analysis is corroborated by Musa Khalid former Counsellor Ogugu Ward Olamaboro who stated that:

Intenal democracy means rank and file members in the party should be carried along. But reverse is the case as rank and files members where not given the opportunity to express their democratic rights which would have built the party from the grassroot to the national level.This shows the culture of personalisation of power in politics which affected the party internal arrangements from 2011 up till now (Musa, Interview, 2019).

**Table 4.16: What measures do you think can be put in place to address the influence of godfatherism on the internal affairs of PDP in your constituency?**

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Political awareness campaign	30	21.58
Respect for party constitution	90	64.75
Using money on party members	19	13.67
Total	139	100

**Source: Field Work, 2019**

According to the table above, respect for party constitution which is represented by 90 respondents (64.75%) is one of the measures to address the effect of godfatherism; while 30 respondents (21.58%) of the key stakeholders said political awareness campaign and using money on members is represented by 19 respondents (13.67%). This shows that respect for party constitution is one of fundamental instruments that will address the effect of godfatherism on internal democracy of PDP in the study area. This assertion is confirmed by the former Chairman of PDP who maintained that:

Respect for party constitutional procedure will give room for due process in the selection of leaders from the party and this will address the phenomena of godfatherism and also political awareness campaign should be put in palce to address the issue of candidates' imposition against the people's choice (Alih, Interview, 2019).

#### **4.4 Discussion of Major Findings**

The research has three objectives in corroborated with three findings:

- 1. The first objective is to Assess whether godfatherism Influence Internal Party democracy of the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Ankpa, Qmala and Qlamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East.**

The research discovered that godfatherism influence internal party democracy in the study area. This is evident from the submission of the sample in table 4.6 as well as the assertion of Peoples Democratic Party Chairman in Ankpa Local Government, which also goes inline with the submission of Zainab PDP women leader in Ankpa that godfatherism affect the party internal arrangement in the selection of leaders in the constituency particularly from 2011 upto 2019.

This confirmed assumption (1) one of the research that godfatherism influence internal democracy of the Peoples Democratic Party in Ankpa, Qmala and Qlamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District in (2011-2015).

**The second objective seeks to find out whether the nature of political godfatherism determine those candidates that emerged in 2011 election in the study area**

This research discovered that the nature of political godfatherism determined those candidates that emerged in (2001-2015) in Ankpa, Qmala and Qlamaboro Fedral Constituency of Kogi East. This evidence can be seen in table 4.11 and 4.8as well as the submission of interview by Mudi PDP youth leader Qlamaboro and John PDP Secretary Qmala that there are political godfathers in the constituency who often determine candidates for election and also take the decision for the party in the constituency unequal.

This confirmed assumption two that the nature of political godfatherism in electoral politics of PDP in Ankpa, Ọmala and Ọlamabọrọ Federal Constituency of Kogi East determined those candidates that emerged during election

**The Third Objective Is To Know Whether Influence of Godfatherism On Internal Party Democracy of PDP Can Be Minimized Through Respect For Party Constitution And Political Awareness Campaign In The Study Area**

This research discovered that influence of godfatherism on internal democracy of PDP can be minimised. This can be seen in table 4.16 as well as the argument of the former Chairman of Ọmala Local Government Hon. Alih who argued that respect for party constitutional procedures and political awareness campaign should be given due attention in order to minimise the negative effect of political godfatherism.

This confirms the assumption three that influence of political godfatherism on internal democracy of PDP in the study area can be minimise through respect for party constitution and political awareness campaign

**4.5 Discussion of Findings**

The findings of this study reveals that godfather influence internal democracy of the PDP in Ankpa, Ọmala and Ọlamabọrọ Federal constituency of Kogi State East senatorial district in 2011. About 85 (54.14%) of the key stateholders of the People Democratic Party in the study area agreed that imposition of candidate has effect on internal democracy of People Democratic Party (see table seven). The principle of internal democracy which gives equal rights to all all members of the party to participate in decision making where not followed because dominant elements have hijacked the party structure especially when it comes to decision making process (Enemona, interview, 2019). This is supported by Ajayi (2014) that

godfatherism is a kind of politics whereby influential persons in a popular or ruling party will assist someone usually the godson to emerge as a winner at all levels either by free or foul means. He can also help him or her to emerge victorious irrespective of whether the candidate is popular or not.

Findings also revealed that the nature of political godfatherism in the People's Democratic Party deny people equal opportunity in decision making in the study area. Internal democracy means rank and file members within the political should be carried along without personal, ethnic or religion consideration. But the reverse is the case as rank and file members were not given equal opportunity to express their democratic rights which actually has become a challenge facing the party from the grassroots to the national level. This culture of personalization of power in politics has affected the growth of the party structure (Musa, interview, 2019). This is in line with Scarow(2005) that in most inclusive party, all members or even all party leaders are given equal opportunity to decide on some important issues, such as choice of party leaders or in selection of party candidates. This particular issue is seriously lacking in PDP due the activities of political godfathers in the party. This is also corroborated with Salihu (2006) who points out that equal participation of all members and groups in democratic processes of the party should be carried along. This emphasises the involvement of rank and file in the party policies, as well as representative at party activities and its party bodies. Democratic policy-making involves participative processes of policy development in debates, consultations, meeting and other platforms and decentralizes the mandate of decision making to the rank and file of the political parties.

The primary election of PDP was conducted under the influence of godfatherism in 2011-2015 election in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency. For instance, the Son of the former governor was imposed on the people which is a bad sign of

representative democracy (Abubakar, interview, 2019). This is in line with Adeyemo (2006) concedes that conducting primaries election no doubt is one of the means of testing the tenacity and authenticity of any party internal democracy. It has been proven from many studies that some primaries conducted in some political parties are sheers promotional agenda of the political godfathers as they do not contribute positively to empowerment of rank and file in those parties. Consensus exists only when people agree on something and they are more likely to agree when the same facts are properly adhered to.

The most debilitating aspect of lack of internal democracy is the party financiers and godfathers select candidates who are the beholdng to them for elective position at expense of the party membership, making election and electoral process a mere shame (Egwu, 2014). This goes in line with (Muhammed,interview,2019), that godfathers has created numerous problems in People’s Democratic Party because its deny many peple the opportunity to pursue their political ambition.

To determine the measure to address the effects of godfatherism in the study area 90 (57.32%) of the key stakeholders agreed that respect for party constitution will solve the influence of godfatherism on internal democracy of the People Democratic Party in the study area. This is in line with the constitution of the People’s Democratic Party (PDP) 2009 (as amended), in Article 17 make elaborate into public offices. Article 17.1 contained the procedure for the selection of candidates at all levels.

#### **4.6 Godfatherism and Internal Party Democracy**

##### **CROSS TABULATION ANALYSIS**

	Was primary election free, fair and credibthele election	Total
--	--	-------

		No	Yes	
God fatherism and conduct of	Yes	10	60	70
Primary Election	No	9	60	69
Total		19	120	139

**Source:** Fieldwork, 2019.

Firstly, based on the above cross tabulation table, it has demonstrated that godfatherism and internal party democracy has negative relationship. The evidence from the above cross tabulation says a total 70% respondents in the study area agreed that godfather influence did not allow free, fair and transparent primary election in the constituency. This analysis corroborated with sample table 4.10 that says a total of 87 respondents (62.29%) of the keystakeholders in the study area admitted that primary election of (PDP) in the study area. To some extent, the election was not free, fair and credible while it was free, fair and credible. This also shows there is negative relationship between godfatherism and internal party democracy in the study area.

Secondly, based on the outcome of the cross tabulation table, it was also demonstrated that 69 respondents in the study area confirmed that godfatherism has negative influence on internal party democracy due to the unconstitutional imposition of candidate during the primary election. This evidence can be seen in table 4.13, that the primary election for the post of house of representative in 2011 was conducted under the influence of political godfathers in the study area. This represents 95 of the respondents (68.35%) of the total keystakeholders, while 44 of the respondents (3.65%) affirmed it was free. This has practically demonstrated that there is negative relationship between godfatherism and internal party democracy in the study area.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **5.1 Summary**

This work investigated the effects of godfatherism on internal democracy of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District,(2011 – 2015). To create a pathway for this study, three research objectives and corresponding research questions were used as a guide. Several studies have been conducted on godfatherism and internal democracy in Nigeria but no careful attention has been paid to the effects of godfatherism on internal democracy of the People's Democratic Party(PDP) with respect to Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District over time. This was therefore the gap that this study filled. Chapter two dealt with literature review and theoretical framework. In this chapter, the researcher examined the concept of godfatherism, internal democracy, political party and democracy and an examination of godfatherism in Nigeria. In this chapter, also the theoretical framework for the study (elite theory) was clearly explained. This theory explains the various relationships of power in the society. This theory assumed that participation of elites in a typical democratic society would be detrimental to the society because interest of the few would be put into consideration thereby neglecting the interest of the masses. Chapter three provided the research methodology for the study, in Chapter Four, data were interpreted and analysed using simple percentage.

#### **5.2 Conclusion**

Based on the outcome of the study, it was concluded that godfatherism affects internal democracy of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Federal Constituency of Kogi State (2011-2015) election. It is clear, though that



godfatherism exists in many democracies around the world. It is good to have influential people in any society in order give strong backing to electoral candidates. There is nothing wrong with it if the aim is to give good people the mantle of leadership. What is wrong with Nigerian situation of godfatherism is that the godfathers have turned Nigerian politics into money making business under which elections are rigged with a view to imposing candidates against the people's choice. The public office has become an instrument of manipulation by the political mentors otherwise known as the political godfathers.

From all indications, godfatherism is the major obstacle to political and economic development in Nigeria because it involves employment of all illegal means to achieve their political and economic objectives during registration of voters, conduct of primaries and general elections in Nigeria.

### **5.3 Recommendations**

In the light of the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are offered:

1. Political parties should cultivate the culture of inclusiveness, accountability, transparency, participation and representation to promote internal structure of the PDP in order to include party members in decision making process and deliberation within the party structure.
2. Political awareness campaign should be put in place to end imposition of candidates by the political godfathers.
3. The electoral laws should lay emphasis on proper conduct of primary elections in order to enhance the right of the electorate

4. Selection of candidates for elections or declaring candidates “ unopposed” should be outlawed and random plebiscite should be introduced by INEC irrespective of constituencies to ascertain the popularity or acceptance of candidate chosen by political parties through primaries.

5. Stakeholders in Nigeria electoral process such as government, judiciary, electoral body, civil society and religion institutions should be committed to strengthening democratic system.

6. Respect for party constitution should be given due attention.

## References

- Abdullah, A and Tunde, S. (2013). Democracy & politics of godfatherism in Nigeria: The effects and way Forward, *International Journal of Politics & Good Governance*.4(2): 1-15.
- Abiola, A.G., Olaopa, O.R. and Ojo ,E.O. (2006). *Challenges of sustainable Democracy in Nigeria* . Ibadan: John Arches (Publishers) Limited
- Ademola, A. (2009).*Political Violence in Nigeria Democracy.The current trend &manifestation*.Ilorin: AKL Publishers.
- Ademola,A(2009). *Ethnicity, Party Politics and Democracy in Nigeria: People's Democratic Party as Agent of Consolidation: Studies Tribes Tribals* 7(1).
- Ademolukun, L. (2000). *Politicians and Administrations under the presidential system*, Ibadan: Spectrum books.
- Adeyemo, W. (2006). Who carries the umbrella? Tell.18-24
- Ajadike,U.(2010). The Politics of Godfatherism in Nigeria. *Journal of Policy and Development Studies*5(2).25-31
- Ajayi, F. (2014). Nigerian political godfatherism in the world ofBaaleMolete[www.nigerian.com](http://www.nigerian.com) downloaded on 7 February
- Akinola,O.A.(2009).Godfatherism and Future of Nigeria Democracy, *African Journal of Political Science and International Relation* .3(6),[htt/www.academics\\_journals.org /AJPSIR](http://www.academics_journals.org/AJPSIR).
- Akpan,B. (2004).“*PoliticalGodfatherism in Nigeria* ‘[www. This day online.com](http://www.thisdayonline.com)
- Albert, I.O. (2005).*Explaining Godfatherism in Nigeria Politics in Africa Sociology Review*, 9(2). 79-105
- Aleyemi, M.B. (2013) “*Intra-party conflict in Nigeria: The case study of People Democratic Party PDP; Journal of sustainable development in Africa*. Vol. 15, no. 4.
- Alibi, A. (2013). *Democracy and politics of godfatherism in Nigeria: Effects and Way Forward* Malete, Ilorin, Nigeria.
- Alli, W.O. (2015). “*INEC and the Challenges of Managing Political Parties for the success of 2015 General Election*,” Being a paper presented at the two day conference on INEC and the 2015 elections: Expectation, prospects and Challenges,” Held on 19<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> January at Musa Abdulahi, Auditorium, Bayero University, Kano.
- Amusan, L.(2011). *Intra-Politics and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria: Five Decades of Undulating Journey*, in *Ogundiya I.S. (ed) (2011). Political Parties and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria*, Ibadan: Codat Publication.
- Ani, K. H.(2013).PoliticalElite Composition and Democracy in Nigeria. *The Open Area Studies Journals, Volume 3, No4*.

- Ani, K. Henry (2011). Political Elite Composition and Democracy in Nigeria' *The Open Area Studies Journals, Volume 3, No, 4*
- Anifiwose, R.(2006).*Violence and politics in Nigeria: The Tiv and Yoruba Experience*. Lagos:First Academic Publishers.
- Anifiwose,R. and Enemuof.(1999), *Element of Politics*. Lagos: Malthouse Press Limited.
- Animasaun, A.G(2013).*Godfatherism in Nigeria's fourth republic the pyramid of violence and political insecurity*, in Ibadan Oyo state, Nigeria
- Appadoral, A.(1974) *the substance of politics*: Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
- Attah, A., Audu J. and Haruna, P. (2014).Godfatherism, party politics & democracy in Nigeria: Issues and Challenges.*Journal of Good Governance and Sustainable Development in Africa.2 (2)*:
- Audu, N.G.(2006).Godfatherism and Electrical politics in Nigeria Election support 2007.
- Azeez, A. (2004).*The Dynamics of Ethic politics and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria: A prognosis*,Ibadan: Stirring –Horden Publishers
- Azeez, K.(2014). Electoral violence and Nigeria's: *Journal of African election* 6(2) 112-121.
- Bala, J.T. and Sonni, G.T. (1987). *The Kaduna Mafia, Jos*: University of Jos Press
- Balla J,(Sonni, G (1987). Godfatherism in Nigeria politics : Way Forward . *Journal of Africa development* 2(6) : 144-162.
- BangboseJ.Adele(2001), *Political Parties and Democracy in Nigeria*.Ede Commercial Enterprises 162.
- Bariledum, K. ( 2013). Political Elite and Challenges of National Development: The Nigeria Experience; *European Scientific Journal, Nov,2013, Volume 31, 165-166*.
- Bassey, N. and Edet, E. (2008). Godfatherism and Good Governance in Nigeria an Appraisal of Nigeria's Fourth Republic.*Journal of Social and Policy*.
- Beni P.(1935) .*The Democratic Process*. Oxford University Press
- Bennet,(1968) in Ekiyo, Henry.' The Contradiction of paternalism and Democracy in Nigeria, 2004, in *Essence Journal of Philosophy, Science and Society*, Vol.(1), No. 1, 25-26.
- Bernard, O.D. (2009) "Godfatherism in Nigerian Politics and the Impact on National Development "Lagos; Centre for Management Development, Shangisha.
- Bonnie, A. and Kehinde, B. (2007): public service and democracy in Developing Societies: *The Nigeria Experience Journal of social science is (2)*.
- Campell, J. (2011) *Nigeria Dancing on the Brink* Row man & Littlefield Publisher inc.2001.

- Carothers T. (2006) *Confronting the Weakest Link: Aiding Political Parties in New Democracies*. Washington.
- Catherine, N.(1994) “Paradox of Democratization in Africa” in *Africa Studies Review* Vol.37, No.1,
- Chafe (1994), “The problematic of Africa Democracy Experience from the political transition in Nigeria” (ed) Ojo, E.O(2006) *Challenges of sustainable Democracy in Nigeria* Ibadan; John Arches (publishers) Limited.,
- Charles, A.O. and Okonkwo, C. N (2014) “Elites and Public Policy Process in Nigeria: A study of Privatization Programme”; *ANSU Journal of Integrated* Vol. 3, No. 1 2014, 198-199.
- Chukumarie, U. (2009).“Nigeria’s Political Parties: The need for ideology,” A lecture deliver at Aminu Kano Centre for Democratic Research and Training, Mambayya House, Bayaro University Kano, Aminu Kano Memorial lecture series.
- Chukwuemeka, E. (2012). *Administration and Politics in Nigeria past, present and issues*. Lagos. vinez Publishers.
- Chukwuemeka, E.Oji R.O and Chukwura, D.J.C. (2013).Give them their Rights: A Critical Review of godfather and godson politics in Nigeria. *Rewiew of public administration and management* Vol.2(2)
- Chukwuma, O.(2008). Political Godfatherism in Nigeria: *Benevolent or Mlevolent Factors International Journal of Social and Policy Issues*. 5(2): 86-93.
- Chukwuma, O.A and Ali A.H. (2014). “Dialectics of intra-party opposition in Nigeria’s Forth Republic: Insight from the Ruling People’s Democratic Party (PDP),” *European Sciencfic Journal*, Vol. 10 No. 7 (March), 249 – 259.
- Claphan,C.(1985). *Third World Politics: An Introduction* .London Croom Helm.
- Coker,K.O. (2004).Christianity and Godfatherism; Lesson for Nigerian Politicians;*Daily Independent ,Journal 6*.
- Dahl, R.(1971).*Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*, New Haven and London :Yale University Press, 1971.
- Diamond, L. (1988). *Democracy in Developing countries*,Vol.2: Africa. Boulder: Lynne Reinner.
- Domhoff, G.W (1967). *Who Rules America*. NewYork. McGraw Hill.
- Duverger, M.(1954). *Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in Modern States*. New York: Wiley
- Dye, T. R (2000).*Top-Down Policy Making* . NewYork: Chathan House Publishers.

- Edigin, (2010). Political Conflict in Nigeria: A Focus on the Fourth Republic. *An International Journal Multi- Disiplinary Journal, Ethiopia Vol.4 (4) Serial No. October 2010.*
- Egwemi, V. (2007). The People’s Democratic party (PDP) and Emergence of a Dominant party system in Nigeria” *NASHER Journal 5(2)*, 90-97.
- Egwemi, V.(2009).Godfatherism as a threat to law and order in Nigeria:*The Case of Oyo state* , “*KogiState University Bi-Annual Journal of Public Law Vol. 2,156-165.*
- Egwu S. (2014) *Internal Democracy in Nigerian Political Parties*” in O. Ibeanu, J.Ibrahim and Egwu, eds .Political Parties and Democracy in Ngeria.Kuru.
- Emiri, O.F. (2004).Godfatherism: Ethical Slippery Slope.*International Journal of Philosophy*,1(10)136-140.
- Epelle, A.(2003). *HobbesianDemocracy and Politics in Nigeria: The Fourth Republic in Nigeria*. Bellco Publishers. Benin City.
- Fawelo, A.(2001).Godfatherism: Menace to Democracy.*Journal of policy and Administration* .10 (6):113-128
- Francis,O.(2015).Regressive Democracy : The monstrous role of godfatherism in Nigeria.*International Journal of Politics and Good Governance Volume VI NO.62*
- Gambo,A.(2007 ).“*Godfathers and Electoral Politics in Nigeria* (ed) Bernard,O.D. (2009) *Godtherism in Nigeria Politics and the Impact on National Development* , Lagos ; Centre for Management and Development , Shangisha.
- Gauja, A, (2006).Enforcing Democracy. Towards a regular regime for the implementation for the implementation of intra-party democracy. Discussion paper.
- Gideons, A.A. (2010).*The Political Economy of Development in Africa*, Markudi ; Destiny Ventures.
- Haruna, D. (2007). *Political Parties and Democratization Process in Nigeria: A Case study of the People’s Democratic P arty( PDP)*, An unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation Submitted to the Department of Political Science, Ahmadu Bello University Zaria, Nigeria.
- Hazan (2001).Candidates SelectionMethod and Consequences, in William(eds.) (2006), *Handbook of Party Politics* , India: Sage Publications
- Held, D. (1993). *Prospect for Democracy: North .South, East, West: Cambridge, Press.*
- Heywood, A (1997). *Politics*, London; Macmillians Press.
- Higley,J.(2012). Elite and Democracy: The futility Thesis Today. Retrieved from: [www.exu.sk/materia/temac/higley/comenius-Elite-Democracy Futility.com](http://www.exu.sk/materia/temac/higley/comenius-Elite-Democracy Futility.com).
- Hunter, F. (1953). *Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers*.Chapel Hill. University of North Carolina

- Ibeogu,A.(2013).*The Public Enterprise Reform in Nigeria*. Unpublished Article Paper,Ebonyi, State University Abakalike.
- Jibrin, I. G. & Dauda (2010). A study of the Independent National Electoral Commission of Nigeria Dakar: council for the development of social science research in African, CODESRIA.
- Jinadu, A.L. (2001), “*Political Parties and Democracy in Nigeria Lagos*: Ijede Commercial enterprises Limited.
- Jinadu, A.L. (2015), “Challenges and prospects of Nigeria’s 2015 General Elections. The Intersection of Structure and Political Culture,” Being a paper Presented at the Two Day Conference on INEC and the 2015 Elections. Expectations, prospects and Challenges,” Held on 19<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> January at Musa Abdullahi Auditorium, Bayero University, Kano.
- Joseph O. Ibeogu A. &Nwankwo O. (2014).Politicalgodfatherism and Governance in Developing Democracy:Insight from Nigeria. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies* 3(4): 137-243.
- Joseph, R. (1991). *Democracy and Prebendal politics in Nigeria*. The Rise and Fallof the Second Republic, Ibadan: Spectrum Limited
- Kamal, B. (2011).Godfatherism in the Politics of Nigeria: Canadian Social Science Vol. 7, No. 2, 2011, 256-260.
- Kew,D.(2010). Nigeria Election and Neo-patrimonial paradox: In search of the social contract : *Journal of contemporary African studies*, 2010,28(4); 499-521.
- Kolawole, D. (2004). *The Struggle for Democratic Consolidation in Post - Colonial States*, In Agagu, A.A. and Ola, R.F (eds) development Agenda of the Nigerian state. Ibadan: FIAG (Nig) Publishers.
- Korikye, M. andWenibowei, C. (2011).Political Godfatherism, violence and sustainable democracy in Nigeria, *International journal of Advised legal studies & Governance* 2(1): 113-121.
- Laswell, H. (1936).*Who gets what when and how?*NewYork Graw Hill. *Leadership* (2017)
- Mainning, C.(2005). *Assessing Africa Party System after third wave*. Vol.11.
- Mainswaring, S. and Scully, T.R. (1995). *Building Democratic Institution: Party System in Latin America*, Stanford; Stanford University Press.
- Mazi, M. ( 2006). *Political Theory and Methodology* . Department of Political Science. Madonna University, Okija.
- Mbamara, C.L.C. (2004). *Anxiety and psychological factors in GodfatherisminDukor*, M (ed) Godfatherism in Nigeria’s politics Lagos: Essence Library.
- Merges, C. (1968).’Ruling Elite Theories and Research Methods :*An Evaluation* ;Volume 3 No.5

- Mersel ,Y.(2006).The dissolution of Politics Parties: The problem of Internal Democracy. Retrieved on 8 November,2010 from [www, Icon oxford journals .org/content/4/1/84abst](http://www.iconoxfordjournals.org/content/4/1/84abst).
- Metuh, O.(2010). Ebonyi:Things fall apart for (PDP).*The Nation*, Thursday April 1. P.13.
- Michels, R.(1965).*First Lectures in Political Sociology*. NewYork: Harpers Torchbook mills.
- Minpen, J. (2006) Intra- Party Democracy Discontents: Democratization in a volatile political landscape “ Retrieved from [http://plein66.n/ document/64/intra-party and its Discontents minpen pdf](http://plein66.n/document/64/intra-party%20and%20its%20Discontents%20minpen.pdf).
- Momodu, A.J. and Majudi, G.I. (2013).“The Impliation of Intra-party conflict on Nigeria’s Democratization”, *Global Journal of Human Social Science*, Vol. 13, Issue 6, Version 1.0, pp, 1 – 13.
- Mosca , G. (1939). *The Ruling Class*. NewYork: Mc Graw-Hill Book Company.
- Nation* Newspaper (2006), Engr. Funsho Williams was killed,” available on [www.thenationonline.net](http://www.thenationonline.net).
- National Population Commission (2006).
- Nwagboso, C.I and Duke O.(2012). “Nigeria and the Challenges of Leadership in 21<sup>st</sup> Century: A Critique” . *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(13),230-237.
- Nwankwo, A. (2001): Political parties in Nigeria.Retrieved from [WWW.all Africa.Com](http://www.allAfrica.com).
- Nwede, J.O. (2004). *Contemporary political analysis, mimeograph, Deployment of Political Science*. Ebonyi state University
- Odumakin,(2009) “The Ultimate aim is to short – change the public goods” Nigeria Guardian, Saturday,July 11 2009, p 14
- Ojo, A. (2006). “The Okija Shrine Episode “, Edo Express, Benin City : Feb 26.
- Ojukwu,CC.andShopeju, J.O(2010)”Elite Corruption and Culture of Primitive Accumulation in the 2<sup>1st</sup> Century Nigeria.*International Journal of Peace and Development Studties* ,vol. No2 pp 15-24
- Olaniyan, A. O. (2009).“Intra and Inter-party Squabbles in Nigeria”, in S.I. Ogundiya, O.A. Olutayo and J. Amzat (eds.), *A Decade of Re-democratization in Nigeria (1999 – 2009)*. Sokoto: Department of Political Science, Usmanu Danfodio University, 51 – 60.
- Olaoye, E.O. (2006).Prebendalism, Political Godfatherism and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria: implication of the July 10, 2003 civillian coup in AnambraState. *Journal of Contemporary Studies and Research*.



- Olasunkanmi, O.(2010).“ Electoral Malpractices in Nigeria, Cause, Effects and Solution”. A paper presented at the Sensitisation and Training Course of Man O. war, Nigeria, Ibadan.
- Olufemi, K. (2003).*The Role of Politics in Human Underdevelopment in Nigeria*. In Kolawale D (Ed): Issues in Nigerian Government and Politics. Dakal Publishers.
- Oluleye, J.J. (1985). *Military Leadership in Nigeria 1966-1979*. University Press Ltd Ibadan.
- Oluloyo, V. (2014).The Politics of Godfatherism in Nigeria the past, present and the future: *journal of politics and Development* 9(1):6-15).
- Ome, E. M. (2004).Godfatherism and executive interface in our justice system, in Dukor M (ed) Godfatherism in Nigeria’s politics, Lagos Essence Library.
- Ome, O.I. and Anyadike, N. (2011). “Intra and Inter-party crisis in Nigeria’s Fourth Republic: Implications for the Sustainability and Consolidation of Democracy in Post Third Term Nigeria”, *Journal of Social Science and Public Policy* Vol. 3 (March).
- Omodia, S.M (2007).’ Politics and political development in Nasarawa state Nigeria; A focus on the Nigeria fourth republic *journal of social and development studies* 1(1): 40-46.
- Omodia, S.M (2009). “Elections and Democracy survival in the forth Republic of (Nigeria)“ *The journal of pan African studies*, 3 (3) 35\_42.
- Omodia,S. M. (2010). “*Elite Recruitment and Political Stability in the Nigerian Fourth Republic*:Volume 24,No 2.
- Omotola, J.S. (2007). Lessons From Godfathers/Godsons politics In Nigeria: Contact NzePrince @gmail.com
- Oni M.A (2012) *The politics of Impeachment in Nigeria’s Fourth Republic”* .Phd Thesis, Department of Political Science University of Ibadan.
- Onubi, A. (2002).Godfatherism in Nigeria politics: Essence. *International Journal of Philosophy* 2(2): 120-132.
- Onubi, R. (2002). *Essentials of citizenship Education for school and colleges*.Ankpa: Cuca printers.
- Osakede and Ijikinwa (2016). Political Godfatherism and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria: Empirical Evidence from Oyo and Kwara State. *Arabian Journal of business and management*. Vol.5, No. 8 March 2016.
- Osuala, E.(2001). *Introduction to Research Method(3<sup>rd</sup>)*:OnitshaAfricanna Publishers.
- Osumah, O. (2010). Patron-Client Politics: Democracy and Governance in Nigeria, 1999-2007, 4(2) 39-64.
- Osuntokun, J.(2003). “more on the Ngige Governorship: the commit” August 7.

- Oyediran ,O. (1968). “The Role of Ethnicity and Partisanship Politics of Nigeria Students ” in *Odu Journal of African Studies* Vol.14 No 2 p.13.
- Oyediran O. (1999). *Politics of Transition and Governance 1986-1996*. Great Britain: Russel Press Limited, Basford
- Oyediran, O.(1972).“In Search of Power Structure in a Nigeria Community“ *In Nigerian Journal of Economic and Social Studies* Vo.l 14 No.2 July, 203.
- Pareto,V.(1935).The Mind and Society. Newyork: Harcount, Brace and Company. PDP (2009) Art.12, Section 76-83
- Penning P and R. Hazan, R.(2001) Democratizing Candidate Selection, Party Politics 7: 267-75.
- Putnam, R.D (1997).Elite Transformation in Advance Industrial Societies. An Emperical Assessment of the Theory of Technocracy *Comparative Political Studies*, 10,3.
- Richard, H. and Fred, L. (2002). *International management, Culture, Strategy and Behavior*. U.S.A: McGraw Hill coy Inc.
- Richard,M.P.’(1986) *America Politics and Government* ; M.C Craw Hill Book Company
- Said, A. and Kehinde, M. (2007).Building Democracy without Democratic? Parties and threats of democratic reversal in Nigeria”: *Journal of African Election* Vol. 6 No. 2.
- Saka, L and Abubakar, A. (2013). “Electoral Violence and Democratic Sustenance in Nigeria’s Fourth Republic: Insight from 2011 post Election Violence in Northern Nigeria,” *Journal of Democratic Studies*, Vol. 4 (December).
- Salawu, B. Muhammed, S. and A.Y Muhammed (2005). *The Myth of Ethnicity and its implication for Democracy*, in Saliu A. Hassan, Nigeria under Democratic rule,1999-2003, vol.2 2005 , University Press Plc , Ibadan page .4.
- Salih, M (2006). *The Challenges of Inra Party Democracy in Africa*, in UNDP. A Handbook on working with Political Parties. NewYork: UNDP
- Saliu, H. (2004). *Democracy and Development in Nigeria:Social Issues and External Relations;vol.3 2006*, University of Ilorin, 90
- Sani, I. (2013). “Political Parties and Governance in Nigeria: Explaining the Misfortune of the Fourth Republic,” *Journal of Democratic Studies*, Vol. 4 (December).
- Scarrow, S. (2005). *Political Parties and Democracy in Theoretical and Practical Perspectives: Implementing Intra-Party Democracy*. Washington : NDI.
- Sergeant, L.T. (1975). “*Contemporary political ideologies* The Dorsey press homeward.
- Shea, D., Green, J & Smith C. (2009). *Living Democracy*. United State of America: Pearson Education Inc.
- Shumpeter, J.A (1961).*Capitalism, socialism and Democracy*, London: Harper.

- Sklar R.(1965). Contractions in the Nigeria Political System “ *In Journal of Modern African Studies* Vol. 3 No2, pp. 201-203.
- Sorensen, G. (1991). *Democracy and the Development State Aarhus Denmark*: Institute of Political Science.
- Sunday Trust* Newspaper, (2006). “Daramola was killed in his residence,” Available on [www.dailytrust.ng/sundayindex](http://www.dailytrust.ng/sundayindex), retrieved on 15/08/2014.
- Tala, O. and Bamidele Alabi (2014).The Elite Factor in Nigeria’s Political Power Dynamics”.*Journal of Studies in Social Sciences* ; Vol. 8, No,1 128-132.
- Tashjean, J. E (2014). Politics : Laswell and Pareto; *Online Journal*, 22-23. Retrieved on 28 January 2014 from URL :<http://www.jstor.org>
- Teorell, J. (1999). A Delibrative Defence of Intra- Party Democracy, *Party Politics* ,5:82-363.
- The *Nation*, April 11, 2011, pp3-12
- The *Nation*,April 20,2011.pp7
- Thorson, T.L (2005). *The logic of Democracy*; New York, Rwnhart and Winston.
- Udo, O. (2011). Money Politics in Nigeria: The warford*International Journal of Sustainable Development*, 1(1):30-38. In Chukwuemeka, Emma E.O. The Politics of Godfatherism as a Foundational Source of Instability In Nigeria, *International Journal of Political Science, Law and International Relation*, (2012), Vol.2, 69-80.
- Udoh,U.V.(2016).*Political Godfathersism And Danger of Nigeria Growth of Democratization*: Department of Political Science University of Nigeria Nsuka.
- Ujo, A.A. (2012), “*Understanding Election in Nigeria: The First 50 years (1960 – 2010)*”, Kaduna: Joyce Printers and Publishers.
- Ukhum, C.E (2004). Godfatherism: The scourge of Democracy in Nigeria. *Journal of philosophy* 1(1): 14-32.
- Victor, A. (2015).*Godfatherism, Money Politics and Electoral Violence in Nigeria*: Focus on 2015 Election . Department of Political Science University of Jos
- Walker Jack L.(1966).The American Political Science Review Vol.LX No.2. 286-291.
- Williams, I. (2004).Citizenship Godfatherism and Democracy. *International Journal of Philosophy*. 1(1): 10-28
- Wright C.( 1959). *The Power Elite*. Oxford University Press
- Yahaya A.(2007).‘Godfatherism and the Democratization Process in Nigeria’s Fourth Republic : A paper presented at the first International Conference of the faculty of Administration , ObafemiAwolowo University , Ile- Ife, Nigeria, September 4-7.

Yamane, T.(1967).*Statistics: An Introductory Analysis 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*.NewYork: Harper and  
row

Zuckerman,A. (1966). The concept“ Politicalelite”LessonsfromMosca and Pareto; *Journal  
of of politics*, 324-344.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix1: Questionnaires

Department of Political Science and International Studies,

Faculty of Social Sciences

Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria

#### Dear Respondents,

I am a postgraduate student of the above mentioned department and institution conducting a research on “**Effect of Godfatherism on Internal Democracy of the Peoples Democratic Party in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District (2011-2015)**”.

Please, kindly tick the appropriate option in the spaces provided against the questions. Meanwhile, be rest assured that the response will be treated with high level of confidentiality and used only for the purpose of this research.

Thank You

Sule seidu

**P15SSPS8038**

**08059288903**

#### Section A: Bio-Data of Respondents

1. Age (a)18-27 ( ) (b) 28-37 ( ) (c) 38-47( ) (d) 48 and above ( )
2. Gender (a) Male ( ) (b) Female ( )
3. Marital Status (a) Single ( ) (b) Married ( ) (c) Divorced ( ) (d) Separated
4. Occupation (a) Civil Servant ( ) (b) Self-employed ( ) (c) Unemployed ( ) (d) Student ( )
5. Educational qualification (a) Primary ( ) (b) Secondary ( ) (c) Tertiary ( ) (d) Non-formal ( )

#### Section B:Effect of God-Fatherism on Internal Democracy of PDP

6. Did godfather factor affect the conduct of primary election in your constituency in 2011-2015 election? Yes ( ) (b) No ( )
7. What factor worked against the party in 2011 election in your constituency (a) Imposition of candidates by powerful individual in the party ( ) (b) through credible electoral process (c) Taking decision outside the party affairs

8. Did godfather factor affect equal participation of all PDP members in decision making in your local constituency? (a) Yes ( ) (b) No ( ) (c) All of the above (d) indifference
9. Were the rules and regulation guiding PDP primary election followed? (a) Yes ( ) (b) No ( )
10. Was the primary election of PDP in 2011 election in your constituency free, fair and credible election? (a) Yes (b) No
11. Did the PDP candidate in the 2011 election emerged out of consensus or election? (a) Election ( ) (b) consensus ( )
12. Was the primary election in 2015 in your constituency free, fair and credible election ? (a) Yes (b) No
13. Did the PDP primary election for the post of House of Representative in 2011 in your constituency held at the constituency or outside? Yes ( ) (b) No ( )
14. Have the PDP leaders respect the constitution of the party? (a) Yes (b) No
15. Have inclusiveness of rank and file members in taking decision has effect on internal arrangement of the party? (a) To some extent (b) to a greater extent ( ) (c) To a lesser extent ( )
16. What measures do you think can be put in place to address the effect of godfathers on internal affairs of the party in your constituency? (a) Political awareness campaign ( ) (b) Respect for the constitution of the party ( ) (c) Using money on the party members ( )

## **Appendix 2: Interview guide**

### **Interview Guide on Effect of God-Fatherism on Internal Democracy of People's Democratic Party (PDP) in Ankpa**

#### **Dear Respondents,**

I am a postgraduate student of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria conducting a research on "Effect of Godfatherism on Internal Democracy of the Peoples Democratic Party in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District (2011-2015).

1. Sir, may we know you by name, by position, rank in PDP?
2. Sir from 1999-2015 PDP has won almost all elections in your local government, what do you think is responsible for that?
3. Sir, what is your party constitutional provision as regard to primary elections. Where these provisions applied or adhere to in 2015 election?
4. Sir, do you allow for consensus candidate or candidate emerged through credible elections in your party?
5. Sir have you ever witnessed imposition of candidate in your local government? If yes, who was imposed and by who?
6. Sir, have you experienced undue interference from either state party exco or stste government in the conduct of primary election in your local government >
7. Sir, what is your understanding of internal democracy?
8. Has your party applied the principle of internal democracy in all the primary election in 2011?

## **Interview Guide on Effect of God-Fatherism on Internal Democracy of People's Democratic Party (PDP) in Omala**

### **Dear Respondents,**

I am a postgraduate student of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria conducting a research on "Effect of Godfatherism on Internal Democracy of the Peoples Democratic Party in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District (2011-2015).

1. Sir, may we know you by name, by position, rank in PDP?
2. Sir from 1999-2015 PDP has won almost all elections in your local government, what do you think is responsible for that?
3. Sir, what is your party constitutional provision as regard to primary elections. Where these provisions applied or adhere to in 2015 election?
4. Sir, do you allow for consensus candidate or candidate emerged through credible elections in your party?
5. Sir have you ever witnessed imposition of candidate in your local government? If yes, who was imposed and by who?
6. Sir, have you experienced undue interference from either state party exco or stste government in the conduct of primary election in your local government >
7. Sir, what is your understanding of internal democracy?
8. Has your party applied the principle of internal democracy in all the primary election in 2011?



## **Interview Guide on Effect of God-Fatherism on Internal Democracy of People's Democratic Party (PDP) in Olamaboro**

### **Dear Respondents,**

I am a postgraduate student of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria conducting a research on "Effect of Godfatherism on Internal Democracy of the Peoples Democratic Party in Ankpa, Omala and Olamaboro Constituency of Kogi East Senatorial District (2011-2015).

1. Sir, may we know you by name, by position, rank in PDP?
2. Sir from 1999-2015 PDP has won almost all elections in your local government, what do you think is responsible for that?
3. Sir, what is your party constitutional provision as regard to primary elections. Where these provisions applied or adhere to in 2015 election?
4. Sir, do you allow for consensus candidate or candidate emerged through credible elections in your party?
5. Sir have you ever witnessed imposition of candidate in your local government? If yes, who was imposed and by who?
6. Sir, have you experienced undue interference from either state party exco or stste government in the conduct of primary election in your local government >
7. Sir, what is your understanding of internal democracy?
8. Has your party applied the principle of internal democracy in all the primary election in 2011?

**Appendix3: Names of Interviewees**

<b>S/N</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>RANK</b>	<b>VENUE</b>	<b>DATE</b>
1	Haruna Muhammed	Ankpa LG PDP chairman	PDP Office Ankpa	16-04-2019,
2	Zainab Maha	PDP Women leader Ankpa	Jer house Ankpa	17-04-2019
3	Ezekiel Onallo	PDP Youth Leader , Ankpa	St. Charles Secondary school Ankpa	19-04-2019
4	Alahji Yusuf Abubakar	Former chairman under the platform of PDP Ankpa	His house GRA Ankpa	21-04-2019
5	Faruk Yahaya Idris	Chairman PDP Kogi, east	PDP Office Lokoja	22-04-2019
6	Haruna Ibrahim	PDP secretary Ankpa L.G.	PDP Office Ankpa	22-04-2019
7	Yahaya Suleiman	PDP PRO Ankpa	His house	22-04-2019
8	Patrick Haruna	PDP Chairman Omala	Central primary school Abejukolo Omala	22-04-2019
9	Maram Sani	PDP Women leader Omala	PDP secretariat Abejukolo	23-04-2019
10	James Omede	Local govt. Youth leader Omala	His house	23-04-2019
11	Atakpa John	PDP Secretary Omala	Front of Local Government Secretariat	23-04-2019
12	Hon. Alih Aju	Former PDP chairman Omala	His residence in Lokoja	23-04-2019
13	Sani Atabo	PRO Omala	His residence Omala	22-04-2019
14	Mudi Ahiaba	PDP youth leader Olamaboro	Community secondary Ogugu	21-04-2019
15	Enemona Alih	PDP chairman Olamaboro	PDP office Ogugu	20-04-2019
16	Victoria Adujo	PDP women Leader Olamaboro	Her residence	23-04-2019
17	Ileimona Dickson	PDP secretary Olamaboro	PDP office Ogugug	18-04-2019
18	Benjamin Ijaja	PRO	His residence	19-04-2019
19	Musa Khalid	Former PDP councillor Olamaboro	His residence	17-04-2019