

## **MILITARY INFLUENCE IN NIGERIAN POLITICS: ITS IMPACT ON AND IMPLICATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A DEMOCRATIC POLITICAL CULTURE**

**Hillary I. Ekemam**

Department of Political Science  
Imo State University, Owerri

### **Abstract**

Contemporary Nigerian political scene since the incursion of the military in its body politic can be described as anything but democratic owing to the militaristic behaviors of its successive political leadership at various levels of government. This behavior has become worrisome in the light of its implications for Nigeria's democratic development. This paper attempts an expose' of the long military presence in Nigeria's politics, its influence on the manifest behavioral patterns of its political leaders, and its implications for the development of a truly democratic political culture. Data for the study were sourced from secondary qualitative materials while analysis is descriptive-comparative and historical. Onuoha's (2019) 'Tout Theory of Politic is found appropriate for explication and comprehension of the trajectory of the paper. Our study reveals, among others, that the political culture of contemporary Nigeria has been influenced by not only the nature and character of the military, but by its long presence and/or meddlesomeness in the country's democratic development. The paper is of the view that given this scenario the militaristic phenomenon will endure, hence sustaining the tout theoretical argument for the explanation of Nigeria's contemporary political culture. It recommends, among others, a serious reorientation or re-socialization of the political class on democratic ethos, a constitutional amendment (provision) banning ex-military officers from running for an elective office and a downward review of perks and appurtenances of elective offices across the board.

**Keywords: Democratic ethos, Political intolerance, 'Toutocracy', Political culture, Rule of law,**

### **Introduction**

In Nigeria and most constitutional democracies, the military is designed to carry out certain specified functions that border on security of lives and protection of the internal security of a country from external aggressors. In the 1999 constitution of Nigeria as well as those before that, these functions are spelled out and are exercised under the command of the executive, in this case, the president.

The military is a professional organization whose activities are shy of partisanship or can be said to be apolitical. This is so to afford it the neutrality required of it to secure the state

without partisan or private influence. In doing so, the military can be free from the encumbrances of politics and to that extent give the citizenry the confidence and assurances of security they deserve when such needs arise.

The history of the military's meddlesomeness in Nigeria's politics traces back to the first military coup of January 15, 1966 when some young majors within the Nigerian military, led by Chukwuma Kaduna Nzeogwu terminated the first post-colonial parliamentary government of Nigeria under the Prime Minister, Alhaji Tafawa Balewa, accusing that administration of infestation with corruption. That military putsch failed as it was foiled by the emergence of General T Y. Aguiyi Ironsi who assumed the reign of power as the highest ranking military officer within the Nigerian military establishment at the time. Following that coup, a counter but successful coup was plotted and executed by Northern military officers, led by Col. Yakubu Gowon on the trumped up charges that the former had ethnic orientation. The ethnic dynamics of these two military meddling in Nigeria's politics laid the landmark of the military's involvement in Nigeria's politics ever since either in the form of military government or in the form of former "military boys" in succeeding civilian administration. This military meddlesomeness has brought with it, a seemingly military style leadership political culture at all levels of successive civil administrations in Nigeria till date.

### **Problem Statement**

Over the years especially since the incursion of the military into Nigerian politics, the democratic ethos as known in the practice and studies of all enduring democracies has been a scarce commodity. Both scholars and practitioners of Nigerian democracy have observed and raised concerns over the hiccups in the Nigerian democratic development trajectory during over half a century of independence due to the meddlesomeness of the military, whether in military uniforms or in civilian garbs.

Nigeria has often been described by scholars of its democratic history as *a lost opportunity*. This identity has been very manifest in her economic and political achievements or developments, leading Akpuru-Aja (2002, p.60) to conclude as having stemmed from democratic failures and high record of human rights violations" associated with the military and its lack of democratic culture.

For a period of its over half a century of independence, Nigeria has continued to witness a great degree of redundancy in growth and development in terms of setting up an enduring democratic architecture and/or political institutions under which its teeming population of

near 200 million people could have a feel of good governance. In these years under review, the military has at one time or the other meddled in its democratic experiment either as uniformed men or as “elected” civilians of former high ranking military officer. It is only in fewer comparative years has Nigeria leadership been trusted in the hands of purely non former military officers.

The following tables (1&2) paint a graphic picture of a time-captured cumulative sole military presence in Nigeria’s politics with civil administrations led by once military officers, and the administrations led by individuals with no military background whatsoever, respectively. Data from these tables will later form the basis of the analysis for this study.

**TABLE 1: YEARS OF MILITARY INFLUENCE ON NIGERIA POLITICS**

<b>REGIME/ADMIN</b>	<b>PERIOD IN OFFICE</b>	<b>NO. OF YEARS</b>	<b>NO. OF DAYS</b>
Gen. TY Aguiyi Ironsi	Jan 16, 1966 – July 29, 1966		194
Gen. Yakubu Gowon	July 29, 1975 - July 30, 1975	9	6
Gen. Murtala Mohammed	July 30, 1975 - Feb 13,1976	-	199
Gen. Olusegun Obasanjo <sup>1</sup>	Feb 13, 1976 - Oct 1, 1979	3	258
Gen. Muhammad Buhari <sup>1</sup>	Dec 31, 1983 – Aug 27, 1985	1	238
Gen. Ibrahim Babangida	Aug. 27, 1985 – Aug 26, 1993	8	-
Gen. Abdulsalami Ababakar		-	355
Gen. Sani Abacha	Nov 17, 1993 - June 8, 1998	4	203
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> <b>Total Years of Military Regime = 29 Years, 255Days</b> </div>			
<b>YEARS OF FORMER MILITARY OFFICER-LED CIVIL ADMINISTRATION</b>			
May 29, 1999 - May 29, 2007	8	-	May 29, 1999 - May 29, 2007
May 29, 2015 – Date	4	130	May 29, 2015 – Date

**Total Years of Civil Admin headed by Former Military Officer = 12 years 130Days**

Total Years of Military Influence = 29 years 255days  
 + 12 years 130 days  
**41 years 385 or 42 years 20 days**

**Total Years of Military Presence and Influence in Nigeria’s Politics = 42 Years, 20Days**

**Source: Field Data, September 2019**

**TABLE: 2**

**NIGERIAN FORMER LEADERS WITHOUT MILITARY BACKGROUND**

<b>Regime/Administration</b>	<b>Professional Training</b>	<b>Duration of Government</b>	<b>No of Years</b>	<b>No of Days</b>
Abubaka Tafawa Balewa	Educationist Civil Servant	Oct 1, 1960-Jan. 15, 1966	5	75
Shehu Shagari	Educationist	Oct 1, 1979-Dec.31, 1983	4	60
Ernest Shonekan	Lawyer	Aug 26, 1993- Nov.17, 1993	-	69
Musa Yar’Adua	Academic	May 29, 2007- Feb.9, 2010	2	348
Goodluck Jonathan	Academic	May 10, 2010- May.29, 2015	5	19
			16	517
			+ <u>1</u>	
			17	206
<b>Grand Total No of Years = 17Years, 206days</b>				

**Source: Field Data, September 2019**

Military influence has manifested in decisions and actions of political leaders in Nigeria at the executive level in terms of law enforcements, at the legislature in terms of law making as well as in the behavioral character of its legislatures, and at the judiciary in terms of law adjudication which often demonstrate inconsistencies in its judicial rulings especially as it relates to electoral tribunal cases (Ekemam, 2015).

The militaristic nature and character of governance has manifested even within the electoral system where candidates seeking electoral positions must have the blessing of the executive at both the national and state levels, respectively. A situation where the president literally calls the shot over who makes the leadership of the legislature raises fundamental concern for the administration of democracy, but more importantly interrogates the principle of separation of power as provided in any constitution such as Nigeria's. A situation where governors continue to impose their will on the legislature and to that extent influencing the outcome of legislation interrogates the meaning of democracy as is known all over the world.

In the light of the foregoing therefore, this study attempts to juxtapose the true essence of democracy with the contemporary leadership political culture in Nigeria thereby seeking for explanation for this character and culture in the disproportionate length of time the military has sojourned in the governance cum administration of Nigeria's democracy.

**Objective of the Study**

This study aims at an examination of how the military either as an institution or as individuals has influenced the character of political leadership behavior of the Nigerian politicians and by extension, Nigerian politics. Specifically, the study seeks to:

1. Show in graphic terms, the disproportionate length of the military's presence in Nigeria's politics vis-à-vis the civilians.
2. Expose the influence of the long military presence in the behavioral patterns of Nigeria's political leaders, and
3. Identify its implications for the development of a truly democratic political culture.

### **Theoretical and Conceptual Reference**

No adequate explanation of military influence can be fathomed in the absence of repositioning such influence on the character of the military that makes it anachronistic to democratic governance and development of a truly democratic political cultural system. To that extent, this study is anchored on what Onuoha (2019) espoused as the *Tout Theory of Politics* or what I would like to understand as *political touting* given the fact that Onuoha's theory, as titled, suggests its *interrogative* stage of development.

Be that as it may, Onuoha's theory came alive at the 2019 Annual Conference of the Nigerian Political Science Association in a paper he titled: "Nigeria's Democratic Experiment and Leadership Question: Interrogating the Tout Theory of Politics".

In an attempt "to unravel the mystery surrounding the leadership question", the author opined that "they are vicious, lawless, and...(disposed to) a do-or-die to get power", revealing in his study that Nigeria is currently practicing *toutocracy* rather than democracy, hence concluding that Nigeria is "... a government of the touts, by the touts, and for the touts (Onuoha 2019, pp.2-4).

Within the context of our study, a critical look at the character of military leadership experienced in Nigeria over time, of which has infiltrated the leadership behavior of its leaders suggests a *tout syndrome* and can find explanation in the lengthy military presence and influence in Nigeria's politics since its independence (whether during military regimes or the civilian administrations). This has been the bane of Nigeria's democratic experiment. For example, this tout like leadership style or behavior is verifiable and identifiable at both the center and the periphery, in the executive policy making and implementation, in the judicial adjudication of cases, as well as in the legislature due to the overwhelming militaristic influence of the seemingly imperial presidency on its membership.

This *toutocratic* phenomenon was appropriately reposed when Onuoha (2019) observed that three psychological traits should be appreciated if one must understand as well as describe a typical motor park tout: "he is "fearless, shameless, and ruthless"(p.4) and we would like to add, lawless.

The Nigerian military (in and out of the uniform) enjoys or shares the characterization reflected in the forgoing passage due to its fearlessness, shamelessness, ruthlessness, and

lawlessness in all its dealing with Nigerians, hence the *toutocratic* theory of politics fits the intellectual trajectory this study wishes to explore.

### Conceptual Clarification

**Democratic Ethos:** this is the set of public moral beliefs, ideas, habits or attitude about the social behavior and relationships of a person or group. It equally refers to the characteristic spirit of culture, era or community which subscribes to democratic attitudes and aspirations within a given political entity and formal organization. It is manifested in governance in which freedom, liberty, justice, and constitutionalism or rule of law is guaranteed with absence of tyranny in the management and administration of public affairs.

**Political Culture:** This concept, though similar to political ethos operates in this study as “a set of attitudes, beliefs and sentiments which give order and meaning to a political process and which provide the underlying assumptions and rules that govern behavior in the political system. It encompasses both the political ideals and operating norms of a polity. Political culture is thus the manifestation in aggregate form of the psychological and subjective dimension in politics” It can represent the national political psychology and fundamental values that define political attitude of a people” (Political Culture-Encyclopedia...).

Political culture can equally be said to be a shared belief and ideas about a political community that defines obligations and expectations.

**Political Intolerance:** This concept refers to the unwillingness, especially by political leaders, to grant political rights and freedom to persons and groups who hold or are perceived to hold different or contrary opinions from those of their political leaders or those occupying powerful positions in a polity.

**Toutocracy:** This concept derives its origin derisively from Onuoha’s “*Nigeria’s Democratic Experiment and Leadership Question: Interrogating Tout Theory of Politics*” (2019) in which he describes Nigerian politics as having all the behavioral semblance or characteristics of a typical Nigerian motor park “touts” who are *lawless, ruthless, and shameless* in all their dealings with their clients.

**Rule of Law:** This implies strict adherence to constitutional and other relevant legal principles and order in the conduct of public affairs in a democracy.

## **NIGERIAN MILITARY BEHAVIORAL CHARACTERISTICS**

Ndoh & Emezie (2007) articulated in details the character of the military that make it likely to intervene in politics especially as has been witnessed in Africa. This is, however, not the immediate concern of this study. The following behavioral characteristics are all the same, germane if we must understand, albeit with the benefit of historical experience in Nigeria, those behaviors of the military that are antithetical to the development of a democratic political culture especially where those behaviors have, as in Nigerian experience, taken a disproportionate toll during the long years of military presence in Nigeria's politics.

### **Aversion for Constitutionalism**

History has shown that in every military takeover of power, the usual first pronouncement has been the suspension of the constitution. This was evident in the first (although failed) military coup in Nigeria when Major Kaduna Nzeogwu in Radio Kaduna announced that: "In the name of the Supreme Council of the Revolution of Nigeria, the constitution is suspended and the legal government and elected assembly are hereby dissolved (Ndoh and Emezie 2010, p. 23).

The same suspension of the constitution was true for Gen. Aguiyi Ironsi who decreed a unitary government following his succession in the aftermath of the failure of Major Nzeogwu's led coup de' e'tat. From that period onwards, every succeeding military government has had the semblance of the use of military fiat in the conduct of governmental affairs. The very 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic is generally but derisively regarded given that its drafters were, in the main, handpicked by General Sani Abacha with little or no input or consultation with the citizenry for the needed shades of interests, be they ethnic, regional, cultural, religious, or geopolitical. Besides, there are assumptions and accusations in many circles that the 1999 Constitution was essentially drafted to pave the way for Gen. Abacha's self-succession bid.

The suspension of the constitution, therefore, literally means that all judicial and legislative powers effectively revolve around the military head of government whose usual establishment of a Military Ruling Council or as the case may be, is in all intent and purposes an establishment of a rubber-stamping instrument for effective control of all aspects of governance. On this, Ndoh & Emeziem (2007, p.25) were to observe that though "there is inclusion of the civilian in their administration...soldiers are not trained social engineers



since their primary role is the defense of the country and so the inclusion of the civilians become inevitable. They rely on the expert knowledge of the civilians” to carry out the usually complex administrative duties of an organized government.

### **Hierarchical and Centralized Structure**

The structural framework of the military is hierarchical and centralized. Thus, unlike the separation of powers that characterize civil and democratic dispensations, in Nigeria, as do in all military establishments, orders are top-bottom effective. In addition, by virtue of its training, obedience without question and loyalty are indispensable value orientation in the military. To that extent, therefore, the principle of hierarchism becomes synonymous with militarism.

### **Dictatorialism**

The military in Nigeria is well known for its dictatorial character and tendencies. Examples of this abound throughout Nigeria’s historical experience with the military (National Democratic Coalition). It was Gen. Ibrahim Badamosi Babangida who declared himself “President” and asked to be addressed officially as “President Ibrahim Babangida”, a nuance in nomenclature to what Nigerians had hitherto under military regimes known.

### **Rule by Decrees**

Military in Nigeria has been known to govern by the use of decrees. It was General Ibrahim Badamosi Babangida who in the 1980s as a *military president* created two political parties by a decree or fiat, namely the National Republican Congress, NRC and the Social Democratic Party, SDP. Babangida had reasoned that he did so in an attempt to rid Nigerian political space the scourge of multi-partisanship with tribalistic orientations given the seemingly historically entrenched tribal sentiments that have characterized party formations in Nigeria. Its merits notwithstanding, political parties in democracies and for democratic dispensations are, in the main, outgrowths of political associations which itself draws membership from people of identical political ideological movements, persuasions, and orientation. And although Gen. Babangida decreed and announced that the parties represented “a little to the right and a little to the left” in their ideological dispositions, yet their respective memberships evidently represented an amalgam of persons with dichotomous ideological bents both in deed and pronouncements. It can be further argued that they did not represent even something unique to be so characterized in any contemporary time. (Ekemam, 2017, pp. 220-228).

### **Intolerance for Opposition**

Gen. Abacha's regime was known to have hounded and driven quite a few opposition underground during the period of "Abacha Must Go" *vuvuzela* was rife. The case with the National Democratic Coalition of Nigeria, NADECO, is evidentiary. Formed on May 15, 1994 by a broad coalition of Nigerian democrats, NADECO called on the military government of Sani Abacha to step down in favor of the struggle in the country against the military rule, and to that extent making its members a target for arrest and imprisonment. Following bomb explosion in Lagos and a month later in Ilorin, Kwara state, its acting Secretary, Wale Osun, Chief Cornelius Adebayo and other NADECO members were arrested and interrogated by the police under the instruction of Abacha who suspected NADECO was behind the bombings (National Democratic Coalition).

In the same vein, Nwahiri (2007, p.166), noted that "...on 18<sup>th</sup> of September, 1997, some pro-democracy activists in Nigeria organized a dinner for Mr. Walter Carrington, the outgoing US Ambassador in honor of his support for democracy struggle in the country but the venue of the event was stormed by armed soldiers and police men with express order to disrupt same."

### **Aversion for Freedom of the Press, Freedom of Speech, and Assembly**

The press has generally been considered as the mouthpiece of the voiceless and in recognition of its significance in any democracy; a onetime American statesman observed that the press is the Fourth Estate of the Realm. In the Nigerian Republican Constitution of 1963, Section 25 which was a re-enactment of Section 24 of the Independence Constitution of 1960 was systematically carried over to the subsequent constitutions of the Federal Republic where it was amply stated that: "Every person shall be entitled to freedom of expression, including the freedom to hold opinion and to receive and impart ideas and information without interference" (Dojo, 1976) by the government provided such information would serve public good.

In the light of the foregoing, therefore, any democratic government is expected to be properly guided on the importance of this constitutional right that the press - electronic and print -, occupy a cardinal position in the administration of democracies. However, the press and individuals were not spared of the assault that is characteristic of military regimes in Nigeria as the military demonstrated its aversion for these constitutional and democratic rights.

Gen. Muhammadu Buhari particularly, was severe in his censorship of the press as depicted in Decree 4 and the unorthodox detentions that characterized his military rule which portrayed his regime largely as one with little or no regard for the rule of law. Few examples will suffice: According to the Human Rights Watch UPR Submission for Nigeria, there has been a renewed crackdown on freedom of expression; "... it is generally believed that Nigerians are at least able to express themselves freely... However, the impression given to the outside world is misleading as the basic rights to freedom of expression and assembly are still not guaranteed" (Nigeria: Renewed Crackdown...).

That report went on to observe that:

*This Report documents a number of cases of violation of the right to freedom of expression in Nigeria which opponents of the government have been arrested, detained, ill-treated and subjected to other forms of intimidation. Brutal measures have been used to repress peaceful expression. In extreme cases the government's reactions to dissent or protest has resulted in extra-judicial killings, most of it by Nigerian police force, in some cases by direct instructions of officials of the State Security Service, SSS. (Nigeria: Renewed Crackdown...).*

Most recent cases that give expression as well as vent to the afore-documented indictment of Nigeria governments are the massacre of the unarmed Sh'ite Muslims protesters by the current Muhammadu Buhari's government along Kaduna-Abuja highway on December 12, 2015 dubbed 2015 Zaria Massacre where 348 civilian were killed and 347 hurriedly buried in a mass grave by the Nigerian soldiers (2015 Zaria Massacre...).

Another widely publicized case of abuse of the freedom of assembly of Nigerian citizens was the attack on Afara-Ukwu, Umuahia, Abia State compound of the Biafran independence agitator, Nnamdi Kanu, the leader of the Indigenous People of Biafra, IPOB by a detachment of the Nigeria army on September 17, 2017 in an attempt to intimidate and arrest him but leaving in their trail after he had fled, five dead and thirty others seriously injured. As we speak, the police and the army are giving different accounts of what actually transpired in that confrontation (Nigeria: Curfew As Soldiers Attack...).

### **The Omoleye Sowere Saga (2019)**

On his own part, a civil rights activist, Mr. Omoleye Sawore organized a non-violent protest for July 5, 2019 against the government of President Muhammadu Buhari. The protest

dubbed “Revolution Now” was aimed at forcing the government of Buhari to appreciate the suffering of a disproportionate portion of the Nigerian masses over government’s lack of even handedness in the administration of justice, economic hardship in the land, the increasing lack of security due mainly to the activities of the Fulani herdsmen who at randomly sack communities, the increasing banditry and kidnappings, as well as the debilitating effect of the continuing Boko Haram insurgency in the north east and the general feeling of insecurity across the length and breadth of Nigeria. Mr. Sawore was as a result arrested and detained incommunicado for months but only released when the local and international public opinion against his arrest and detention became too great to handle by the administration. .

While reacting to and criticizing President Muhammadu Buhari over the arrest of Mr Omoyele Sawore by the Nigerian police on August 8, 2019, the European Union noted that “protests remain a cardinal part of democracy as long as it remained peaceful” and that “the judiciary should be allowed to do its job”. And according to a Nigerian researcher at the Human Rights Watch, Anitie Ewang, “the mere use of the word *revolution* is not enough to support the claim of violent insurgency and should not be treated as crime” (Nigeria: Activist’s Detention...).

Ibrahim Babangida’s regime was not spared in the violation of the democratic rights of the Nigerian citizens. It was under that military regime that a mail bomb was sent to assassinate the editor of the Newswatch magazine; Mr. Dele Giwa on October 1986 on the suspicion that he had access to some incriminating information which if published could have unraveled President Ibrahim Babangida government or person. Giwa’s assassination had occurred exactly two days following his invited interview by the State Security Service, SSS officials.

*In an off-the-record interview with airport journalists, Lt. Col. A.K. Togun, the Deputy Director of the SSS had claimed that on October 9, Dele Giwa and Mr. Alex Ibru had organized a media parley for media executives and the newly created SSS. Togun claimed that it was at the meeting that the SSS and the media executives reached a secret censorship agreement. Under this agreement, the media was to report any story with potential to embarrass the government to the SSS before they tried to publish same. Besides other sundry stories published and unpublished by the Newswatch that were perceived by Babangida’s government as unfriendly, like the “Power Game: Ukiwe Loses Out” and Dele Giwa’s alleged whispering that Babangida had embarked on secret arms importation, Giwa was accused of plotting with Nigeria Labor Congress, NLC, the Academic Staff Union of Universities, ASUU, and the students*

*to carry out a socialist revolution. It was in the heat of all these that a mail bomb was sent to his Ikeja home through a purported courier (Dele Giwa-Wikipedia).*

This suppression of dissent, of expressions, and of peaceable assembly, perceived as inimical to good governance, military or civilian, has become a recurrent experience of Nigerians and has by extension not only become a constant reminder in their (citizens') collective psyche of a *political culture* that has been anything but democratic.

### **UNDEMOCRATIC POLITICAL BEHAVIORS AMONG NIGERIAN POLITICIANS: SELECTED CASES.**

In quite perhaps inexhaustible number of cases, Nigerian politicians have exhibited in their actions semblance of politics of those who had drunken from the fountain of military culture. Few cases have been presented below to give vent to our submission that contemporary Nigeria lacks any semblance of democratic political culture.

#### **Attitude Toward Civil Protests:**

The character of the military has continued to manifest in actions and behavior of political leaders in Nigeria even during purely civil administrations when non former military officers held sway. These behaviors as shall be outlined underscores the extent of undemocratic politico-cultural orientation and socialization politics in Nigeria has taken over time.

Few cases are worthy of citation here but before that it will be germane to be reminded that the right to *dissent* and *peaceable assembly* are some of the fundamental features of democratic governance.. This dissent or assembly may be real or symbolic and are guaranteed under the constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria as well as protected under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948. Unfortunately, these rights have continued to be under threat during various administrations in Nigeria civil or military.

Postulating from a comparative praxis and distinguished from theory, Nigerian politics during the premiership of Alhaji Tafawa Balewa, during the presidencies of Alhaji Shehu Shagari, Chief Earnest Shonekan, Umaru Yar' Adua, and Dr. Goodluck Ebele Jonathan, respectively, can be said to have witnessed a character flowing more from what a onetime American president, George Walker Bush, referred to as "a kinder and gentler nation" (1989 Presidential Inaugural Speech), as opposed to the seeming militarization of governance be it with the legislature, the judiciary, the individuals as well as with the media.

During the lives of the administration of Balewa, Shagari, Shonekan YarAdua, and Jonathan cases, the use of the military or police to disperse civil protests were very rare vis-à-vis those under the military. However, as much as his administration, in particular, was derisively branded “weak and clueless”, the *Sahara Reporters* observed that “Soldiers deployed by Nigeria’s head, Goodluck Jonathan forcefully dispersed protesters around the city of Lagos...” during the protest tagged **OCCUPY** by its organizers on January 16, 2012 during which live bullets were fired above the crowd to effect disruption of the protest and dispersal (Soldiers Shoot to Disperse...).

### **Findings and Conclusion**

Our analysis does not suggest that during the era of non military rulers, purely democratic character represented the politics and politicking in Nigeria. Instead, the paper argues that the virus of militarism equally affected the practice of politics in thereby giving vent to our submission that Nigeria’s political culture was to that extent influence

A close look at Table 1 reveals that men who at one time or the other served in the Nigerian military have been in the leadership portfolio for a total of forty two (42) years and four (4) months out of the total number of fifty nine (59) years of the existence of Nigeria as supposedly an independent democratic entity. Similarly, Table 2 shows that those who have rules and/or currently ruling Nigeria without military background have a total of seventeen (17) cumulative years. From this data, we can conclude that:

$42 = X/100$  of 59years, where  $X$  represents the unknown percentage (%) of 59 years is 42. Hence  $42/1 = X/100 \times 59/1$  or  $42/1 = 59X/100$  or  $X = 4200/59 = 71.2\%$ . It therefore stands to reason that the number of years in Nigeria’s politics without military influence is only 28.2 percent.

With the military known for its aversion for democratic ethos and norms, its lack of democratic culture and credentials bothering on the nexus of its organization and training, its long presence in Nigeria’s politics as demonstrated in the tables as well as the analysis above, its influence on Nigeria’s politics of over half a century can never therefore be in doubt.

### **Recommendations**

1. An aggressive reorientation of the political class on the value of democratic ethics which will form the basis of in during democratic political culture.

2. A constitutional amendment should be made expressly forbidding individuals with military training background from vying for public electoral office as a way of rebranding Nigeria's politics
3. Curriculum in tertiary institutions in Nigeria should include a required course on democratic political culture by examining the factors influencing the sustenance of democratic political culture in selected democracies.
4. Salaries, appurtenances, and/or perks currently associated with electoral Offices in Nigeria should be downwardly reviewed in line what is obtainable in poorly developed states of Africa to discourage the attractiveness of electoral offices to Nigerians of questionable ideological orientation.

### References

- Akpuru-Aja A. (2002). *Selected Themes in International Economic Relations: Understanding Trends of Globalization & Regionalization*. Enugu: Rhyce & Brothers Publishers
- Bush, G.W. (1989). *Presidential Inauguration Speech*. Washington, District of Columbia. January 20.
- Ekemam, H. I. (2015). "An Analysis of the Contradictory Judicial Rulings in the Post-2015 Gubernatorial Election Tribunal Cases in Nigeria: Implications for Nigeria's Democracy" in *International Journal of Research in Arts & Social Sciences*. Vol. 8, No. 2. pp. 239-247.
- Ekemam, H. I. (2017). *The Phenomenon of Decampment and Money Politics In Party Political Party Association Amongst Nigerian Politicians and The Place of Political Ideology, in Quarterly Journal of Contemporary Research, Federal University, Otuoke, Vol. 5, Number 2. Pp. 220-228.*
- Dele Giwa-Wikipedia. Retrieved September 1, 2019 from <http://en.n.wikipedia.org>
- Nwahiri, A. (2007). *The Dynamics of Nigerian Foreign Policy*. Owerri: Nation-Wyde Printers.
- National Democratic Coalition. Retrieved August 22, 2019 from <http://en.n.wikipedia.org>
- (Nigeria: Curfew As Soldiers Attack...). Retrieved September 3, 2019 from <https://allafrica.com>main>main> and <https://www.bbc.pigin>

(Nigeria: Curfew As Soldiers Attack...). Retrieved September 3, 2019 from <https://allafrica.com>main>main> and <https://www.bbc.pigin>

(Nigeria: Renewed Crackdown...). "Nigeria: Renewed Crackdown On Freedom of Expression" in *Human Right Watch 2003*, Vol. 15 No. 19A.

(Nigeria: Activist's Detention...). Retrieved September 6, 2019 from <http://www.hrw.org>.

Ojo, DJ. (1976). "Freedom of the Press in Nigeria Since 1960: A Comparative Analysis" in *Journal of the Indian Law Institute*" Vol. 18, No. 4., pp.529-550.

Onuoha, J. (2019). "Nigeria's Democratic Experiment and Leadership Question: Interrogating The Tout Theory of Politics" in *The Book of Abstracts Annual Conference of the Nigerian Political Science Association*, p. 3-4.

(Political Culture-Enc...).(2008). International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences. Retrieved September 6, 2019 from: <http://www.encyclopedia.com>

(2015 Zaria Massacre...). Retrieved September 6, 2019 from <https://en.n.wikipedia.org>

Soldiers Shoot to Disperse..." in *Sahara Reporters*. Retrieved September 24, 2019 from [saharareporters.com](http://saharareporters.com).