



Politics of Stomach and Physical Infrastructure: A Barometer for Good Governance in Nigeria

¹Okeke Martin Ifeanyi Ph.D, ²Nnamani Desmond O. Ph.D, & ³Johnpaul Onyebuchi Nduba

¹ Department of Political Science, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

²Department of Public Administration and Local Government, University of Nigeria, Nsukka

³Department of Political Science, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

Abstract

The house hold prayer of every Nigerian is “give us this day our daily bread” Men celebrate being given fish to eat, as against being taught how to fish. The proponents of stomach infrastructure believe that government cannot be investing heavily on physical infrastructure when the stomach is empty, both stomach and physical infrastructure need to be addressed side by side. The avenue to mobilize party supporters in Nigeria is to sell their votes to the standard-bearers of the party; the easiest way to organize meetings or mobilize people to attend political rallies and campaigns is through stomach infrastructure, with the slogan use what you have to get what you want appears to be the cache. Many serving political class reveal that every day of the week from dawn to dusk, their political supporters and constituents’ members besiege their homes and offices for one support or the other. These people are not meeting their political representatives to advocate for the entire local constituent needs or welfare, instead their personal needs such as school fees for their children, house rent, and financial support for the new awaiting bride, assistance for funerals and other mundane requests takes the centre stage. This has not improved the living standards of all Nigerians in service delivery (physical infrastructure) to the people. Nigerians like the biblical Esau are selling their birthrights for a mesh of porridge. The main objective of being in politics is to improve the welfare of the masses but these has ceased to be as instant political gains takes over the stage. It is now money for hand, vote for ground’ and the citizenry who benefits from this largesse are prepared to go extra mile to achieve their goal. Using descriptive-analytical method the paper investigate stomach and physical infrastructure side by side as a gateway to national development in Africa with particular reference to Nigeria. It is the opinion of this paper to conclude that balancing stomach and physical infrastructure must go hand-in-hand to enhance good governance. The political class will no longer subject the electorates to hunger, joblessness, poverty wages, hopelessness and a bleak future.

Keywords: infrastructure, Development, electorates, political actors.

Introduction

The political phrase politics of stomach and physical infrastructure evolved in the political dictionary of Nigerian politics. This phrase was birthed recently after the just concluded governorship election in which the opposition party PDP (Ayo Fayose) heavily



defeated the then incumbent governor on the platform of All Progressives Congress (APC) (Kayode Fayemi) in 2014 Ekiti State governorship election that still remains controversial in nature till today (www.ekitistate.gov.ng). In channels television programme, former governor Fayemi was acknowledge by his political detractors for his sterling performance especially in social and physical infrastructure while in office but they were not happy with him because he relegated to the background their stomach infrastructure (www.sunrise.gov.ng, 2014). Some members of APC claimed that Ekiti State voters prefer the provider of stomach infrastructure over the builder of physical infrastructure. In every society food is the basic need of life for immediate survival of mankind and food is important to human being. Stomach infrastructure is means food items, money and other edible items distributed to the electorates in order to gain their votes and support. Also, physical infrastructure is the basic social amenities and facilities needed for the operation of a society for functional sustainable development. The concept of stomach infrastructure varies worldwide from place to place, this boils down to the same issue of food and food security. Elections are won and lost based on how the political actor makes stomach infrastructure his main priority in his list if elected or re-elected. In the words President Jonathan, while at PDP rally tagged ‘Unity Mega Rally’ in Edo state, Peoples Democratic Party believes in stomach infrastructure because they ensure food and job creation security in the country. Any leader that does not believe in stomach infrastructure is not ready to lead hungry people (www.nationnewspaper.ng, 2014). This political concept was echoed by all Nigerian politician who is not willing to share money openly or secretly to buy support, if not you are regarded as rookie in politics. The voters see stomach infrastructure not necessarily as an act of food security as claimed by the contenders, but the only way they can get share of the national cake as well as make candidates squeeze out goodies and rewards if they must win elections.

It has been noted that the emergence of democracy is the most preferred form of government partly linked to the power that periodic and credible elections give the electorate insight to determine who govern them. Thus elections should provide an opportunity to make yesterday’s winners today’s losers and vice-versa (Iwayemi 2014, Ogunsanwo 2003, Jinadu 1997). This accounts why many serving and out-of-office political office holders, every day of the week from dawn to dusk, their political supporters, constituents and allies besiege their



homes and offices for one support or the other. It is ironic that these people are not meeting their representatives to advocate for the basic infrastructures their communities need, but for their own selfish needs. They visit either to demand for payment of school fees for their children, funds to pay house rent and support for new bride they are about to take or funerals they need to organize with other mundane and self-seeking requests. They believe that once the contenders win elections, they will, not only become inaccessible to them, but will forget all the promises they made in their manifestoes as regards meeting the basic needs of the masses. Some of the electorates threaten that they will not vote for any candidate who does not attend to their stomach. Some will collect such gifts at the elections but still vote against such money bag contenders, especially if voting for them parallels their conscience.

Generally, stomach infrastructure evolves over time and the citizen used the platform to view the level of performance to attain good governance in Nigeria. Stomach and physical infrastructure does not require a doctorate degree in development studies, nor needs a power-point presentation in a posh conference room to be understood. It only needs a leader to come down from his high horse to feel the immediate needs of the masses and deploy strategies to ameliorate them. It is against this backdrop that the paper serves as a connection between electoral outcomes and politics of the belly described in the contemporary political lexicon of Nigeria as stomach infrastructure (Iwayemi 2014). Obviously, the pertinent questions remains what factors should be regarded as the basis for running government for public interest in Nigeria? These factors are building of physical infrastructure that is supposed to enhance ultimate development or patronage in the form of occasional sharing of money, food items and other materials.

Clarification of Concepts

Politics According to Easton (1979), politics is the authoritative allocation of values; this means that politics encompasses various processes which government responds to pressures from the larger society in allocating benefits, rewards or penalties. Authoritative values are those that are widely accepted in society, and considered binding by the masses. Politics is associated with policy and formal decisions that establish a plan of action for the community. Politics involves the allocation of scarce social, economic and cultural resources to individuals, groups, regions and classes. Politics is what takes place within a system of social



organization centred on the machinery of government. This is practiced in cabinet rooms, legislative chambers, government departments, and it engaged specific group of people like politicians, civil servants and lobbyists. This indicates that most people, institutions and social activities is regarded as being outside politics like businesses, schools and other educational institutions, community groups, families and so on are non-political, because they are not engaged in running the country. The link between politics and affairs of the state helps to explain why negative images are often attached to politics. Put differently, Okeke (2007) sees politics as a civilizing agent, a way of ruling in divided society without violence. Lasswell, (1949) defined politics as who gets what, when and how; this definition can easily be remembered because it represents reality for good especially in Africa. Therefore, whether defined in terms of human being as a political animal; the art of the possible who gets what, where and how' the struggle for power; or the authoritative allocation of resources and values, politics has the state as its centrepiece. Politics has been defined as the governing of men and women; he discusses the relationship between those who govern and those who are governed, between ruler and the ruled. He argues that this relationship is central to political life (Nnoli, 2003). The machinery of conventional political life is rooted in a view of politics as a self serving, two-faced and unprincipled activity evident in the use of derogatory phrases such as office politics and politicking.

Stomach Infrastructure stomach is a muscular, hollow organ in the gastrointestinal tract of humans and many other animals, including several invertebrates. The stomach has a dilated structure and functions as a vital digestive organ. In humans and many other animals, the stomach is located between the oesophagus and the small intestine. It secretes digestive enzymes and gastric acid to aid in food digestion (Wikipedia, 2013). stomach infrastructure is widely describe as petty inducements and bribes to describe materialism, and the love of pleasurable things. It is the prioritization to eradicate food insecurity by accelerating the institutional activation of productive structures and systems that deliver food to the society. Stomach Infrastructure aided fast-track of structured strategies of building sustainable systems for immediate food security as against the politically motivated system of dispensing political patronage. Nigerians often quote the biblical injunction that man does not live by bread alone but man cannot live without bread (Olanrewaju, 2015).



The expression ‘politics of the belly’ was popularised by Francois Bayart (1993) in his publication “The state in Africa: the politics of the belly” it is an adaptation of several scholarly works produced before it, all related to the abuse of official privileges and the personalisation of the state and its institutions in many parts of Africa. It is in this sense that the understanding of governance and politics in Africa is generally argued to be devoid of the pursuit of public interest or service rather it entails the pursuit of private ends. Similarly, Williams (1980) cited Nigeria as an instance in Africa where a narrow conception of politics, one that reduces politics to the contest for political office and its spoils, largely exists. It is in this sense that Dudley (1975) notes that politics in Nigeria is not about alternative policies but about the control over men and resources cited in (Okunade 2008). The 1979 Nigerian Draft Constitution declared that the ‘preoccupation with power and its material benefits’ was a major interest, and that political ideals ‘as to how society can be organized and ruled to the best advantage of all, hardly enter into the calculation of the Nigerian ruling class’ cited in (Okunade 2008). Stomach infrastructure is used by politicians to sweep off the residual sense of judgment from unsuspecting masses while continuously holding them down. It is not the route to electing honest leaders with the capacity to transform Nigeria.

Physical Infrastructure The word ‘infrastructure’ is derived from the following systems, structures and facilities (<http://www-wds.worldbank.org>). Infrastructure is the basic physical and organisational structures needed for the operation of a society like industries, buildings, roads, bridges, health services, governance and so on. It is the enterprise or the products, services and facilities necessary for an economy to function (Sullivan and Sheffrin, 2003). Infrastructure can be described as the set of interconnected structural elements that provide framework supporting an entire structure of development. It is a to achieve an objective or set of objectives and also includes the objectives. It is an important term for judging a country, region or state’s and individual’s developments. Functionally, infrastructure facilitates the production of goods and services, and also the distribution of finished products to end-users, as well as basic social services such as schools and hospitals; for example, roads enable the transport of raw materials to a factory (AHD, 2009). In military parlance, the term refers to the buildings and permanent installations necessary for the support, redeployment, and operation of military forces (DDD, 2005). According to Online Etymology Dictionary



(2012), infrastructure means the installations that form the basis for any operation or system. Infrastructure in developing countries connotes roads and transport infrastructures. The advent of telecommunication in Nigeria brought infrastructure to the front seat as the products and services necessary for the performance of an entity.

Two types of infrastructure

Hard infrastructure refers to the large physical networks necessary for the functioning of a modern industrial nation, whereas soft infrastructure refers to all the institutions which are required to maintain the economic, health, and cultural and social standards of a country, such as the financial system, the education system, the health system, the governance system, and judiciary system, as well as security (Kumar, 2005). Governance can be described as “the total ability to organise, synthesise and direct the various actions of the working parts of government machinery in order for such government to perform meaningfully, creditably and acceptably” (Ikpi, 1997). This explains that governance involves both the leaders and the followers and the process of governance must be democratic, involves people to be popular, responsible and allows people’s will to reign. Achievements of state leaders are measured with the level and type of infrastructural development the leaders or those in position of authority engage in compared to the agitation of the people and the available resources.

Good Governance

Good governance entails decision-making and process by which decisions are implemented, formal and informal actors in decision-making to arrive at the decision (Dahal, et al, 2002). Good governance is a mechanism in which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights and meet their obligations to mediate their differences (UNESCAP, 2013). Good governance fulfils the social contract, empower citizens through participation in decisions affecting them. The right of every citizen is to demand from his or her government on certain dimensions like rule of law, political participation, human rights and sustainable development (Mo Ibrahim foundation, 2011). Oyovbaire (2007) declared the concept as the use of power and authority to affect human condition; this will enable the society to sustain and improve the quality of life and transform the physical environment. Hyden and Court (2002) describe that good governance as the arena in which state economic and societal



actors interact to make decisions. Lutz and Linder (2004) assert that good governance is participatory, transparent, accountable, effective, equitable to promote rule of law.

Eyinla (2000) view good governance as security of human rights, devolution for local autonomy to pilot democracy and socio-economic development. Good governance involves the management of socio-economic development in an environment void of rancour, ill will, strife and disdain; it is a sine-qua-non to achieve selected goals (Davis, 2003). Good governance enhances maximum participation, transparency, accountability and rule of law so that views of the minorities are taken into account and voices of the vulnerable heard in decision-making (UNESCO, 2005). Good governance is the process in which governments are elected, monitored to replace their capacity to effectively formulate and implement sound policies; respect citizens and the state for the institutions that govern economic and social interactions among them (Kaufmann, et al, 1990). Potter (2000) defines good as governance is exercised in the management of a country's economic and social resources for development. It has been noted that good governance is an ingredient of democracy and socio-economic development (Pryor, 2003, Dozie, 1999). Politicians who appealed to the conscience of the masses via their stomach always had the upper hand against those who tried to use other measures.

Theoretical Framework

Several scholars have analysed Nigeria's politics with emphasis on the activities of dominant class and its consumerist behaviour patterns (Joseph 1987). While others find the loyalties of Nigerians to linguistic, regional and ethnic groups to be prevalent to political life they make these sentiments the main focus of their analyses. Nnoli (1978) and Kasfir (1979), among others, adopted the arguments on ethnic politics and the politicisation of ethnicity, the seminal essay by Ekeh (1975) on the concept of the 'two publics' remains a classic. The third scholars prefers to look beyond the internal dynamics of Nigerian society, and emphasize the dependent nature of the country's political economy, treating domestic politics as subordinate to the activities of external forces and agents (Joseph 1987). Some apply the theory of incentives and strategic behaviour to explain the political economy of democratic elections in Nigeria during colonial rule, in the post independence years and to a lesser extent, many years after, have emphasised the colonial origins of the modern state of Nigeria. This



examines the effects of colonialism in all facets of life like competitive elections and other processes in which individuals aspire to hold public offices. This colonially contrived state was regarded as an alien structure, good only for exploitation by indigenous officials for the benefit of their primordial communities.

This model is found in the efforts of Weber (1978), Clapham (1985), Callaghy (1987), Theobald (1990) and Ikpe (2005) to show how beneath the layers of administration, legal procedures and constitutional order inherited from the colonial state, neo-patrimonial administrative states have been organised 'through an array of personal linkages and patron-client networks. In these regimes, power is concentrated and personalised, and rulers have broad discretion over almost all aspects of public life including democratic elections, which are either outright rigged or whose outcomes are determined by inducement of voters. There can be occasional changes in voting behaviour and patterns, just as Nigeria witnessed in 2015 presidential election. In other words, neo-patrimonialism, clientelism and prebendalism produce similar consequences in any political system where they thrive. In Nigeria, the personal prerogatives of rulers override the rule of law and organisations, giving rise to weak and unstable institutions. It should be noted that to other peculiarities of military rule there are great tendencies for neo-patrimonialism, clientelism and prebendalism to worsen under it. The foregoing theoretical explanation is supplemented by the theory of 'state capture'. The World Bank (2000) used this model to analyse the activities of weak, sensitive public institutions under 'individuals who are egoistic, rational and prone to the pursuit of self-centred goals' (Olopoenia 1998). I have found it apposite to adopt an eclectic framework of analysis in this paper. It combines profound explanations of the effects of the colonial beginning of Nigeria, the politicisation of ethnicity, leadership failure across the civil-military political cycles, inconsistent followership, and the exploitation of the dark sides of governmental powers by people saddled with the performance of the basic functions of government. The paper also focuses on the manipulation of certain cultural elements, particularly in the traditional patrimonial system had its own and on the abuse of the culture of gift giving among almost all ethnic and tribal groups in the country.

The eclectic framework also emphasises the inherent dangers in the possible trivialisation of the politics of stomach infrastructure or politics of the belly. Such politics were



popularized in Ekiti State during the 2014 governorship election, and appear to have enjoyed widespread acceptability less than a year later. Adedayo (2015), posit that this brand of politics is described in some quarters as *jejune*, un-intellectual and elementary, the Ekiti people as reflected in their voting pattern in the 2014 governorship elections seem to say it is what they want. In a way, such politics might be desirable in other parts of the country before long. An assertion by Jeremy Bentham, British philosopher and jurist states that government is government only if it seeks the happiness and good of the greatest number of citizens. In view of the probability that most beneficiaries of this brand of politics are acolytes and praise singers, it is a continuation of the sycophantic followership which coincided with the high levels of poverty and despondency under General Ibrahim Babangida, which was inherited in the fourth republic. Finally, President George Bush of the United States in 1989 quoted that he alluded to the need for a refinement of the old ways of dealing with issues of governance, jurisdiction and even economy. We can't turn back the clocks but when our fathers were young our differences ended at the water's edge'. In light of this sentiment, it is necessary to reconsider certain humane qualities and values, especially in terms of welfare of the ordinary people, in our bid to attain developmental goals in Nigeria.

Manifestations of Stomach and Physical Infrastructure in Nigeria

The principles of electioneering under a democratic dispensation include rallies, symposiums, town hall meetings and more; election process in Nigeria has taken a new form of mobilisation and campaign today, instead of rallies where candidates present their manifestos and aspirations to the electorate, hammering mostly on physical infrastructure to touch their lives like access road, electricity, pipe-borne water, schools and many more, candidates now employ stomach infrastructure to win the hearts of the electorate and buy their votes. The 2014 governorship election in Ekiti State, in which Governor Ayodele Fayose was brought back Fayose to the office he first occupied in 2003, will probably be the first to mind in any analysis of 'stomach infrastructure or politics of the belly' in contemporary Nigeria. However, Fayose seemed to rekindle and adopt the populist agenda of the late Adegoke Adelabu and Lamidi Adedibu, both of Ibadan, Oyo State, origin. It should be noted that although the courteous personal attributes of the then incumbent, Kayode Fayemi, and the better-than-average performance of his administration in terms of road and



other physical infrastructural development as well as some social security services were regarded as sufficient for his re-election in some quarters, several other factors probably accounted for his defeat. Among these were the reported inaccessibility of Fayemi to a large section of the downtrodden masses, and his cat-and-mouse relationship with the State's Workers' Union and a few other important socio-political groups. Although it cannot be overemphasised that governance requires seriousness, discipline and possibly stepping on toes, the peculiarity of African in terms of poor economies and disturbing levels of underdevelopment requires a sort of balancing. This balancing is between strict compliance with best practices found, for instance, In the case of Nigeria, a country reported by *Sunday Punch* on 4 August 2013 as 'habouring one of the largest populations of the poor in the world', the point on poverty cannot be overemphasised. As I note elsewhere, it may not be controvertible that up to 70% of Nigeria's entire population still lives on less than the United Nations poverty threshold of \$2 a day. This figure is obtained if the N18 000 (less than \$120) a month minimum wage for workers in the public sector of the economy is considered (Yagboyaju 2014). The point raised here should be better understood when it is remembered that quite an insignificant population in the country is employed by the government and another fraction by the organised private sector. A huge part of the population is either unemployed or engaged in various forms of informal business activities, for which incomes and earnings are unstable because of generally harsh economic conditions.

Ekiti State is peculiar in the sense that it is one of the smallest and it also receives the smallest allocation from central government. To compound its challenges, the state like so many others is agrarian and predominantly rural. Almost all its inhabitants look to the government for sustenance. Although the Fayemi administration's social security package in which aged indigenes of Ekiti State and widows collected monthly stipends of N10 000 each was novel and commended, the direct effect was not felt by many other needy groups. These included unemployed people and jobless youths, artisans no longer patronised as before, and commercial drivers and bikers (*okada* riders), among others. For obvious reasons, members of these groups formed the bulk of the electorate. These reasons included the fear of continuity that forced them to register and obtain their permanent voters' cards (PVCs); their joblessness, which afforded them the ample waiting time required for registration as voters



and the collection of PVCs; and similar others. Ayo Fayose, with his populist style unlike the polished approach of Kayode Fayemi, which made Fayemi appear somehow elitist cashed in on the vulnerability of the army of jobless young people and others not gainfully employed, but whose votes counted.

The outcome of 2015 National Assembly and State House of Assembly elections in Ekiti, it appears the majority of Ekiti people states that whether ‘politics of stomach infrastructure’ is jejune, un-intellectual or elementary, it is what they want for now (Adedayo 2015). This is obvious in spite of any theorising about high-sounding concepts of good governance and dividends of democracy, which are not directly felt by the majority of the common people of Ekiti State. Similarly, it is logical that the Ekitis, generally classified as part of the well-educated in Nigeria, should know better, most educated elites in today’s Nigeria prefer to live in big cities like Abuja, Ibadan, Lagos and Port Harcourt, among others do not participate in voting as much as the commoners. Obviously, this was a factor in favour of Ayo Fayose, whose populist agenda largely accommodated the immediate needs and aspirations of local artisans, labourers, drivers and other categories of transporters, as well as lower cadre public servants, all of whom formed the bulk of the electorate in a rural state of Ekiti. According to Adindu (2014), the ideology of Ekiti people is that Fayemi built physical infrastructure at the detriment of stomach infrastructure, as he was confident that he performed and delivered his promises of providing democracy dividends while the people disagreed because they cannot enjoy the mighty infrastructure when their stomachs were squirming with hunger pangs. It is about understanding the bottom-top, gradual approaches in developmental strides. It is about carrying everybody along, everyone in his own pace.

In Osun state, the August 9th gubernatorial election, where rice and other food stuffs were distributed as tools for wooing and winning the votes of the electorate by the various political parties (OSG, 2014). Political parties with financial muscle were more involved; it was like a pay as you go campaign session with PDP and APC having the edge and outdoing them; even though they denied sharing food stuffs to buy votes. Since the assumption of governor Rauf Aregbesola has committed to the infrastructural development of the state, constructing and rehabilitating roads, building schools and markets, providing pipe-borne water and even building bridges within the state’s available federal allocations and resources. The governor



introduces the school feeding programme in Nigeria to increase the number of children in school, as well as food production. This entails feeding 300, 000 pupils every school day at the cost of N3.6 billion per annum and even welfare of the elderly programme. His bid for a second term against PDP, Omisore seemed to be diversion of interest and purpose as most candidates for the election took to the stomach infrastructure agenda; forcing APC to shift ground because if you cannot beat them, you join them. The two major parties in the poll intensively embarked on sharing of rice, noodles, milk and even kerosene in order to win the hearts of the electorate. Before now, this practice of foods sharing was done underground and mostly in the interior parts of a state, this has eaten so deep into the fabrics of Nigeria's electoral system that there seems to be a normal practice in major cities and towns, forty thousand youths engaged through Osun Youth Empowerment Scheme O-YES (OSG, 2013), road networks, free home medicare including eye treatment and surgery for 14,000 elderly citizens, with N10,000 (\$67) monthly allowance for 1602 vulnerable elders without any kind of support from anywhere and security of lives and property, as indicators of performance. There was also the O-YES recruitment exercise that led to the employment of 20,000 youths in the first 100 days of Aregbesola's stay in office as Osun State governor, monthly stipends for widows and the aged, and the provision of free railway services to those travelling home to Osun during festivities. Aregbesola did not leave out traditional rulers and other community and religious leaders, many of whom conduct regular prayer sessions and other forms of solidarity that are often broadcast in the mass media. This gave him victory over Senator Iyiola Omisore of PDP and Akinbade of Labour Party for a second term in office as Osun state governor (Oludayo, 2001). The 2003 governorship election in the state which Bisi Akande, lost to Olagunsoye Oyinlola noted that Akande's defeat, in spite of his frugality, transparency and relative high level performance of his administration, could be linked to his failure to embrace patronage and money politics. The controversy and widespread fraud as confirmed by the over-turning of many results by the election tribunals and courts of law that characterised the general elections of that year also helped to account for Akande's unfavourable electoral outcome.

Almost all the elections that have been conducted in the country, irrespective of the level, were won and lost courtesy of stomach infrastructure. For instance the largely celebrated



presidential election victory of Moshood Abiola of the Social Democratic Party in 1993 was won via stomach infrastructure. M.K.O Abiola was able to gain the love of Nigerians and enormously harvest their votes, not because of the policies he promised to initiate and put in place when elected into office, but because of his large-heartedness which appealed to the masses. The masses needed it because he was once in their shoe, and he went around the country campaigning and distributing bags of branded rice and other edibles to cheer Nigerians (Abegunrin, 2006). They were held spellbound by his seemingly bottomless pockets that he was ever willing to generously dish out the goodies that flowed to the long-suffering and economically disadvantaged plebeians (George, 2014).

There are two notable deceased Nigerians, who are reputed to have used the weapon of feeding their loyalists to win votes. These two gentlemen were Alhaji Lamidi Adedibu and Dr Abubakar Olusola Saraki. While Adedibu held sway in Oyo State referred as the strongman of Ibadan politics and promoter of 'Amala' politics; Saraki is the strongman of Kwara politics. These two musketeers were kingmakers in their own rights. They played key roles in the emergency of governors and other political office holders in Oyo and Kwara states respectively. By providing food for the hungry, they buy their unflinching loyalty and use their influence to win elections for their protégés. On 11th June 2008, Lamidi Adedibu died, many people wept and moaned in his house at Ibadan for many days which in the opinion of Agosu, (2014) is not because of the love they had for him but because there would no longer be free food for them after his demise. Similarly, many people have lost their lives while several others sustained injuries two different times at late Olusola Saraki's residence in Kwara State, in a stampede that occurred when they were trying to collect their share of free food distributed on salah celebrations. Ibrahim Babangida, Nigeria's former military Head of State understood this idea of stomach infrastructure very well. He is famous for his generosity and people skills traits which kept him relevant in Nigeria's power play. The voters see stomach infrastructure not necessarily as an act of charity or food security as claimed by the contenders as the only way they can get a share of national cake and make candidates squeeze out goodies and rewards if they must win elections. Many Nigerians claim there is nothing wrong with it, because it is not a crime in the eye of the constitution;



let them not forget that Esau's sale of birth right was not a sin in the eye of God, it had serious implications on him (Ezema, 2014).

In Abia State, Governor Okezie Ikpeazu may have drawn from the two concepts of physical and stomach infrastructure simultaneously. The building of dilapidated roads of Abia, particularly renewing the city of Aba and at the same time building human capacity by attending and feeding of school pupils fall in line with stomach infrastructure. Gov Ikpeazu is constructing forty-five roads and two bridges in Abia and these cut across three geographical zones of the state. Also, four road construction in Aba with cement pavement technology that blaze a trail in Nigeria, this is because apart from airport tarmacs and factory platforms where big machines are installed, cement technology is not yet a common experience in Nigeria, especially in road construction. It is a proven theory that upholding the practice of stomach infrastructure must be an essential character of political leadership in present Nigeria (www.abiastate.gov.ng). The lesson emerged in physical and stomach infrastructure must be given due consideration by any leader who wants to remain a legend in the hearts of the citizenry. On the contrary, stomach infrastructure looks down to the people's immediate needs empowerment programme for unemployed youths and widows; maintenance assistance to the aged; health foundation to assist the poor; agriculture facilities for the rural poor farmers; skill acquisition centers for poor unskilled men and women; loan grants to enable them take off in little measure; direct food relief to the poorest of the poor; borehole in rural communities to solve water scarcity problems; establishment of small-scale cottage industries in the villages where the rural community can work and acquire experience on how to produce minor things and many more. It is from this perspective that governor has launched his pet project of feeding school pupils in 170 primary schools in the state, three times a week. Under the UBE provisions, the governor is driving a pilot arrangement of feeding primary school pupils three in ten schools in the 17 local councils of the state. The pupils are to be feed on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. This action will have to be executed in schools in the rural areas with high indigent population. The target public is the poorest of the poor, pupils from indigent homes who study under very unhealthy situations. The governor wants to create an enabling environment for them and share his little milk of human kindness. At his 51st birthday celebration, the governor also launched the school



adoption initiative and invited the friends of Abia to come and rediscover their roots and give back to the communities that made them by adopting indigent pupils and volunteering to renovate the dilapidated structures of the schools. This project is a novel idea which is a bit different from government tradition of renovating and equipping primary schools in rural, urban and semi urban areas. The approach is to identify the worst primary schools in every local council and give them a face lift with the hope that when the worst of these schools are upgraded, the effect on the entire primary school system will be enormous (Adindu, 2014).

The 2015 general elections in Lagos State, Nigeria's commercial headquarters warrant an analysis for a number of reasons. The effect of the widely reported relocation of President Jonathan and the alleged extensive distribution of money to party stalwarts, traditional and other opinion leaders in Lagos State and other neighbouring communities in the south-west cannot be overemphasised. While it could be argued that financial inducement partly accounted for the closeness of the '659,788 votes won by Jimi Agbaje of PDP to APC's Akinwunmi Ambode and the eventual winner's 811,994 votes' (*The Punch*, 13 April 2015), it also possibly accounted for several other incidents, particularly within the PDP in the aftermath of the 2015 general elections. These, as widely reported by *Sunday Punch* newspaper on 19 April 2015, included the alleged mismanagement of N2-trillion in election funds and the request for an audit by President Jonathan. Other incidents included allegations that many top-notchers' of the party responsible for sharing the funds utilised most of them for personal cars and houses. There were several calls for the resignation of Adamu Muazu, then national chairman of the PDP, as well as his national working committee.

Challenges Affecting Physical Infrastructure in Nigeria

Funding is a challenge to infrastructural development in Nigeria for decades, as the country's population demand for additional infrastructure in all sectors increases. The government resources hardly meet the increasing demand. Consequently, government relied on foreign loans to complement budgetary allocations in the provision of infrastructure. This situation led the country's indebtedness over the years. At the inception of the fourth republic in 1999, Nigeria's foreign debt profile was over \$40bn. The country received debt pardon from her creditors and recorded a zero debt profile about five years ago, again, the country has been plunged into debt because of need to develop infrastructure in critical sectors of the economy.



- **PARETO Analysis:** is a statistical method in decision making used for identifying a specific number of tasks that produce major impact. It uses the Pareto Principle called 80/20 rule. It originated the idea that by doing specific 20% of the work, you can generate 80% of the benefits of doing the whole job. In terms of quality improvement, majority of defects (80%) are produced by a few causes (20%). In project management, 80% of project delays are caused by 20% of tasks. It can mean that 80% of the tasks are done by 20% workforce. The people in charge should strive to improve the workforce that is genuinely working.

- **Development Matrix:** The four requirements of any physical infrastructure projects are: design, finance, technology and management. The appropriate designs that will ensure value for money are not adopted. The finance is not adequate, is procured at high interest rates and financial management is lacked by most Nigerian contractors. The technology of construction is scarce and the management of infrastructure is lacking. The maintenance culture of Nigerians is poor and this allows most projects to decay.

Bad Governance: visionary leaders are the builders of a new dawn, working with imagination, insight, and boldness. They present a challenge that calls forth the best in people and brings them together around a shared sense of purpose. Visionary leaders are change agents. Nigeria contains few change agents and therefore lacks the needed infrastructure to develop the nation. Poor system of governance is responsible for poor state of infrastructure in all sectors. To realize the 2020 vision, the country's economy was expected to grow at 14% per annum; but current data show that the economy is growing at 7%. The low GDP growth is largely due to inefficient allocation and poor management of the country's human and natural resources (www.punchnewspaper, 2011). The system of governance in Nigeria has truncated infrastructural development at the grassroots. Section 7 of the 1999 constitution empowers states House of Assemblies to make laws for the operations at the local councils. Consequently, this provision gave the state governments opportunities to control the finance of local governments, many local governments across the country today lacks freedom and financial strength to embark on any infrastructural development project that serve as catalyst for economic and propel economic empowerment among the people in the grassroots.

Corruption and Economic Sabotage the socio-economic problem in Nigeria has negative effects on infrastructural and social development. The embezzlement of funds allocated for



infrastructural development is a common feature in public offices. Many projects for which funds have been allocated and released were never completed while inflation of project costs is a common experience. The case of abandoned projects is common because civil servants in charge of such projects collect bribe from contractors and this either results in sub-standard jobs or abandonment. According Transparency International Report Index (2011), Nigerian civil servants received \$3bn bribes in 2010. Indeed, the private companies were also said to be involved in such economic crimes (www.punchnewspaper.ng, 2011). Besides corruption, economic sabotage through vandalization of public facilities impact negatively on the nation's economy. The vandals' activities are regularly observed with oil pipelines and power transmission lines. In the same vein, the plundering of the country's gas resources due to the failure of foreign oil companies to invest in infrastructure to utilize natural gas is an act of economic sabotage and needs to be checked. Gas flaring not only wastes a potentially valuable source of energy; it adds significant carbon emissions to the atmosphere. As long as the country intends to be among the 20 top economies in the next nine years, the country cannot afford to be wasteful. Corruption does not only raise the price of infrastructure, it reduce the quality and economic returns from infrastructure investment. The corruption in Nigeria is very high and unbearable for effective infrastructural development. The Bureau of Public procurement (BPP), the Independent Corrupt Practices Commission (ICPC) and Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) have not been able to eradicate corruption in the country. The BPP has saved the country a whopping sum of N216.6 billion during the 2010 Appropriation year from its review of contract processes before the issuance of Certificate of no Objection.

Pestles Analysis: The challenges of infrastructural development in Nigeria can be discussed under PESTLES Analysis meaning political, economic, social, technology, legal, environmental and safety and this has to do with political stability, policy formulation and politics of the project environment both within and without. Economic environment deals with issues like interest rate, inflation, currency exchange rate, price fluctuation. The social environment has to do with workforce diversity including cultural difference, age difference, and technology environment deals with the machineries used for the execution of projects. Physical environmental like site topography, geology and climatology is essential while



safety issues have to do with health and security of resources on site that is human, material and financial. Nigeria does not have common strategic targets for infrastructure development, good governance entails that resource allocations will reflect national development priorities and respond to societal demand.

The Marriage between Stomach and Physical Infrastructure

Stomach infrastructure involves bribing electorate in a brazen manner, with material incentives like rice, vegetable oil and ‘small cash’ during elections. Sometimes, voters openly demand this indulgence while on queue to cast their votes (Ojo, 2014). The term literally emerged around the mid-2014 during the governorship election in Ekiti State of Nigeria. During the time, the incumbent governor, Kayode Fayemi of All Progressive Congress (APC), relied on his development provision of social infrastructure as a guarantee for victory at the poll. On the other hand, Ayo Fayose of Peoples’ Democratic Party (PDP) subscribed on distribution of consumables to citizens and eventually won the election with a wide margin (www.ekitistate.gov.ng). Aremu and Ahmed (2011) argued that the concept of gratifications in Nigeria is reflecting government’s failure to curb crime and provide gainful employments to the youth. Macebong (2014) posit that stomach infrastructure is philosophically anecdote that describes the system by which political patronage is dispensed to various groups in a particular society. The patronage predates and transcends election manipulations and can manifest in varying forms. The scholar argued that influencing job placement for a relative by putting in a good word’ to a high-ranking ruling party chieftain; ensuring awards of contract to a close political ally or their relative; and guaranteeing issuance of necessary documents to meet a point and time of need, are a recurring decimal in Nigeria. The grassroots politics in Nigeria is more or less a fancy term for maintaining stomach infrastructure or having a strong political structure that dispense political gratifications to the masses. In the words of Ejiofor, (2015) stomach infrastructure is a two-side coin history and psychology of African.

Historically, Ejiofor (2015) argued that ‘the concept of the stomach infrastructure’ dates back to the ‘pre-independence regional elections across the country’. To him, Nigerian political history shows that politicians who appealed to the conscience of the masses via their stomach always had the upper hand in elections. Since then, and across the board, a good number of the elections conducted at all levels were won and lost courtesy of the stomach



infrastructure (Ejiofor, 2015). The scholar summarized that because food-related poverty is rampant in Africa, it should be expected that a hungry man could be too angry to appreciate the benefits of the physical and social infrastructures that are built for him. Idike (2014) explained how politicians in Nigeria and their proxies have cashed in on the weakness of the social fabric created by pent-up poverty to arrive at 'stomach infrastructure. Following these, most especially Idike (2014), developed a paradoxical twin-paradigm explanation of voter's preference that led to the development of stomach infrastructure. The first paradigm relates to losing election despite developing physical and social infrastructures that, in conventional governance parlance, should guarantee landslide victory. The second paradigm relates to winning election by directly giving bailout cash to needy citizens, giving them food items and attending to their sundry personal problems (Idike, 2014). Hence, stomach infrastructure can be cause and effect of clientele politics of the reinter states, a process described by democracy theorist as abhorrent to the development drives of the states.

Conclusion and Suggestions

This paper states that physical infrastructure supersedes stomach infrastructure because when the basic social services are put in place the events of stomach infrastructure will be overtaken towards the development of any nation. The nation has to imbibe the culture of transparency and accountability with managerial skills, adequate funding and greater private sector participation. In other words, if we had stayed this long as a third world country in spite of clamour for development, we should be getting ready to shift to a worst place with stomach being our new priority. As voters continue to pretend they are deceiving the contenders and vice-versa, it will make sense if we bear our dear country and the generations yet unborn in mind as we clamour for what gives immediate satisfaction at the expense of what offers a more lasting satisfaction that will be beneficiary even to generations to come. The politics of balancing the infrastructure of stomach with physical infrastructural development must go hand-in-hand and side-by-side. Food is good and so is investing in stomach infrastructure is equally good. The reality remains that many Nigerians are hungry with little or nothing to eat and any politician that looks after their nutritional wellbeing is an astute statesman, a humanitarian and shrewd politician. Investment in stomach infrastructure is good but must be a short-term measure and not a long term policy. It should be strategic



investments in physical infrastructures. Food only meets an immediate, basic and pressing need, while adequate physical infrastructures, as well as stable institutions, and increase the possibility that those pressing needs will always be met in the future. Neither of these measures should be neglected, ridiculed, castigated or set aside. One way or the other, they contribute to the sustained improved wellbeing and upliftment of the masses. When people put stomach infrastructure before physical infrastructure, the price for immediate gratification is corruption, long term poverty and unending underdevelopment. Nigerian political class should not subject the poor electorates to hunger, joblessness, poverty wages, hopelessness and a very bleak future, all in the name of building the 21st century modern infrastructural development.

References

- Abegunrin, O. (2006): MKO Abiola's Presidential Ambitions and Yoruba Democratic Rights', in T. Falola and A. Genova (eds) *Yoruba Identity and Power Politics*. NY: University Press.
- Adedayo, F (2015): 'Time to scrap state-sponsored pilgrimages', *The Punch* (Lagos, Nigeria), April 29, 29.
- Adindu, G. (2014). Governor Ikpeazu: Combining Physical & Stomach Infrastructure. <http://www.vanguardngr.com/stomach-infrastructure/>.
- Agosu, P. (2014): Futility of Stomach Infrastructure. <http://www.punchng.com/opinion/futility-of-stomach-infrastructure/>
- Ajiboye, O. (2015). Political Campaign and Stomach Infrastructure: Understanding. Voters' Behaviour in the Nigerian 2015 General Election. <http://www.inecnigeria.org/wpcontent/uploads/2015/07/Conference-Paper-by-Olanrewaju-Ajiboye.pdf>
- American Heritage Dictionary (2009): *Infrastructure*, American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. <http://education.yahoo.com/reference/dictionary/entry/infrastructure>
- Aregbesola, R. (2015). *I can't pay because banks stopped giving me loans*. 7th Bola Tinubu Colloquium. Victoria Island, Lagos.



- Aremu, M. and Ahmed, Y.(2011): Investigation of Security and Crime Management in Developing Society: The Implications for Nigeria Democratic Set-Up, *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, Vol. 1, (3), 390-399
- Brian, H (2005): *Infrastructure: the book of everything for industrial landscape*. New York City: Norton.
- Callaghy, T (1987): The state as lame leviathan: The patrimonial administrative state in Africa, in Z Ergas (ed), *The African state in transition*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Clapham, C (1985): *Third World Politics*. London: Croom Helm
- Dapo, A (2014): <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2014/07/group-rebuffs-stomach-infrastructure-theory/>.
- Davis, .A (2003): Imperative of Transparency and Accountability for Good Governance. *Ilorin Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, Vol. 8. (1), 2-12.
- Dudley, B (1975): 'Skepticism and political virtues', inaugural lecture, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Ekeh, P (1975): Colonialism and the two publics in Africa: A theoretical statement, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 17, (1), 91-112.
- Easton, D (1979): Political theory, *Political Science Reviewer* (1), 184–235
- Ejiofor, C. (2015) Stomach Infrastructure is what Nigerians need, <http://www.naij.com/why-stomach-infrastructure.html>.
- Etymological Dictionaries (2012): www.etymologicaldictionary-Wikipedia.htm
- Ezeama, C. (2014) Stomach Infrastructure: Contenders, Electorates, Who is Deceiving Who? Speech by Catholic Bishop of Nsukka Dioceses for 2015 general elections
- George, C.O. (2014). "Stomach Infrastructure" Is Exactly What Nigerians Need. Retrieved from [http:// www.naij.com/309385-why-stomachinfrastructure.html](http://www.naij.com/309385-why-stomachinfrastructure.html).
- <http://www.nationalmirrornewspaper.2014/ekitistatgov.ng/Stomach%20InfrastructureVsPhysicalInfrastructure.Politics/Nigeria.htm>.
- <http://www.wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/>



- Hyden, G. and Court, J. (2002): “Comparing Governance and Conceptual Challenges” in Olowu, D (eds.), *Better Governance and Public Policy: Capacity Building for Democratic Renewal in Africa*. Kumara Press.
- Idike, A. N. (2014): “Reinforcing Democracy in Nigeria”, *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review Vol. 4, No.3*.
- Ikpe, B (2005): ‘Towards explaining the continuing dominance of patrimonial exchanges in state-society relations in Nigeria: The relevance of the ethno-patrimonial incorporation model’, *Unilag Journal of Politics*, vol. 2, no. 2, 5-35.
- Iwayemi, A (2014): ‘Elections, electoral outcomes and political accountability in Nigeria. Paper presented at the 55th annual conference of the Nigerian Economic Society, November 13, Abuja, Nigeria.
- Ikpi, A. (1997). Democratic Governance and Development in 21st Century West Africa”, in J. K. Olayemi and A. E. Ikpi (eds.), *Governance and Development in West Africa: Perspective for the 21 Century*. Arlington: Winrock International.
- Jinadu, AL (1997): Matters arising: African elections and the problem of electoral administration. *African Journal of Political Science*, vol. 2, (1).
- Joseph, R (1987): *Democracy and prebendal politics in Nigeria: the rise and fall of the Second Republic*, Cambridge University Press.
- Kasfir, N (1979): Explaining ethnic political participation. *World Politics*, vol. 31, (3), 345-364.
- Kumar, R (2005) *Research Methodology: step-by-step guide for beginners* www.sagepublications.com
- Lasswell, H (1949): “Politics: Who Gets What, When, How” Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.
- Lutz, G., and Linder, W. (2004): *Traditional Structures in Local Governance for Local Development*. Switzerland: University of Berne.
- Macebong, J. (2014). Attempting To Define Stomach Infrastructure. Retrieved from <http://jmacebon.g.wordpress.com/2014/06/23/attempting-to-define-stomach-infrastructure/>.
- Marcuzzo, M.C. (2005). Keynes and the Welfare State. Preliminary Draft. Universidade de Roma http://www.ie.ufrj.br/datacenterie/pdfs/seminarios/pesquisa/texto_02_12.pdf



- Madhav, .G (2007): Report for Committee on Good Governance in Nigeria <http://hrw.org/backgrounder/africa/nigeria0407/index.html>.
- Mo. Ibrahim, (2011): “The Agenda on Sustainable Development in Africa on Good Governance” www.un.org/wcm/content/site/chronicle/cache
- Nnoli, O (1978): *Ethnic politics in Nigeria*, Fourth Dimension Publishers, Enugu.
- Ogunsanwo, A (2003): ‘Keynote address’, in R Anifowose & T Babawale (eds), 2003 general elections and democratic consolidation in Nigeria, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Lagos.
- Okeke, B.S. (2007): *Politics of education: The Nigerian experience*. Awka: Doone Publishing.
- Okunade, B 2008, ‘Leadership: The big challenge’, inaugural lecture, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Olajide, O and Ndukwu, E (2014): “Nigeria’s Politics and Stomach Infrastructure Revolution” *National Mirror*, October 09, 14.
- Olanrewaju, E (2015): “Political Campaign and Stomach Infrastructure: Understanding Voters Behaviour in the Nigerian 2015 General Election” Lagos State University, Ojo
- Oludayo, T (2001): *Sociology of Stomach Infrastructure Independent Newspapers* www.independentnewspaper.html
- Olopoenia, R (1998): *A political economy of corruption and underdevelopment*, Faculty of the Social Sciences Lecture Series, No 10, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Orji, N. (2008): ‘Eat and Give to Your Brother: The Politics of Office Distribution in Nigeria, *In-Spire: Journal of Law, Politics and Societies* 3(2): 125-139.
- Osun State Government (2013): 40,000 Youths Engaged in OYES. <http://osun.gov.ng>.
- Oyovbaire, .S (2007): *The Crisis of Governance in Nigeria. A Convocation Lecture delivered on the 23rd Convocation Ceremony, University of Port Harcourt, March, 15th.*
- Ramsay, A. (2012). *Welfare spending is the most important infrastructure investment.* <http://liberalconspiracy.org/2012/-infrastructure-investment>.
- Stober, E.O (2016): *Stomach Infrastructure: Lessons for Democracy and Good Governance Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy Vol.4 (4), 449-460*
- Potter, D. (2000): “Democratization, Good Governance and Development” in Alien, T and Thomas, A (eds.) *Poverty and Development in the 21st Century*. UK: Oxford Press.



- Shaffer, M. (1978): Determining Minimum Viable Population Sizes: A Case Study of the Grizzly Bear. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, NC.
- Sullivan, A and Steven, M. (2003): *Economics: Principles in action*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Taiwo A. O (2015): Patrimonial Politics as a Threat to Good Governance and Development in West Africa Global Journal of Human-Social Science. Vol 15 Issue 6
- The Punch (2015): Monday, April 13, Lagos, Nigeria, 1
- Tunji, L. (2002): What is Stomach Infrastructure? www.Premiumtimesnews.html.
- Theobald, R (1990): Corruption, development and underdevelopment, Duke University Press, Durham.
- UNESCAP (2013): “http://www.unescap.org/20what_is_good_governance.htm”
- UNESCO (2005): “Good Governance” <http://portal.unesco.org/ci/html>
- Walker, R. Martin, A and Jones, W. (1992): Asian older People: housing, health and access to services, *ageing and Society*, 17, 141 – 165.
- Weber, M (1978): Economy and society, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Wikipedia (2011): <http://www.Infrastructure.Wikipedia,20free%20encyclopedia.htm>
- Wikipedia, (2013): Stomach & Social Infrastructure. www.stomachandsocialinfrastructure.html.
- Williams, G (1980): State and society in Nigeria, Afrografika, Idanre.
- World Bank (2000): Anticorruption in transition: a contribution to the policy debate, The World Bank, Washington.
- Yagboyaju, D (2014): Nigeria and the political economy of underdevelopment on selected issues. *Journal of Sustainable Development*. vol. 4, (1), 17-44, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- www.abiastate.gov.ng.
- www.ekitistate.gov.ng.
- www.osunstate.gov.ng.