



**VALUE ALLOCATION, IDENTITY  
FORMATION AND POLITICAL STABILITY  
IN NIGERIA'S DEMOCRATIC EXPERIENCE  
(1999-2017)**

**Social Sciences Research**

Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka Nigeria

**Samuel N.C. NWAGBO<sup>1</sup> & Ambrose O. ABANEME<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Political Science, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka-NIGERIA

<sup>2</sup>Department of Political Science, Alvan Ikoku College of Education, Owerri-NIGERIA

**ABSTRACT**

Value allocation has been the primary factor that determines attitude of the citizenry towards the affairs of the state and how they interact among themselves on any background. State and state actors' attitude over value allocation in Nigeria have created unnecessary identity consciousness and alignment among Nigerians. Pressure, competition and rivalry associated with this is responsible for political instability in the polity even in the era of democracy. This is contrary to democratic ethos of justice, equity, inclusiveness, unity and development. Therefore, this paper interrogated continuous increasing of identity formations (ethnic and religious) like Avengers, Boko Haram, Odua Peoples' Congress (OPC), Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB), Fulani Herdsmen, etc. in Nigeria, why these identity formations always contest and struggle for value allocation within the polity and why Nigerian state actors have not been able to engage state machinery in democratic manner to address this development challenges in this dispensation of democracy. Rather it has turned to be a party to the whole political imbroglio. Group theory served as a theoretical framework to guide this investigation, likewise, secondary source of data was utilized while ex-post facto method of data analysis was used to analyse data collected. It was recommended that government

should deemphasize ethnic and religious recognition in her value allocation and activities. Military engagement should be abolished in addressing internal problems, in order to reduce level of militarization that citizens experience every day. Value allocation (appointment, promotion, award of contracts, creation of states and local government, provision of infra-structure) should be based on justice, equity, fairness, merit and etc not on ethnic or religious considerations. These will help state and its agencies to create an enduring environment for national integration devoid of identity struggle for a better and stable political system in Nigerian state.

**Keywords:** Value Allocation, Identity Formation, Ethnic Patriotism, Political Instability, Democracy.

### **Introduction**

Political, economic and social system of every nation takes its characteristics from value allocation of such state. In view of the importance of this, which Karl Marx called it substructure upon which the superstructures (politics, social interaction, religion etc) are built, that state takes full responsibility of definition, determination and supervision of value allocation pattern of its society. Developed societies experience stability in their polity as a result of disposition of the state and state actors in managing authoritative allocation of value. Therefore, the developed polities have less or no political crises anchored on identity formation that leads to political instability. However, most African countries like Sudan, Congo, Libya and especially Nigeria have turned state as an instrument of value allocation to establish superior and inferior identities hegemonies. This has created serious identity formation like IPOB, MASSOB, OPC, Boko Haram, Avengers etc. The unbearable competitions among these identity formations, pressure they mount on the state and attitude of state actors towards them have brought serious political instability in the Nigeria's polity. Due to involvement of state in this rivalry it becomes difficult to manage as a result of its assumed bias position in support or against another.

Patriotism is then shifted from the central government (unless when benefiting from it) to ethnic government or formation by the citizens. These formations always present to their people the notion that they are ill-treated by the central government and other ethnic groups who are in control of its activities. Therefore, they should join forces together to destabilize the central authority. The situation where all the identity groups have these attitudes towards the affairs of the state, development is seriously hindered.

Nigeria has experienced a lot of political crises as a result of this, right from pre-independence till now. It only changed in nature and pattern. Colonial masters created identity differences in Nigeria to keep Nigerians divided in order to be able to control and govern them. Forceful joining together of ab initio independent nations into one entity called Nigeria in 1914 was a serious mistake by the British authority. The unfortunate thing was that no serious effort was put in place to unite these entities for better cohabitation and harmonious living rather sense of suspicious and division was created through the policy of divide and rule (Obikeze and Obi 2003). Aside from the reason for the introduction of the indirect rule in Nigeria which include the vast territory,

diverse ethnicity with different languages, lack of personnel and the unwillingness of the colonial masters to use their own resources to govern Nigeria, there was also ulterior motive of the colonial master who introduced divide and rule tactics which helped to create bad blood in the polity, especially between major contending units of the federation. Divide and rule made different groups (nations) to develop an identity wall against another. Nigeria was assumed to be one but religion, language and tribe turned to become a dividing pole. The colonial master never made effort to remove this barrier after 46 years of administering Nigeria as colonial appendage of Britain. Colonialism provided scaffolding of holding the different communities together, not much change was achieved in altering communal mentality and predilection (Obasanjo and Mabogunje, 1992)

This division was not manifest during colonial era due to collective efforts of these groups to remove their common enemy "Colonial Master". All dividing characteristics were underplayed and ignored. But the attitude of division and suspicion silently grew in the minds of Nigerians immediately after independence. Okeke (2017) argues that at the time of independence, Nigeria inherited a skewed federal structure, with the various ethnic and nationality groups competing for the control of the state resources. Building a united Nigeria has been a problem as a result of this. Ethnic predominance kept manifesting in politics, economy, education and interactions among Nigerians. Nigerian politics has undergone a chequered metamorphosis in an attempt to build a genuine, federal democratic system, where all the component units of the federation will live in peace, harmony and mutual respect for one another (Okeke, 2017).

Group theory was used to interrogate phenomena in this paper. Sources of data were secondary sources which include text books, journal articles, magazines, unpublished but relevant works etc. Method of data collection was library, internet, etc, whereas methods of data analysis was ex-post facto.

### **Conceptualization of Key Variables**

**Value Allocation.** Value allocation is the central point in politics and in fact the primary business of the state. David Easton understanding of this made him to define politics as authoritative allocation of value (Chikendu, 2002). He situated the place of state in this all-important business of state. It is what determines nature of peace, development, social, political and economic system, level of participation and acceptance by the citizenry if well adjudicated. Where otherwise is the case, it is the root cause of conflicts, wars, militia and militant groups, succession and all manner of activities that lead to socio-political instability. Any nation that have established stable and institutionalized system of value allocation acceptable to her citizens is bound to develop. Identity crisis all over Africa and other places in the world is associated with lopsidedness in the distribution of state resources. Value allocation stands as a process through which state resources or commonwealth is being distributed among the citizenry. In some parlance, it is also referred as resource allocation (Nwagbo, Ayogu and Chukwujekwu, 2016). It includes appointments, award of contracts, employments, state and local government

creation, engagement of armed forces and police, location of government parastatals, provision of social services and infra-structures etc (Agbaenyi and Nwagbo, 2016). Considering its importance in social structure, value allocation should be based on rules that was democratically established, inclusive and acceptable to all or at least majority of the people. Forceful formulation, imposition and implementation of such formula as seen in Nigeria most a times has led to formation of identity groups that compete with each other including the state for favorable participation in distribution of commonwealth. Ethnic, religious, political, militant groups etc derive the strength of their justification from lopsidedness in handling collective affair of the citizenry by the government. State should be an umpire in this business of distribution of state resources. Not taking side with any part of the state otherwise its stand and authority will be undermined, and once done it may decide to showcase its superiority by suppressing any group (s) or person(s) that says no it.

**Identity Formation:** it is natural for humans to create an environment where they have sense of belonging especially in a society where there is competition and insecurity. Identity is a means through which a thing or a people can be easily recognized and associated with and also through which they can assert their importance in such an environment. Hogg and Abrams (1988) argue that identity is people's concepts of which they are, of what sort of people they are, and how they relate to others. Whereas Nwanegbo (2014 p184) opines that "identity is the way individuals and group define themselves and are defined by others on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, language, and culture". These mentioned characteristics by Nwanegbo are basis upon which identity formation usually based. Organization of such group to fight or advance collective interest is identity formation. Most often, it is based on social contact, common cultural heritage and similarities, language, religious associations etc. Identity formation is based on some things held in common by the concerned people which prompted the formation, gives sense of belonging and proud to them and disposes them to take any measure to defend it. Identity formation is not on its own bad par say but when there is a social and political construct that engineers competition among the various identity groups, it becomes a threat to peace and social wellbeing of the people. It was on this background that Nnoli (1978) argues, the most critical factor in this structure (*identity formation and crisis*) is the degree of socio-economic competition involved. Resource competition implies that the disputed resources are scarce and that their accessibility is limited. For instance, Nnoli illustrated that

in the case of Reindeer and Tungus and the Cossacks of Northwest Manchuria both groups remained racially and culturally dissimilar and characterized by a general ethnocentric preference for the ingroup. But there was no socioeconomic competition among them. The two economies were complementary. Each admitted that the other was superior in certain specific aspects of life. And they

shared a wide range of values and interests. But in the kolanut trade between the Hausa and Yoruba, conflict first arose in 1934, when some Yorubas tried to enter the trade in competition with the Hausa. As a result, during the course of the 1930s and 1940s, scores of highly knit Hausa communities sprang up in Ibadan, Shagamu, Abeokuta, Agege, Ife, Ijebu and other Yoruba areas which enabled the Hausa to control the kola nut trade even dictate price to the Yoruba kola nut farmers. This incipient ethnicity was later reinforced by the struggle over who should collect the “lada”, a commission paid for trade in kola nuts, the Yoruba farmers or the Hausa buyers (Nnoli, 1978 p70, 71).

In the present Fulani Herdsmen cum Farmers’ crisis in Benue state Nigeria, both groups were living together and classified themselves as brothers on the basis of North-South division in Nigeria of which both of them are of Northern region not minding differences in religion and distance in location. But crisis emerged when competition for ownership and use of land started. The far north Fulani herdsmen migrate in their numbers towards south (north-central), started competing over use of land for grazing and farming with the indigenous people in Benue state which led to ethnic and religious crisis among them of which thousands of Benue indigenous have killed, maimed and displaced without any serious government invention to stop it. Political competition in Nigeria, identity based on ethnicity and religion has been a determining factor of which candidate and political party to vote for by the citizenry during election. In this struggle to overwhelm the other identity, crisis starts. Furthering this crisis is the inability of party or person that emerge victorious to use state power via value allocation to unite the already divided groups during political competition rather state apparatus is used to deepen the crisis by rewarding each ethnic group according to their voting pattern.

***Ethnic patriotism*** When resource allocation becomes scarce, arousing competition and identity formation, the next likely thing to occur among the identity groups which are usually ethnic in nature is ethnic royalty or patriotism. Ethnic patriotism is diversion of patriotism from national/central government to ethnic authority as a way to express love, against other groups in struggle-like structured society. It is sincere and undying commitment to one ethnic group usually expressed to the detriment of other groups. It deters development. Ethnic authority roles in taking care of citizens’ problems as a result of government inability to do so, and/or government partiality in doing so have created sense of marginalization among citizens which led to citizens shifting loyalty to their ethnic groups. Nnoli (1978 p106) maintains that “transfer of responsibility for socio-economic welfare from government to the communal (*ethnic*) unions, and the greater cohesion of the latter, contributed significantly to the emergence of ethnic identity”. The situation is totally different in the states where government is the centre piece of taking care of the problems of her citizens without having sense of marginalization or dissatisfaction by ethnic group (s).

It is pertinent to note that Tanzania consists of at least one hundred and fifty cultural-linguistic units. Nevertheless, no one ever hears Tanzanians talking of their heterogeneity, diversity, or federal character; and they are not organizing themselves into a federation with a proliferating number of states. Tanzania is a unitary state; so are Ivory Coast, Mozambique, Zambia and many other African states which consist of a multiplicity of cultural-linguistic groups. They do not celebrate this diversity in their national anthem either or conceive of and define their problems essentially in ethnic terms (Nnoli, 1978 p110)

*Democracy* democracy has had many meanings today both in definition and practice. Each scholar defines it most often not only by scholarly views of it but also by personal experience about it. In other word environmental influence and encounter of scholars and actors determine their view on and about democracy. This has raised the question of which version of democracy is the best? However, in simple terms, democracy by Greek meaning emanates from two words “Demo” which means the “People” and “Kratia” which means “to rule” meaning “peoples’ rule” (Okeke 2017, and Chikendu, 2002). This time Athenians participated directly in deciding on matters of governance. This is taken to mean direct democracy. It is argued that it ended as the society advanced (Okeke, 2017). Regrettably, this type of democracy is not only associated primarily and practically with Athens alone and has not really ended. But neglect of good values of Africa by the colonial masters brought this. Many African societies practiced democracy in their pattern of governance especially Igbo nation of Nigeria before their encounter with the colonial masters. Even uptil now direct democracy is still being observed by some Igbo societies especially at the grassroot and decision-making unit called *Umunna*. Adult males gather to deliberate and take decisions on issues of importance to them. This decision is respected and abiding on all. Likewise, married females also assemble to take decision either as it concerns their fathers’ house (where married from) or husbands house (where married to). These two groups are called *Umuada* or *Nludi* respectively. So, in Igbo society women were not totally marginalized in decision making. This democratic nature of the Igbos necessitated women participation in politics which brought about women courageous organization of Aba women riot as far back as 1929. The difference is that present practice of democracy in Africa is not of African origin rather a bye product of colonialism, capitalism and imperialism which is associated with all manner of force and naked imposition. Crepaz(2008) argues that African states have democracy imposed on them by their colonial masters and therefore do not follow the same pattern of development with states in the west... imposing western democracy in Africa is like putting an adult jacket on a five-year-old boy and ask her to run. This will most likely end in a bad spill and perhaps with a bloody nose.

Be that as it may, democracy has advanced in its outlook, that direct participation of all the citizenry in state affairs and activities has become impossible. In line with advancement in human governance and relations indirect or representative democracy

became an option for the time. Indirect democracy stands for people choosing those that will take binding decisions on their behalf. Rights and authority is granted to these elected people to superintend the state and its affairs on behalf of and for the collective well of the people. The people have the right to withdraw their mandate during election or in obvious critical matters through recall processes and or impeachment or vote of no confidence depending on system of government in practice.

Some have defined democracy as rule by the people or what Abraham Lincoln defined as “government of the people by the people for the people”. Schumpeter (1942), Moshi and Osman (2008) argued that democracy is not synonymous with rule by the people, rather a method by which decision-making is transferred to individuals who have gained power in a competitive struggle for the votes of the citizens. By this view it infers that some practices to establish representatives in democracy are not usually in consonance with peoples’ way of decision making. In Africa for instance, the struggle associated with politics and manifest unlawful violence have forcefully detach the citizenry from political games (activities) of their country therefore creating a democratic system of citizenry non-participation. In other words, it is not government by the majority as some do argue rather powerful and aggressive minority.

On this basis, it cannot be called “government of the people or rule by the people. At political party selection only party members decide who contest for election, majority of citizenry do not belong to political parties therefore are not part of that decision-making. Law of many countries makes it that it only the political parties that decide and present those who contest for election. The people by implications only sanction what few political elites have decided. Citizens are just instrument through which elites settle their conflicting interest and differences. Citizens play less or no roles again unless during next elections. It is then difficulty to simply argue that democracy is government of the people or rule by the people. This does not mean that democracy is a bad system of governance. And even in its shortcomings it is still the best among other systems of government, its shortcomings both in theory (definitions) and practice notwithstanding. Democracy by Barrow (1983) means that form of government in which all adult persons have equal rights both nominally and practically to vote regularly for any representative they choose, for a parliament that alone has the power to legislate; and in which additionally, absolute freedom of expression is guaranteed. Maduagwu (2003) opines that it is an institutional arrangement in which individuals having completely struggled for the people’s votes and acquired them; secure the power to carry out political decisions on their behalf.

There are many definitions and school of thoughts on democracy which is not primary concern of this work. In all their arguments and differences, there are agreed characteristics any society must possess before it can be tagged democratic. According to Agbaenyi and Nwagbo (2016) democracy is characterized by Civil rule, Periodic election, Rule of law, Participatory governance, Tolerance of the opposition, Competition, Decision by the majority, Equity, Etc. Dahl (1971) alludes that democracy must feature a) Freedom to form and join organizations b) Freedom of expression c) The right to vote d) Eligibility for public office e) The right of political leaders to compete for support f)

Alternative sources of information g) Free and fair election h) Institutions for making government policies.

No matter the hues and shades of democracy (Nor, 2014), climes and practice, it must reflect majority or all of these characteristics to be called democracy, otherwise it will be taken to be militocracy. Militocracy is a mixture of some democratic tenets with military or dictatorial norms in governance (Nwagbo, Ayogu and Chukwujekwu, 2017). It breeds abuse, non-participation; conflict and underdevelopment. In such a political system, ethnicity and other primordial identities determine what one gets from government. Force is order of the day due to manifestation of all kind of (destructive) struggle to get state attention and reward.

### **Theoretical Framework**

Group theory guided this paper in its interrogation of value allocation and identity formation in Nigeria, thereby giving understanding to the prevailing political instability for some decades now. Group theory as advanced by Bintby (1975), Raz (1986), Larry May (1987), Sevansson (2005) (Vinod and Deshpande, 2013) opines society is nothing other than a complex of groups that compose it. It advocates that societies are comprised of many groups or unit therefore power is not concentrated in a single group, but dispersed among a wide variety of social groups (Gaubá, 2003). Group gives identity and medium of expression to its members. These groups strive to see that wellbeing of their members are taken care of by the superintending authority. This gives the groups a struggle like characteristics in their interaction. However, what actually determines their mutuality/ harmony or disagreement and agitation is the attitude of the state (central authority) to aggregate their interests in her policy and value allocation. Each group actually tries to out whelm the other if there is no coordinating force or authority to call it to order according to collectively accepted pattern of interaction.

This explains the groups in Nigeria, which manifest in nature of ethnic or religious groups. The primary interest of these groups is better allocation of commonwealth of the state. Adeleye (2014) argues that struggle for acquisition and access to power in Nigeria has been patterned largely along ethnic lines. This becomes more problematic because the state is not neutral force in mediating political conflict. Therefore, these groups contest about injustice and marginalization in the polity. State value allocation in Nigeria has given the groups aggressive spirit in their dealing with government and themselves. Political instability in Nigeria even after 19 years (1999-2018) of it consistent democratic practices is as a result of the groups' inability to interact harmoniously in their quest for control of state resources. Nwadiakor and Uzoigwe (nd p66) aver that parochial interest of ethnic groups have brought about insecurity that had engulfed the entire society due to injustice, poverty and unemployment it created. This culminated into political instability in our nascent democratic dispensation.

### **Historical Background to Nigeria's Identity Formation and Crises Experiences**

Nigeria's identity cleavages took its shape under colonial leadership. In as much as Nigeria prior to contact with the west (colonial masters) was not united but each ethnic

group was independent from others, there was no room for ethnic or then national rivalry. Various nations were relating amicably with each other. Sense of ethnicity started under colonial administration especially through the policy of divide and rule after amalgamation in 1914 (Nnoli, 1984). It grew gradually leading to the formation of political parties on the frontline of ethnicity i.e Action Group (AG), Northern People's Congress (NPC), National Congress for Nigeria and Cameroun. The parties that arose in the colonial period were tribal based parties. It was NPC for the North, AG for the West and NCNC for the East... No efforts were made in penetrating other regions. Parties that made such attempts to penetrate other regions were quickly challenged and stopped through political intrigues (Obikeze and Obi, 2003).

Move for independence was slowed by political squabbles that were identity based in its manifestation between South (East and West) and North. In 1953 Chief Enahoro moved motion for self-determination come 1956, but was out rightly rejected by the Northern leaders (NPC) in a suspicious that South wanted to take over control of political system of the country as a result of political underdevelopment in the north. The aftermath effect of this was mob action on the Northern leaders and retaliatory action of the North in 1953 Kano riot (Chikendu, 2002). According to Obikeze and Obi (2003) due to "pebbles thrown on the northern leaders, abusive name calling given to them, the northern leaders prepared 8-point programme for secession. The southern politicians felt there was need for union of the North and South in one entity called Nigeria. Some Southern leader went up to the North to convince their leaders of the need to team up to wrestle power from the colonial masters. This led to Kano riot of 1953 in which many Southerners were killed". From this time forth, serious crack was experienced in the socio-political and economic relationship between the South and the North even in their struggle for independence which has made political integration and stability very difficult. Political intrigues after independence did not help Nigeria political system.

Every region was more interested in building its region and paid no attention on national issues. Each regional government developed self-confidence in itself and used its powers in various ways which made them look more important even than federal government. Each of the political parties in Nigeria secured firm control of a Regional Government (Cohen, 1968). The regional government controlled education, health, tax assessment, customary court, miles of roads and bridges etc. Pitiably it gave impetus to ethnic identity formation immediately after independence. Citizens were made to believe that their welfare is more secured in the hands of regional government and political party. National government and other political parties which of course were region/ethnic based were their enemies and should be treated as such. This culminated into serious national crisis that led to Nigerian-Biafran civil of 1967-1970. Identity politics has become a serious national problem since then. Military leadership did nothing much after the war to unite Nigeria rather the defeated Biafrans were treated as victims of war which made them feel aggrieved with Nigerian state and since then has always demand for freedom/secession from Nigeria (Nnoli, 2011).

Struggle for political power and agitation against federal/central government allocation of resources which favoured the north necessitated formation of some ethnic

pressure and militant groups especially in the South. Odua People Congress (OPC) emerged to demand for presidency of a Yoruba person. It believed that Nigeria is old enough to have president from other regions outside of Northern Nigeria which has dominated the position since independence. Obasanjo became Nigerian president in 1999 to compensate the Yorubas over 1993 annulled general election which Abiola won (Madubuko, 2008). After 1999 election, movement for Actualization of Sovereign State of Biafra (MASSOB) came on board to demand for inclusion of the Igbos in the national programmes which they felt marginalized. Inability to materialize this, gave rise to another serious agitation by Indigenous People of Biafra demanding for secession from Nigeria, alluding all manner malpractices against them by Nigerian state (see table 1,2,3,4,5). Boko Haram which went beyond state control since 2011 become violent as a result of the feeling that the North is short changed for not completing its tenure under President Yar'dua who died in power in 2009. Also, that Christianity through its western education is having much influence in Islam controlled Northern Nigeria. Militant groups resurface again in the Niger Delta to continue the demands of development of their region that produce crude oil which Nigeria's economy solely depended on. This struggle got militant and destructive. Oil pipelines were vandalized, expatriates kidnapped and killed. The argument was simple, the South-South region (Niger Delta) is being marginalized by Nigerian government in the distribution of value (common wealth) which they produce. This destabilized Nigeria's economy during Obasanjo, Yar'dua administration (1999-2009). Yar'dua established a very helpful palliative measure to address this which was called "Amnesty Programme".

### **Value Allocation, Identity Formation and Political Instability in Nigeria**

Many crises in Nigeria have either been state engineered or emanated out of state policies, activities or inaction over issues that are of vital interest to one group or the other. In other words, state has been accused of being responsible for misunderstanding among ethnic and religious groups. This is in connection to act of marginalization, abuse of law, application of coercive instruments over democratic issues, injustice, and non-inclusive governance. Ironically, this is a total contrast of essence of state. The state by social contract theorist is to end social anarchy by providing security, justice and fair play (Nwoye, 2002).

In essence state should be fair to all component parts. Inability of state to play these roles has led to struggle to control state institutions by various ethnic groups in Nigerian state. Relevance of any ethnic group is usually based on its connection to those in power. The undemocratic disposition of this practice inevitably prompts other neglected groups to articulate destructive approaches to first attract government attention over their needs. Secondly to distract government from performing. Ethno-religious crises have dominated Nigerian politics and political landscape since independence (Nnoli, 1978). Every activity both by government and groups in Nigeria is given either ethnic or religious interpretation. Each of the groups fights hard to protect the image and interests of its group against national integration and growth. Nigeria had experienced civil war (1967-1970), ethno-religious crises in the north since independence, political crisis in the

south-west especially 1993 Abiola crisis, socio-economic quagmire in the Niger Delta since fourth republic and reprisal attacks in the south-east.

Division and suspicion among groups in Nigeria emanates out of quest to get fair share of national wealth. This should not have been the case if the state had in all fairness been just to all, not minding ethnic or religious affiliation. Unfortunately, in all these maladies, government which is supposed to superintend and meditate over this squabble has been engulfed in it and became a serious party. In a bid to maintain control over its stand even in a democratic system; the political actors have adopted harsh military system contrary to the provision of the law to manipulate the agitations and agitators. This has created undemocratic experience like inequality, injustice, domination, rancor and socio-economic upheaval. The citizenry seems to have taken heed to Nnoli's advice that "the people must struggle for democratization of access to the ownership of the means of production and wealth in order to ensure full political equality. They must struggle for universalization of the systems of education, health, social welfare, legal etc in order to abolish the political inequality... after all "democracy is a product of sweat, toil and sacrifice of millions of people in the long history of man's struggle for a better life" (Nnoli, 2003: p 169). In midst of these scenarios we have a lot of ugly experience of whole lots of groups mostly ethnic in nature struggling against undemocratic disposition of Nigerian leaders in a democratic system (Nwagbo and Eze, 2015).

### **MASSOB and IPOB in Igbo Nation**

Marginalization of the Igbo nation in socio-economic and political scheme of things in Nigeria led to emergence of MASSOB, IPOB etc. These groups kept lamenting over marginalization of their ethnic group by government, injustice against them by both government and other ethnic groups, wanton destruction of lives and properties of their people even in non-provocative issues. Government inability to address this, has kept the agitation high. It creates feeling of exclusion by the people of Igbo nation. Sequel to this came unpatriotic behaviour by some people towards the state. IPOB spokesman Chief Clifford Iroanya appeal to President Buhari to explain to Ndigbo why he abandoned the zone in terms of appointment and project execution, and why businesses owned by Ndigbo are allegedly being frustrated by his administration (Odogwu, 2016).

MASSOB and IPOB gave instances of these wrong doings to include

- No president of Igbo extraction after civil war (see table 3).
- No Chief of Justice from Igbo nation (see table 4).
- Poor state of federal government presence in the region like roads, rail stations, industries, sea ports, power station, refineries etc.
- Wanton destruction of lives and properties of members in other parts of the country without government protection and compensation.
- Non reflection of federal character in appointment at federal level especially in the present Buhari administration (see table 4).
- Imbalance in creation of states and local governments (see table 2).
- Unfavorable resource distribution pattern/formulae (see table 1).

- Skewed constitution of security/ military heads under Buhari administration (see table 4)
- Noncompliance to court judgments in matters that concern the people like in NnamdiKanu case and other cases associated with the groups (IPOB and MASSOB).

Madubuko (2008) cited in Agbaenyi and Nwagbo (2016) provided comprehensive facts on some of these claims. These are illustrated in the tables below:

**Table 1: Federal Allocation to States 1999-2005 in Billions of Naira**

Group 1		Group 2		Group 3		Group 4	
Delta	387.4	Ondo	165.2	Ogun	134.4	Ekiti	102.0
Rivers	357.6	Niger	164.5	Edo	131.5	Plateau	101.9
Akwa-Ibom	313.6	Imo	155.5	Anambra	130.2	Gombe	99.6
Bayelsa	285.6	Jigawa	151.8	Cross River	126.7	Nassarawa	96.7
Kano	254.4	Bauchi	146.0	Zamfara	125.6		
Lagos	226.6	Sokoto	146.0	Yobe	121.8		
Kastina	192.9	Osun	143.5	Abia	120.6		
Oyo	180.3	Adamawa	136.9	Taraba	119.0		
Kaduna	177.4	FCT	136.2	Enugu	117.0		
Borno	165.6	Kebbi	134.6	Kwara	122.5		

**Source:** Madubuko, (2008) in Agbaenyi and Nwagbo (2016)

**Table 2: States and Local Government Distribution among Nigerian Regions**

Zones	No of States	No of L.G.A
South East	5	95
South West	6	137
South South	6	122
North East	6	186
North West	7	112
North Central	6	121

**Source:** Madubuko, (2008) in Agbaenyi and Nwagbo (2016)

**Table 3: Power Distribution in Nigeria since Independence**

North West	Year
Gen Murtala Mohammed	July 29 1975- Feb 13 1976
Alhaji Shehu Shagari	Oct 1, 1979- Dec 31, 1983
Maj Gen Muhammadu Buhari	Jan 1, 1984- Aug 27, 1985
Gen Sani Abacha	Nov 17 1993-June 8 1998
Alhaji Umaru Musa Yar' Adua	May 29 2007-2009
Muhammadu Buhari	May 29 2015-Date
North East	
AlhajiAbubakar Balewa	Oct 1, 1960-Jan 16 1966

<b>North Central</b>	
Gen Yakubu Gowon	July 29, 1966-July 29 1975
Gen Ibrahim Babangida	Aug 27 1985-Aug 26 1993
Gen Abdul salami Abubakar	June 9, 1998- May 29 1999
<b>South East</b>	
Gen AguiyiIronsi	Jan 16 1966- July 29 1966
<b>South West</b>	
Gen Olusegun Obasanjo	Feb 14 1976-Oct 1, 1979, May 29, 1999- May 29, 2007
Chief Ernest Shonekan	Aug 29 1993- Nov 17 1993
<b>South South</b>	
Goodluck Jonathan	2009-May 29 2015

**Source:** Madubuko (2008) in Agbaenyi and Nwagbo (2016)

**Table 4: Names and Dates of Justices of Supreme Court of Nigeria**

S/N	Names	Year
1	Hon. Justice Stafford Foster Sutton	1956-1958
2	Hon. Justice Adetokunbo Ademola	1958-1972
3	Hon. Justice Taslim Olawale Elias	1972-1975
4	Hon. Justice Darnley Arthur Alexander	1975-1979
5	Hon. Justice Atanda Fatai-Williams	1979-1983
6	Hon. Justice George Sodeinde Sowemimo	1983-1985
7	Hon. Justice Ayo Gabriel Irikefe	1985-1987
8	Hon. Justice Muhammed Bello	1987-1995
9	Hon. Justice Muhammadu Lawal Uwais	1995-2006
10	Hon. Justice Salisu Modibo Alfa Belgore	2006-2007
11	Hon. Justice Idris Legbo Kutigi	2007-2010
12	Hon. Justice Aloysius Iyorgyr Kastina-Alu	2010-2011
13	Hon. Justice Dahiru Musdapher	2011-2012
14	Hon. Justice Aloma Mariam Makhar	2012-2014
15	Hon. Justice Mahmud Mohammed	2014-2016
16	Hon. Justice Walter Samuel Nkanu Onnoghen	2016-Date

**Source:** Supreme court. gov.ng and www.naij.com (29<sup>th</sup> August, 2017)

The above lopsided history and imbalance in value allocation is what ethnic movements of Igbo extractions are holding claims on to demand for secession from Nigeria political entity. For instance, since independent of Nigeria from her else while colonial master in 1960, the southeast (Igbo ethnic group) held the post of Head of State/ President for 6 months, whereas other zones and ethnic groups have held it for than 6 years at least (see table 3). More pitiable is the case of the Supreme Court of the Federation, where no Southeast (Igbo) person has been appointed as the Chief Justice of the Supreme of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (see table 4). Those that made it to the Supreme Court retired without such consideration. Also no serious effort is being made for balancing of this cry

of marginalization. Furthermore, since 4<sup>th</sup> Republic power sharing especially the offices of President, Vice President, President of the Senate and Speaker House of Representatives have been a reflection of three ethnic groups or zones in Nigeria (North: Hausa, Southwest: Yoruba, Southeast Igbo or South south). But the present dispensation totally ignored this prevailing political culture of Nigeria political arrangement thereby breeding ethnic rancor, suspicious and contention which is seriously destabilizing the socio-political sphere of Nigeria.

One of the claims for political agitation of the Igbo ethnic group in recent time is in appointment of the Heads of Defence/Security agencies in Nigeria where no person of the ethnic extraction was considered. In other words, security meetings will be held and decisions taken without anybody representing the interest of the group, worriedly in an ethnic competition and contention riddled Nigeria (see table 5). Also, the Igbo ethnic group/Southeast zone has only 5 states and 95 local governments in 36 states and 994 local government areas in Nigeria (see table 2). Whereas other zones have at least 6 states and not less 112 local government areas, in as much as Igbo is among the three dominating ethnic group in Nigeria.

Failure of government to address some of these maladies has made every effort to uphold Nigeria entity difficult. Government of every regime keep spending resources it would have used to develop the nation in quailing conflict. Onuko (2016) extended the argument to present Buhari administration. He illustrated that the appointment of the present federal government is lopsided and have necessitated ethnic agitation that have aggravated Nigeria state disintegration. Rev Fr Aghaulor advised federal government to address inequality in appointments in the security sector which gives impression in the current arrangement that military and other security agencies belong to a particular region of the country ( Ojo, 2016).

**Table 5: Appointments into Sensitive Security Posts by Buhari led Federal Government**

	Office	Name	Region/State	Religion
1	Chief of Air Staff	Air Vice Marshal Sadique Abubakar	North, Bauchi	Muslim
2	Chief of Army Staff	Lt. Gen. Tukur Burutai	North, Borno	Muslim
3	Naval	Real Admiral Ibok-Ete Ekwe Ibas	South, Cross Rivers	Christian
4	Chief of Defence	Gen. Abayomi Olonisakin	South, Ekiti	Christian
5	Minister of Defence	Brig. Gen. Mansur Mahammed Dan Ali	North, Zamfara	Muslim
6	DS DSS	Lawal Daura	North, Kastina	Muslim
7	IG of Police	Ibrahim Idris	North, Niger State	Muslim
8	Comptroller of Immigration	Mahammed Babandede	North, Jigawa	Muslim
9	Comptroller	Col Hameed Ibrahim (Rtd)	North, Kaduna	Muslim

	Custom			
10	Civil Defence	Com. Gen. Abdullahi Muhammadu	North, Niger	Muslim
11	Minister of Interior	Maj. Gen. Abdulrahman Dambazau	North, Kaduna	Muslim
12	National Security Adviser	Maj. Gen. Babangida Munguno	North, Borno	Muslim
13	Minister of Police Affairs	Alhaji Oyewele Adesiyun	South, Osun	Muslim

Compiled by the Researchers in 2016

In midst of this, government has failed to adopt democratic means of dialogue and compromise to address these groups agitation for Biafran state rather coercive instrument which is precipitated on abuse of rule of law is usually adopted. Under this ugly situation Okorie and Esheya (2013) maintain that the beauty of democracy globally lies in equity. They suggested its applicability in Nigeria, infers that equitable representation of the ethnic nationalities in political appointments, career positions and such other positions of national representation or significance will ensure peace and development. But this suggestion has not been in any way adhered to, thereby causing political suffocation and socio-economic instability.

#### **MEND, Avengers and Other Militant Groups of Niger Delta**

Agitations and destruction of national assets in the Niger Delta region is based on non-inclusive resource allocation formula. The people of the region argue that the region produces resources that sustain the economy but they are neglected in its distribution. Unfortunately, people from other zones benefit more from the resource whereas her people bear the destructive impacts of the resource production. Some of the factors they point at are environmental and aquatic lives destruction, high mortality rate due to pollution, unemployment, poor infra-structure, poor political appointment at federal level and non- compensation by both MNCs in the area and federal government. In an effort to address these, Obasanjo regime established Niger Delta Development Commission (NDDC) to address some of the socio-economic problems of the area. Obasanjo revenue allocation formula increased to 13% on derivation to assuage the militants and stakeholders from Niger-Delta. This served as palliative measure. It reduced pressure on federal government but did not adequately solve problems of the area. They kept agitating for more federal government investment to alleviate socio-economic effects of oil exploration activities in the area.

More so, Yar'dua and Jonathan administration intervened through Amnesty Programme, appointment, award of contracts and etc. Tempo was reduced and relative return of peace was experienced in the area during the period especially when one of their own became President of Nigeria (Goodluck Jonathan). However, status quo ante was re-established when Buhari government decided to suspend some of these projects with view of reviewing the processes of their establishment and execution. This led to destruction of oil facilities and companies in the area on daily basis. Nigeria as a mono-economy nation that depends majorly on oil for her foreign exchange is seriously being

challenged by the activities of these militants. In recent times, Federal and some state governments have not been able to meet up with their social responsibilities due to low volume of oil production. Oil production drastically reduced from 2.1million barrels in 2015 to 850,000 barrels per day in 2016 when militants' attacks on oil facilities became intense. Likewise, 2016 budget was not been implemented as a result of paucity of fund. In recent times Nigeria economy went into recession as a result of some of these activities. Economic effect of this act has been quite destructive especially in this era of economic recession. The MEND, Avengers, Joint Revolution Council, Niger Delta People Volunteer Force etc maintain that marginalization of the area as the main reason for their actions.

The groups and people of this area posit that federal government spends billions of naira rehabilitating North-East destroyed by its own people (Boko Haram) whereas Niger Delta Amnesty programme was revoked. Destructions and poverty in the area are effects of MNCs activities and neglect of government to rebuild the area. They maintained that this is just robbing Peter to pay Paul. There has been accusation in recent times that 85% of oil wells in the region are owned by the people from north as a result of lopsided value allocation system in a militocratic state like Nigeria. Regrettably, this zone is politically marginalized in appointment, promotion and recruitment into federal government institutions which negates the principle of federal character as established.

Dialoke and Edeja (2017) assert dissatisfied with the condition under which the people live, the youths in the Niger Delta have become more restive than ever, but youth restiveness has instead of redress, attracted state violence, repression, suppression and brutalization as exemplified by the killing of Ken SaroWiwo and 8 others Ogoni's. The continuous suppression of peaceful agitations leaves the youths with no option than to militarize the struggle to match force with force, and these has led to the evolvement of many militant group within the region. Chiefly among them is the dreaded Movement for the Emancipation of the Niger Delta (MEND), Movement of the Niger Delta People (MONDP), Niger Delta Vigilante Force (NDVF), Niger Delta People Salvation Front, and Niger Delta Avengers that allegedly emerged in February 2016 with a mandate to paralyzed the economic activities of the country through its operation code; "Operation Red the Economy"

According to Dialoke and Edeja (2017) NNPC report indicated that Nigeria lost 643 million litres of crude oil or N51.28 billion as a result of 3,000 incidences of pipeline vandalization in 2015. NNPC reports that between 2010-2015, it recorded 18,000 incidences of pipeline vandalization while the figure for January to May, 2016, no fewer than 1,447 incidents leading to loss of 109 million of litres of petroleum products and 560,000 barrels of crude oil to refineries were recorded (Vanguard, August, 2016). In 2016 a total of 1600 incidents of pipeline vandalization was recorded in two (2) months s against 3000 in 12months of 2015.The record of 3000 pipeline vandalization shows a monthly average of 250 incidences as against average of 800 incidents recorded between January and February, 2016.This shows an increase of 220% pipeline vandalized in the year 2016 compared to 2015. The 2015 International Monetary Fund (IMF) report showed that Nigeria has dropped from 1st to 2nd position as the largest economy in Africa with a

GDP of \$296 billion while South Africa with a GDP of \$ 301 billion rand's ranks first position in Africa.

Federal government has responded through all manners of approach but of no avail. Outside of all the military approach under military regime of Gen Sani Abacha, Obasanjo during his democratic regime also engaged military approach, Yar'dua adopted diplomatic approach of Amnesty Programme likewise Goodluck Jonathan while Buhari of the present engaged in military approach tagged 'Operation Crocodile Tear'. But these engagements have not been able to bring remedy to the problems of Niger Delta due to attitude of the Nigerian government in addressing them.

### **Fulani Herdsmen**

Outside of conflicts as a result of marginalization of groups by the state, the favoured group, a times exhibits attitude of superiority against other groups. States inability to rise up to its responsibility of bringing every group to order, gives impetus to this assumed connected group to take laws into their hands. Fulani Herdsmen in recent time advanced their business interest outside the provisions of the law without the state and its institutions intervening to stop such a breach. Human rights and business activities of other Nigerians are being abused and destroyed respectively. The argument has always been that power belongs to the North having been born to rule. On this basis, the state (federal government) cannot rise against them. Rather covertly support these atrocities by keeping mute. Due to monistic nature of Nigerian state, sub-units, like state government authorities (governors) who should rise to provide security to their people are also incapacitated. That is why pluralism theorists argue that state should not be invested with absolute power to avoid abuse or become instrument of oppression by the ruling group.

Fulani Herdsmen while rearing their cattle from North down to South have invaded farmlands of communities on their ways. They rape, maim, kill even destroy communities that try to protest these unlawful activities of invading farms, homes, streams, sacred places in their communities. These are against the law of the land. The perpetrators are not controlled by the law and its agents. Rev Fr Aghaulor decried "we are tempted to wonder if Nigeria is on the verge of collapse. All over the country, women are being raped, intimidated, innocent Nigerians are being slaughtered and property worth billions of naira are being destroyed by hoodlums suspected to be Fulani Herdsmen" (Ojo, 2016). It is also recurrent especially in states like Plateau, Benue, Adamawa, Enugu, Imo, Kaduna, Taraba etc. The group bears arms that are by law meant for the security agents of the state. This raises suspicion that state or its institution gives assistance to the group.

One could easily ask how such illiterate nomad could acquire such sophisticated arm like AK47 and other associated raffles. How did they gain the training on her to bear arms? How do they manoeuvre security agents in their movement from North down the East? Why is it that many years of these atrocities they have not been brought to book? If the state could fight Niger Delta militants, MASSOB, IPOB agitators and Boko Haram group and other security challenges, why is it that Fulani Herdsmen who are identifiable

have not been able to be checked? Innocent Nigerians are left unprotected while there are military wares and personnel protecting pipelines in Niger Delta, this gives impression that oil is more important than human lives (Ojo, 2016).

According to AIT 8pm News of 14<sup>th</sup> September between 2014 -2016, 12 out of 24 local government areas in Benue state have been attacked by Fulani herdsmen. 1800 persons were killed, 500,000 people displaced, still both federal and state governments who are in charge of security have not been able to do anything serious to curtail this. The statistics of this attacks and associated havocs are higher in Plateau state than Benue state and it is increasing every day. Socio-economic effects of this are quite colossal, among which is social disharmony, suspicion, security tension, unemployment, hunger and political instability. Worriedly, it makes citizens to feel unsecured, kills patriotic spirit, and necessitates self- security and taking of arms against the state. For instance, Ekiti state government has promulgated an act banning grazing in the state. A jail term of 2 years for anyone caught. It is an effort to secure Ekiti state. Other states may take recourse to this, even on other matters outside herdsmen activities especially, to target business of other social groups. Nigeria social harmony and security is threatened everyday as a result of federal government inability to effectively act as arbiter in reconciling conflicting interests of groups within the Nigerian state. Identity formations either ethnic or religious have been so high in recent time. In their engagements, they do not consider again interest and collective wellbeing of the Nigerian state rather how to advance their own interest even when it is detrimental to the entire nation. Identity crisis is more expensive to address than any other social crisis and responsible for many destructive activities going on in the country (Nnoli, 1984).

### **Identity Crisis in Nigeria and Efficacy of Government Remedial Approaches**

Nigerian government since independence has tried to see how identity problems in Nigeria that manifest primarily through ethnicity and religion are solved. Also, to see that no part of the country feels marginalized in every facet of the state programs. In view of this, in an attempt to see that minority groups interests are protected or no group either ethnic or religious holds the country at ransom, government formulated policies like "Federal Character Principle" to accommodate every part of the country in every activity of the state. Section 14 (3) of the 1999 Constitution states that "the composition of the Government of the Federation or any of its agencies and the conduct of its affairs shall be carried out in such a manner as to reflect the federal character of Nigeria and the need to promote national unity, and also to command national loyalty, thereby ensuring that there shall be no predominance of persons from few states or few ethnic or other sectional groups in that Government or in any of its agencies" As Nwagbo, Ayogu and Chukwujekwue (2016) assert,

Federal character is a creation in Nigeria political system to address inequality, marginalization, discrimination, domination, etc, among the various ethnic groups or federating units in Nigeria especially in value allocation... Political appointment, recruitment, admission, promotion, budgeting and budget

implementation, etc, must represent at least every ethnic and religious group; and by extension every state of the federation and at equal proportion. It is essentially developed in order to avoid ethnic or religious domination among the peoples of Nigeria.

Federal character rather than solve the problem of its creation has constituted more nightmares to the government. Citizens now see their positions as a loyalty from their ethnic group and owe allegiance to it rather than government. Every person interest now becomes to interrogate government programmes to see if it reflects federal character by capturing the person's and/or interests of his/her ethnic or religious group(s) no longer how such programme can add to national growth and development. Merit as a result of this is sacrificed for the sake of federal character. The person that is best qualified for a given job is neglected and less qualified person is granted such appointment or promotion on the basis of ethnic group that should occupy such position.

So unfortunately, Nigerian children and youths experience this in Unity Schools (federal government secondary school) admission, admission into tertiary institutions, thereby making these deprived future leaders offended of Nigerian state and esteem more their ethnic groups. It has generated so much conflicts that it needs to be replaced by more inclusive citizenship provisions, even though some people are of the opinion that it has equally provided effective protection for minority rights. It has become an instrument to gain access to power, employment, claim benefits and sometimes ensure denial to others. People suffer discrimination in recruitment into federal institutions, admissions to most of the federal universities and education at military academies (African Report, 2012). At sub-federal levels, where the practice is rife, they are denied access to schools, health care, roads and academic scholarship and are discriminated against in access to job. Finally, the door to participation in local politics is virtually shut against them (Nwanegbo, 2014; Danfulani, 2006). Insistence of any regime/government to neglect this and go for merit, is of course abuse of law, and leads to all manner of agitation and political instability especially in this age of democracy where social mobilization is easy.

State creation is argued to be government effort to reduce ethnic unity by dividing previous ethnic blocs into many states. In this sense loyalty of individuals should not be based on ethnic fronts because nothing is holding them together rather attention should now be on state and central governments. State creation could not solve this problem due to government sincerity in state creation especially inequality in state creation. Ethnic groups like Igbo, united again to argue that they are marginalized in state creation on the background of their ethnic nationality. Likewise, that other ethnic group and region that got higher number of states got so due to their ethnic background. This became another national problem that stirs up political instability in the system till date.

Equality in resource allocation was another government approach to addressing identity cleavages and its associated political instability. Inequality in social and economic development is argued to be responsible for un uniform and disparity in development among the various regions or the newly created states. Government

established policy of distribution of some portion of Nigeria resources equally on the purview of even development and non-domination by wealthy state over the poor. Resource allocation agitation struggles in the Niger Delta region arose to confront this formula. The argument remains that change in pattern of allocation of resource control of early independent Nigeria when crude oil has not been discovered is an obvious marginalization of the region that suffers great havoc as result of oil exploitation activities by Oil Company.

Replacement of resource control policy with that of even development when major ethnic groups in Nigeria were no longer contributing much to national development is injustice to oil producing states and it originated out of ethnic or identity superiority politics in Nigeria political environment. Niger Delta region started demanding for resource control system to be able to address development challenges in the region. Nigerian economy and politics have suffered serious instability as a result of activities of militant groups from the Niger Delta region. The region is the heartbeat of the Nigeria's economy; yet, its abundant natural wealth stands in stark contrast to its palpable underdevelopment. The high rate of unemployment among the youths has helped to drive and sustain high levels of violence and criminality throughout the delta region (Dialoke and Chijindu, 2016).

Engagement of the military in internal matters was adopted as mechanism to engender peace. The military turned to be an option to government to control social and identity disturbances in the state. Since 1999 all manner of operations has been established by government to forcefully establish calmness in Nigeria polity but of no avail. In the Niger Delta in recent times Operation Crocodile Smile was established to end militancy and secure oil facilities and expatriates in the region. In the North-East operation Lafia Dole was established to end Boko Hara and other act of insurgency and terrorism. In the Northwest and North Central there are Operation Harbin Kaunama and Operation Dokaji to tackle cattle rustling and armed banditry. Likewise, in the South-East Operation Python dance was established to end demand for insurgency. Pitable billions of dollars have been spent in all these operations but peace and stability has not been established. This volume of money would have gone far in solving some of the social, political, economic etc problems that necessitated these identity misgivings. The most unfortunate thing military operations are used to handle civil and internal security issues thereby citizens are being militarized which poses serious threat to democracy and security.

## **Conclusion**

Value is the primary thing that prompts citizens' perception of one another's action. Its allocation by government that define the nature of such state and harmony that exist within it. In a multi-ethnic country like Nigeria fair play is only justifiable approach to manage divergent interest and groups. In reality, each group always struggle to see that its interest is favoured against that of other. In line with groups' theorists, it is now the responsibility of the state which stands as arbiter to regulate activities of these groups to avoid getting destructive. But unfortunately, this has not been the case. Rather

government has been partial in addressing identity interest. These bias actions are responsible for identity crises and cleavages in Nigeria and other parts of Africa. Identity formations like OPC, MEND, MASSOB, IPOB, Avengers, Boko Haram, and Fulani Herdsmen have been instruments of destructive struggles to get favourably state attention in ethnic driven Nigerian state. However, approaches adopted by government to address these abnormalities have been lopsided in its outlook and operation, thereby adding more cause more nightmares to the system

In this study it was found out that identity formation in Nigeria takes the nature of ethnic or religious affiliations and boundaries. The formation is usually to contest and compete for state resources because value allocation in Nigerian state is done on identity basis (ethnic or religious). Therefore, value allocation mechanism is turned to favour ethnic group and religious group in power. State on this instance is no longer fulfilling its social contract responsibility rather a party to groups' competition. State then is found out to be largely responsible for causing social crises that lead political instability in Nigeria. More so, democratic norms have not been engaged in addressing social problems in Nigerian political system. This attitude has aggravated social disharmony in the system, bearing in mind that Nigeria is now a democratic state. Military in engagements (Operation Crocodile Tears, Python Dance, etc) are bad approach in settle internal and civil unrest especially when the root cause of such disturbance has not been addressed.

We therefore recommend that government deemphasize ethnic and religious recognition in her value allocation and activities. Likewise, democratic norms should be followed in addressing social upheavals. Military engagement should be abolished in addressing internal problems, in order to reduce level of militarization that citizens experience every day. This hardens them, makes them believe that live in the state is life of force and struggle which manifest in their daily activities and contributes to unpatriotic activities and political instability. Value allocation (appointment, promotion, award of contracts, creation of states and local government, provision of infra-structure) should be based on justice, equity, fairness, merit and etc not on ethnic or religious considerations. This will help to reduce unnecessary contention, competition, suspicion, mistrust, hatred and wanton killing ravaging the country. Nigeria education system and curriculum starting from primary school, should be restructured to build sense and spirit of national patriotism among her citizens in order to reduce loyalty and support to ethnic formations.

## References

- Agbaenyi, A.N & Nwagbo, S.N.C (2016). The igbonation in Nigerian democratization: The need for collective political bargaining. *Preorcjah* Vol 1(2). [www.ezenwaohaetoorc.org](http://www.ezenwaohaetoorc.org)
- Adeleye M.A (2014). Ethnicity and the politics of state creation in Nigeria. Retrieved from <http://www.absidiqu.com>
- Africa Report (2012). Curbing violence in Nigeria (1): The Jos crisis. International Crisis Group, African Report No 196, 17 December.

- Barrow, R (1983). Injustice, inequality and ethics: a philosophical introduction to moral problems in Nor Z.M (2014), *Democracy and development in Nigeria: which way?* in Tsuwa, Akuul & Ashaver (ed) *Democracy, Leadership and Good Governance in the 21st Century: Contending Issues and Options for Nigeria*. Makurdi, Nigeria: Gamint Corporate Publisher
- Chikendu, P. (2002). Definition, meaning and use of political science. In Chikedu P.N (ed). *Introduction to Political Science* (pp1-17). Enugu, Nigeria: Academic Publishing Company
- Crepaz M.M.L (2008). Reflection on recipe for democracy in Africa, in Moshi L. and Osman, A.A (eds). *Democracy and Its Culture: An African Perspective*. New Haven CT: Yale University. University Press.
- Cohen, A (1969). *Custom and Politics in urban Africa*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Danfulani, U (2006). The Jos peace conference and the indigene/settler question in Nigeria politics. Unpublished paper; in Nwanegbo, C. J (2014) *The Jukun and their Neighbours: Identity Politics and Crisis in Wukari LGA, Taraba State*; in *Social Science Research, NnamdiAzikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria*: September, Vol 2 No. 2.
- Deng, F.M (1997). Ethnicity: An African predicament. *Brookings Research Article, Summer 1997*. Available on: [www.brookings.edu/research/article](http://www.brookings.edu/research/article).
- Dialoke, I. & Edeja M.S (2017). Effects of Niger Delta militancy on the economic development of Nigeria (2006-2016), *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management Research* Vol.3 No.3 2017 page 25-36. [www.iiardpub.org](http://www.iiardpub.org) (accessed 22/4/2018).
- Dialoke, I. & Chijindu, S.J. (2016). Effect of regional agitation for resource control on human capital development: A study of Niger Delta region of Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management Research*. Vol.3 No.22 (accessed 22/4/2018).
- Gaub, O.P (2003), *An introduction to political theory* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), India: Macmillian Indian Ltd.
- Maduagwu, M.O (2003). Nature and character of democratic governance: Nigeria perspective. In Tsuwa Akuul & Ashaver (eds), *Democracy, Leadership and Good Governance in th 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Contending Issues and Options for Nigeria*. Makurdi, Nigeria: Gamint Corporate Publisher.
- Moshi, L & Osman, A.A. (eds) (2008). *Democracy and Culture: An African Perspective*. London: Adonis and Abbey Publications Ltd.
- Nnoli, O. (2011). *The struggle for democracy in Nigeria*. Enugu, Nigeria: Snaap Press
- Nnoli, O. (2003). *Introduction to Politics* (Revised 2ed). Enugu, Nigeria: SNAAP Press Ltd.
- Nnoli, O. (1989). *Ethnic conflicts in Africa*. Senegal: CODESRIA
- Nnoli, O (1984). *Ethnic politics in Nigeria*. Enugu, Nigeria: Fourth Dimension Publishing Company.
- Nor, Z.M (2014), *Democracy and development in Nigeria: Which way?* in Tsuwa, Akuul & Ashaver (eds), *Democracy, Leadership and Good Governance in the 21st*

- Century: Contending Issues and Options for Nigeria*. Makurdi Gamint Corporate Publisher.
- Nwadiakor, K.L. and Uzoigwe, A.M (nd). Ethnicity and social stability in Nigeria: The place of religion. UJAH UNIZIK Journal of Arts and Humanities. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ujah.v14i3.5>
- Nwanegbo, C. J. (2014), The Jukun and their neighbours: Identity politics and crisis in Wukari LGA, Taraba State; in *Social Science Research, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria*: September, Vol 2 No. 2. (pp 179-212).
- Nwagbo, S.N.C, Ayogu, C. & Chukwujekwu, O. (2016). Authoritative allocation of values and ethno-religious squabbles in Nigeria: Militocracy in democracy. *South East Journal of Political Science*, Vol 2. No. 2, July-December
- Nwagbo, S.N.C & Eze, R.C (2015). Power of incumbency and challenges of democratic Election in Nigeria: A critical overview. *Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Studies*. Vol 19, No 1. (pp 137-157)
- Nwoye K. O (2002). The State: Meaning, Function and Theoretical Antecedents. In Chikedu P.N (ed). *Introduction to Political Science* (pp101-127). Enugu: Academic Publishing Company
- Obikeze, S.O. & Obi E.A. (2003). Government and politics of Nigeria: The struggle for power in an African State. Onitsha, Nigeria: Bookpoint Ltd
- Odogwu, E.O. (2016, 16 September). Biafra: IPOB invites Buhari to Igboland, The Authority Daily. [www.authorityngr.com](http://www.authorityngr.com).
- Ojo, I. (2016, 29 September). Herdsmen kidnap catholic priests, shoot another in Anambra, The Authority Daily News. [www.authorityngr.com](http://www.authorityngr.com)
- Okeke, M.G.S (2017). Ethnicity, religion and the task of democracy-building in the south-west geo-political zone of Nigeria. *NnamdiAzikiwe Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 5,1. February.
- Okorie, C.O. and Esheya, G. (2013). Federal character principles, nation building and national integration in Nigeria: Issues and options. *Mediterran Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 4,1, (pp33-40).
- Onuko, D.O. (2016). Sectional politics and democratic consolidation in Nigeria: A study of Nigeria's fourth republic. A B.Sc Project submitted in the Department of Political Science, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.
- Schumpeter, J (1942). Capitalism, socialism and democracy. London: Routledge
- Supreme Court of Nigeria (nd) *Past chief justice of Nigeria*. [Supremecourt.gov.ng/profile/pastcjn](http://Supremecourt.gov.ng/profile/pastcjn). Retrieved on 29th August, 2017.
- Vinod & Deshpande (2013). Contemporary political theory. Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.