·Social Mobilisation as an Instrument of Nation-Building: The Nigeria Experience

TAMEN, Didymus Ph.D
Department of political science
Bingham university, karu
Asarawa state

Abstract

Nigeria as we see her today is a colonial creation through various processes culminating in the policy of amalgamation. The policy sought to unify the heterogeneous people into one nation. The process marked the consolidation of the British imperial administration in Nigeria. In place of political development, it marks the induction and mobilization of the various peoples of Nigeria into one geographical entity- a process geared towards nation building. Thus, the common denomination of the process of social mobilization is change expressed in terms of aspirations and orientations of the mobilized population and the erosion of traditional commitment for nationhood. The paper critically examines the nature and character of this process and certain functional prerequisites which must be fulfilled to enhance the effective integration of the cultural sections for real nationhood. The paper evaluates the historical origin of social mobilization vis-a-vis political development of successive governments since independence but, concluded that the Nigerian federation suffers from over centralization of power, a lack of popular democracy, and the absence of a political class sufficiently committed to arouse the national consciousness essential to political integration. The paper calls for the emergence of a dynamic and purposeful leadership to create enabling conditions for true national integration and stable democracy.

390

Introduction

The essence of this paper is to explore the concept of social mobilization as a phenomenon of nation-building in Nigeria. This concept as expounded by a political scientist, Deutsch (1968) aim at creating, depending on the nature of a community's political culture, a virile political community. The cardinal principle of the concept is the induction of various cultural linguistic nationalities into a new geo-political entity called states. However, the common denomination of the process of social mobilization is 'change' expressed in terms of aspirations and orientations of the mobilized population and the erosion of traditional commitment for nationhood.

The process provide for certain functional prerequisites which must be fulfilled to enhance the effective integration of the cultural sections for real nationhood. These conditions are as follows;

i)   The induction of people from the original habitations into some relatively stable new group identity;

ii)   As people are mobilized, their aspirations change. Therefore, for a successful mobilization process, the political system must have the capacity to satisfy the basic demands of the citizenry.

iii) The process can either be functional or dysfunctional depending upon the complexion of the mobilized population;

iv)   Social mobilization leads to the formation of ethnic associations which might promote or discourage the emergence of a sound political community.

In this regard, it is imperative for the mobilizing agency to comprehend the complexities of this phenomenon and thus fashion policies which will promote the integration of the mobilized population.

The thrust of this paper therefore, is that successive political/military governments of Nigeria have grossly ignored the variables of a successful social mobilization process of the heterogeneous Nigerian political community. More importantly, the indigenous Nigerian political elites have by their dysfunctional political behavior further discouraged the emergence of a healthy Nigerian polity. However, the hallmark of a successful social mobilization process is the induction of the various cultural linguistic nationalities into a stable, regularized and sustained political community.

This paper is divided into three sections. Section one shall briefly examine the concept of social mobilization as a harbinger of political development; section two will consider the application of the concept on the Nigerian polity, while section three shall examine what is to be done. Here, recommendations will be made to any of the problems highlighted in the paper.

Social Mobilisation as a Harbinger of Political Development

Social mobilization necessitates the movement of a people from its traditional habitation based on Durkheimian Organic Solidarity into a new socio-political framework characterized by a rationalization of political authority charged with the responsibilities of modern government. It follows that as people are mobilized, actual changes in residence, occupations, literacy rate, military conscription and all the indexes of modernity are manifested. Thus, social mobilization broadens the political participation of the inhabitants of the modern state. Under the new political arrangement, the mobilized population decides their political fate and collectively, makes binding authoritative decisions on the allocation of values in the community.

For the growth and survival of the new nation state however, there must be a broad consensus amongst the leaders of the mobilized population and on the part of the citizens, an agreement as to the object of their associations. Therefore, the mobilized population must prima-facie; purge themselves of sectional ideals and other dysfunctional expedients reminiscent of the traditional societies from which they graduated. Thus, according to Deutsch (1968) social mobilizations is a " process in which major clusters of old social, economic and psychological commitments are eroded or broken and people become available for new patterns of behavior and socialization" Deutsch's definition of the phenomenon implies the determination of the contracting inhabitants to graduate into modernity by throwing off the garbs of traditionalism, which had relied on undifferentiated role structures in assigning systematic roles. The process implies the refinement of traditional patterns of behavior for absorption into a new society. It is further an attempt at nation-building by bridging the vast differences between the old and the modern politics.

Thus, people who had in old setting habits broaden their political horizon by entering into new socio-political relationships for sustain nationhood.

.   The new nation must as a pre-condition for social participation and mobilization, satisfy the rising expectations of the people by the creation of socio-economic infrastructures through which the community's set goals of development are implemented. The process of social mobilization as an instrument of nation building is akin to the literal escape of the Lockean man from the state of nature to civil society.

To accurately perform the protective functions of the society, the state must have the capacity to harness the resources of the system to fulfill the numerous demands of the mobilized population. This will go a long way to exacting the loyalties and commitments of the citizenry to the survival of the entity. The state must therefore stand above their conflicts and also provide institutional machinery for arresting those conflicts. There is thus, a kind of "political symbiosis" between the mobilized population and its nation-state. This affords the state in view of Finer, (America political Science Review, 1964) a "matured political culture". At this juncture, the polity can be said to have arrived. This is precisely the essence of political development.

Thus, Finkle and Gable (1961), defines political development as a process of meeting new goals and demands in a flexible manner. Having identified themselves with the polity, the mobilized population discharges their obligations to the political community and indeed accepts the legitimacy and authority of the state as binding. Political development therefore, is a function of the extent to which the society itself-the economic, social and political infrastructures can absorb, deflect or respond to the wide range of demands generated by the influx of people into a modern polity. It is as Huntington, (1968) noted, "a process whereby institutions acquire an increase capability to sustain successfully and continuously new types of goals and demands and the creation of a new types of organizations". Viewed from this perspective, political development is changes in the types and style of politics.

These changes imply "that government is the product of man, not of nature or of God, and that a well-ordered society must have a determinate human source of final authority, obedience to whose positive law takes precedence over other obligations".(De Vree; 1972) And the hallmark of this process is social mobilization-an instrument of nation-building.

Social Mobilisation and the Nigerian Polity

So far, we have been exploring the concept of social mobilization from a theoretical perspective. In this section of the paper, we will attempt to apply the Deutschian concept on the Nigerian polity. Perhaps it will be pertinent for us to undertake a brief excursion into the making of modern Nigeria with a view to examining the intricacies of the social mobilization process of this nation.

Prior to the penetration of western influence into that part of Sudan called Nigeria, the people existed in separate tribal kingdoms, Empires and Emirates which were culturally and linguistically different. With the advent of Europeans into this geographical area of Western Africa called Nigeria, a process began by which different cultural nationalities were brought together under one entity within a defined territorial boundary. For the first time ever, the various peoples of Nigeria were forced by the exogenous forces of colonialism to group themselves rather frictionally into an economic unit. Thus, whoever the citizens were, whatever their cultural disposition did not present any impediment to this economic ideal. It was here the seeds of Nigeria's problems were sown (Anifowese: 1982). For, social mobilization can either enhance the unity of a people with complementary habits or render difficult the integration of a plural society.

The British by their divergent policies further compounded the complexities of the Nigerian political community. Firstly, there was differential rate of social mobilization as the southern part of Nigeria was the first to embrace Western culture. Secondly, the British irrationally resisted the division of Nigeria into units which would have reflected their ethnic compositions. And worst still, shielded the Islamic Northern part of Nigeria from modernizing influence of Western culture. The nature of the colonial experience in Nigeria was such that, far from narrowing the differences between the people who underwent it, it actually widened and deepened it. Nevertheless, the political community that emanated from the mobilization of the people of Nigeria did not arise out of the "social contract" of the population, neither did the social mobilization of the people lead to immediate political participation. Therefore, without the prerequisites of a political community-a lingua franca, common political institutions, stock of thoughts etc, the Nigerian political community threatened times without number to rapture into its original fragments.

However, by the grid they imposed on the people, the British succeeded in holding restless population together. But, Nigeria continued to wobble and to screen under this political edifies. It is a political axiom according to Eckstein (1964:42) that, "---once units are brought within the relevant context of collective organizations, power is the medium of invoking their obligations to contribute to collective functioning" But, no political system can persistently rest on coercion for sooner or later those who wield the power, which is a public trust would be overthrown and a new status –quo established. Therefore, according to Rousseau (1979:168), "if force creates right, the effect changes with the cause; every force that is greater than the first succeeds to its right. As soon as it is possible to disobey with impunity, disobedience is legitimate".

In this circumstance, the social mobilization of the peoples of Nigeria has become an intractable political issue which continued to plague the various governments of Nigeria. The crux of the matter has always been the difficulty of discovering a workable political formula with which to build a strong and virile nation capable of articulating the interest of Nigerians. Paradoxically, the first indigenous elites far from promoting policies that will enhance the integration of Nigeria,

repeatedly pointed out that Nigeria has never been a nation but a "mere geographical expression"; and others threatened to continue their interrupted conquest to the sea in the advent of British exist from Nigeria (Awolowo,1947). Obviously, the fibers of Nigerian disunity were lighted from this divergent perceptions and utterances of the leaders of Nigeria. More importantly, these unguarded pronouncements further aggravated the mutual fears and suspicious of the mobilized population whose initial experiences were their induction into the new geo-political entity-Nigeria. The relevant effect of this was excessive identification with their ethnic groups now subsumed in the collectivity of the Nigeria state.

Be that as it may, as from 1946 the British government without creating the preconditions for nationhood began to concede limited rights of political participation to the mobilized people of Nigeria. The departing British colonial authorities, in its bid to relinquish its control over Nigeria made it a condition that political parties be formed and Nigeria follow a democratic principle of government. No one described this better than Fanon (1965), the dilemma of colonial democratic experiments under this condition.

Nevertheless, the need to seek freedom from colonial rule made it inevitable to come together to face a common adversary. The desire to break their colonial shackles and to manage their own affairs overrode all ideological considerations. To meet the criteria for independence, the Nigerian elites ultimately converted their ethnic associations into outright political parties. At first, the Northern part of Nigeria was not enthusiastic for self-government. This was principally because the North was handicapped by the absence of a political class sufficiently educated in western art of politics. Thus, the differential rate of social mobilization may cause a plural society to be divided over socio-political issues affecting their interest. This is reflected in the mutual suspicious of the Nigerian cultural actors and the inevitable 1953 motion for self-government crisis that emanated from this imbalance.

For any reason, the British are to be blamed for this dysfunctional development. This was compounded by the regionalism introduced by them (Richard constitution of 1914) which divided Nigeria into three regions- Northern, Western and Eastern Nigeria. Political parties that were formed as a result of this constitution also reflected this regional principle. In this regard, the Ibo Trade Union reincarnated into the National Council of Nigeria and Cameroons (NCNC) for the East; The *Egbe Omo Oduduwa* as the Action Group (AG) for the west; and *Jamiyar Mutane Arewa* as the Northern People's Congress (NPC) for the North.(Dudley; 1982)

Accordingly, the political destiny of Nigeria was guided by the Big three premiers – Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, Premier of the Eastern Region and the National President of the NCNC; Sir Ahmadu Bello, Premier of the Northern Region and the General President of the NPC; Chief Obafemi Awolowo, Premier of the Eastern Region and the President of the AG.(Nnoli; 1980) This political alignment of the political class of Nigeria set the volatile political atmosphere of the Nigerian political system and as such aggravated the problems of the social mobilization process of Nigerian polity. The situation was further exacerbated by lack of effective communication and interaction among the mobilized population.

This state of affairs is certainly not conducive to the growth of political institutions that will lead the country for development. Therefore, Huntington (1968) warned:

> *In a society of any complexity,*
> *the relative power of the*
> *groups changes, but if the*

society is to be a community, the power of each group is exercised through political institutions which temper, moderate, and redirect that power so as to render the dominance of one social force compatible with the community of man.

Accordingly, this chaotic political atmosphere was poisoned by the role confusion of the indigenous Nigerian elites. Caught in cross-cultural dilemma-their in ordinate desire for power, the numerous tribal demands of the systemic rewards and the need to enhance the modernization of the polity they got trapped in the sinking sands of Nigerian pluralism. From then on, tribal interests, even in the respect of the distribution of the national cake become highly politicized.

As a result of this fierce struggle for political power, the political system was further plunged into serious crises of political participation and with it, the system became grossly dislocated. The by-product of this situation was the intervention of the Nigerian military to arrest the political instability of the system. Infact, in praetorian societies, the army usually acts as a third force and indeed, as a symbol of nationhood, it assumed the responsibility of saving the political community from total collapse. And this was precisely what a group of five majors on 15th January, 1966 attempted doing in the Nigeria political arena except, that they resorted to political assassinations which weighted heavily on the Northern and Western Cultural sections of the Nigerian polity.

In a plural political system like Nigeria, such lopsided political strategies are bound to arouse the suspicious of other tribes. Thus, the common cultural origin of the military elites who triggered the radical change and their subsequent transfer of political power to a senior military hierarchy, major-General J.T. Aguiyi Ironsi, who happened to had come from the same cultural section as four of the five majors further complicated issues. Thus, the dilemma of Ironsi as noted by Gutteridge(1975:124), "was how to reconcile the idea of one Nigeria, national unity and a strong central government with the local loyalties and sensitivities of other tribes." Given the differential rate of social mobilization of the Nigerian cultural sections, Ironsi's decree 34 would have resulted in the domination of the country's services by the more educated southerners. Furthermore, in a plural political community lacking institutionalization of roles, citizens cognitive maps are read with the lenses of ethnicity, they associate the formal policies of their leaders with their cultural origins. Power in Nigerian polity is seen as zero-sum game. The result at this perception was the Counter-coup which led to large scale atrocities and the demise of Ironsi's regime. The morality of this political catastrophe is that, Nigerians may welcome the idea of one Nigeria, but certainly not a unitary government.

The political situation was further aggravated by the struggle for power between the then Lt. Col.Yabuku Gowon who stepped into the shoes of late Aguiyi Ironsi and Lt. Col. Odemegwu Ojukwu, the then military Governor Administrator of Eastern Region, who subsequently declared that region a "Republic of Biafra". Under this elitist intransigence, a civil war erupted. As a wartime measure, Lt. Col. Gowon partitioned the Nigerian political community into twelve states. Paradoxically, what political intrigues could not achieve was made possible by the exigencies of war. However, the Gowon policy resulted in the neutralization of the power of the dominant tribes and power was thus, shifted to the peripheries – the minorities. No one best captured this than

Ghali Na'abba(2004) when he opined,

> *The basic problems of our society are traceable to the nature of an underdeveloped military which for a very long period of time held our societies captives and retarded the natural growth of our people all over Africa. The military in Africa, owning to its inferiority complex as an alternative government due to its lack of legitimacy resorted, more often than not, to the use of naked force in order to get an undeserved obedience from the civilian populations it repressed.*

It should be noted that, there was profuse supply of human and material resources which should have confidently launched the country on a sound path of industrialization. With hindsight, the agricultural and other sectors of the polity should have been diversified to provide the momentum for successful national development. This opportunity was wasted as a result of the unhealthy partnership between Nigeria and the metropolis and the endemic corruption of the comprador officials in the army and the bureaucracy. Thus, on 29th July, 1975, it became inevitable that the system had to be drastically redefined by late General Murtala Mohammed.

General Murtala Mohammed injected the principles of accountability and responsibility in the conduct of public affairs. He contended that a sound political system must have virtue, an unselfish public spirit and civil zeal. Accordingly, he emphasized the need for a complete reorientation which must be manifested in the personal example of discipline, diligence, integrity and modesty in order to inspire the confidence of the people in

government (Newswatch, 1987). Be that as it may, Mohammed braced himself for the task of nation building by announcing a five stage political transition programme which he would not implement before he was cut down by the bullet of an assassin. It was therefore, left to his successor, General Obasanjo to carry the laudable programme of his predecessor to its final conclusion.

However, Obasanjo observed one disturbing trend in the body politics of Nigerian political community-the absence of a sound political culture to support the democratic aspirations of the mobilized population. Accordingly, in his view, corruption and indiscipline must be eradicated. The by-product of this was his philosophy of Ethnical Revolution and low profile which aimed at refining Nigerians for membership into the Nigerian political community.

When Alh. Shehu Shagari came to power and confronted with the high incidence of corruption in his government, he emulated Gen. Obasanjo's mode of stemming the dysfunctional expedients of the Nigerian political system. Shagari went further to preach to Nigerians the need to internalized positive values in order to enhance the survival of the Nigerian polity. But the magnitude of the corruption and indiscipline in his government were beyond the virtues of an ethical philosophy. Infact, a surgical operation was what was mostly needed.

This was what happened when on December 31st, 1983, General Muhamadu Buhari sacked shagari's decadent political regime. Gen. Buhari impressed on the mobilized peoples of Nigeria the common ownership of the political community of Nigeria. However, in his bid to assume the modernizing stature of Peter the Great of 1684 Russian society, he resorted to excessive repression of the citizenry. The resultant effect of this was a breakdown in communication between the government and various interest

groups. This development alienated these bodies from contributing significant inputs into his government. Thus, on 27th August, 1985, major-General Ibrahim Babangida intervened to restore popular confidence.

However, the survey of the social mobilization process of Nigeria points to one concrete fact- the unshakable conviction amongst the Nigerian civil/ military elites to afford the Nigerian political system the basis of survival and greatness but the endemic corruption and indiscipline of the system obdurately resists all positive political operations.

It was against this background that General Babangida indicated his intention to return the country to civil rule after the creation of a new political order. Accordingly, a Political Bureau was set up to identify and recommend an appropriate political system for Nigeria. After a protracted search, the Bureau recommended the presidential system of government with all its accessories. It must be emphasized that it is not the governmental system that has consistently failed to deliver the goods but the political actors of successive Nigerian regimes. Thus, the hallmark of General Babangida's transition to civil rule was to purify the practical climate and thus facilitate the emergence of a new political order unadulterated by the acrimonious politics of the past turbulent regimes. There was also the conviction that the politics of Nigeria cannot be persistently monopolized by one group of political actors. Thus, given the pluralism of the polity, other citizens should also be given a change to contribute their quota towards the material and spiritual upliftment of the nation.

However, as laudable as the transition to civil rule was, inordinate ambition and the maradonic in General Ibrahim Babangida could not allow him to fully implement this programme. The transition programme was infested with several contradictions. It was over regulated and over supervised with too many rules and regulations which were too easy to violate. Indeed, the entire process has been regimented, mechanical and elitist. Be that as it may, after 40 amendments of the transition to civil rule programme, General Babangida dribbled Nigerians when he finally annulled the presidential election that was considered by both the local and International observers as the freest and fairest in Nigeria's history. He was forced to step aside.

An interim National Government was put in place headed by Chief Ernest Shonekan. This could not last long when Gen. Sani Abacha overthrew it three months later. Gen. Abacha started the mobilization of the people to civil democratic rule. This too did not get anywhere when the General himself died in questionable circumstance. Power then fall on Gen. Abdulsalami Abubakar who organized a hurriedly transition and handed over power to the political class in 1999 (Chief Olushegun Obasanjo). However, more than 10 years of democratic rule in Nigeria, Nigerians have not fared better.

There is a fundamental threat to federalism and democracy in the country. But as Jinadu (2005) noted; this threat derives less from faulty institutional design than from the more fundamental combination of social forces and political behavior thrown up by the structural conditions revolving around the rentier character of the Nigerian state and the philosophical or jurisprudential basis of Nigerian federalism and by conservative nature of our legal culture. This combination of problems arising from the structural and philosophical foundations of Nigeria federalism and democracy require much more radical, indeed revolutionary reform than what we have done so far since 1960.

Related to this is the naïve, narrow, unhistorical and undialectical view that has characterized political and social mobilization efforts since 1976. This is what Jinadu (2005) call the "fix-it" approach to political reform: the faith placed in the power

of constitutional design or re-design, as a solution to political problems. This approach reduces political reform to that of "fixing" a number of problematic items in a shopping list: electoral reform, revenue allocation and resources control, tenure of elective positions, carpet crossing etc. The political consequences of such changes, intended or unintended, hardly come into consideration. This fix- it approach reduces the problem of political reform to a constitutional-legal one. It takes the sociology or political economy of politics out of it.

Our political parties which are, ideally, the vehicles for mass mobilization are today nothing more than barren structures.

They are devoid of vision, mission and ideology. The existing parties are part of the grand contraption which constitutes the blinkers needed to prevent their members from comprehending the actual character of the political process. The parties have been reduced into becoming mere stepping stones for people with electoral ambition. The lack of internal democracy which largely characterizes the nature of relations between the leadership and the membership of those political parties has further accentuated the feelings of helplessness, hopelessness, and despondency among their rank and file. The various forms of manipulations taking place in the political parties have made it difficult if not impossible for the institutions to attract the required respect or interest from their members. In a situation where monarchical system emerges in supposedly democratic institutions, and those in positions of responsibility feel that they rightly owned everybody and everything, then the nation could be said to be in a state of total apathy and the search for alternative models of leadership.

What is to be Done?

The survey of the social mobilization process of Nigeria indicates the absence of a spirit of patriotism and loyalty to the nation. Therefore, to foster a viable political community, the Nigerian leadership must inculcate in the citizenry a sense of purpose and loyalty to the nation by firstly, showing examples that this nation is worth dying for.

Secondly, we must search for the creation of an indigenous ideology which will provide a focal point for the operation of an endurable democratic system of government. An ideology will spell out the socio-political objectives of the social mobilization process of Nigeria. It will also enhance the birth of a sound political culture capable of nurturing the democratic expectations of the people. The coming of an ideology implies a new positive political orientation which will discourage the perception of politics as a cheap arena for parochial personal gains.

Governments at all levels must ensure that qualitative education is given to the citizenry. Education is therefore, a sine-qua-non for the effective political orientations of the mobilized populations of Nigeria. This is where the philosophy of a true mass social mobilization of Nigerians must realistically work to internalize a new value structure in the people. A serious constraint in the bid of this institution to operationalise its tenets is poverty and ignorance. It is therefore, imperative to set up the adult education programmes in the rural areas. This will provide the enlightment on the complex philosophy of social mobilization

Furthermore, to effectively mobilize the citizenry, the agricultural sector must be overhauled to feed the teeming population. National Institutions like the Universities of Agriculture, Research Institutions and Financial Houses must as from now identify themselves seriously with the necessity of boosting agricultural productivity. This is where they must conduct more agricultural oriented researches to alleviate the agricultural predicaments of the rural farmers.

Governments at all levels must

persistently work in concert with the above institutions to afford the farmers the much needed agricultural loans and fertilizers as well as sound infrastructural network for their socio-economic progress.

The Nigerian political entity is a conglomerate society with vast cultural differences which has militated against a successful social mobilization of the people. Religion is one of the most sensitive spheres in the existence of the people. It is therefore suggested that the secular status of Nigeria be maintained. This country is in a hurry to develop. We cannot therefore, afford a hundred years religious war. Similarly, ethnic militias that are threatening the foundation of the Nigerian state must be stopped. Most especially, the Federal Government must urgently stop the militia activities in the Niger-Delta.

Although Africa remains the centre piece of our foreign policy, we must evaluate our responses to the needs of our brothers from other countries in Africa so that our generosity and spirit of brotherhood are not taken for granted. In the name of brotherhood, we had in the past allowed our sister countries in Africa to violate our territorial integrity. We have to step up our border patrols to forestall such reoccurrences.

We call for the decentralization of governance and the governance system in the country with a view to allowing the federating units to be so not only in name but indeed; and thereby be the basis of credible developmental initiatives and healthy competition for development purposes. We need to take a closer look at the legislative lists and match them with allocation of resources between the tiers of government.

Again, an arrangement that promotes fiscal federalism needs to be put in place; so that those who produce either by dint of hard work or design of nature, are rewarded rather than make to suffer as is presently the case.

We must transcend the politics of numbers and percentages to match resources to the needs of ordinary Nigerians, including education, employment and social welfare.

The electoral system in Nigeria should be based on proportional representation that would make it possible for the interests of those preferred candidates/political parties may have lost elections to still have their views and aspirations represented in a formal sense through a system of equitable sharing of elective as well as appointive offices on the basis of the number and or percentage of votes won. This ensures that everybody has stake and valued work for the survival of the system.

The Nigerian federation suffers from over centralization of powers, a lack of popular democracy and the absence of a political class sufficiently committed to arouse the national consciousness essential to political integration. The creation of more states as a means of alleviating these problems has failed to do so. Rather the Nigerian citizen is being socialized into "indigeneity" and "statism" as crucial parameters for survival and social existence. Parochial strategies are encouraged and imposed on citizens at the expenses of national values. There is therefore, an urgent need to renegotiate Nigeria on the basis of self – rule and shared rule designed to sustain unity in diversity (Alapiki;2005)

Until all these suggestions are studies and implemented, the social mobilization process of Nigeria will continue to be a huge illusion. It is hoped that the political leadership would take advantage of this and create the enabling conditions for national integration and stable federal democracy.

Ultimately, the key lies in the emergence of a dynamic and purposeful leadership that is seriously lacking in Nigeria.

References

Alapiki; H. (2005), "Federalism and the National Question: Challenges of political restructuring and Institutional Engineering in Nigeria". In Alli; W. (ed), Political Reform Conference, Federalism and the National Question in Nigeria. (a publication of the Nigerian Political Science Association). P.270 American Political Science Review, vol. iv. No. 3. Sept. 196. P.494

Anifowese; (1982), *Violence and Politics in Nigeria: The Tiv and Yoruba Experience* (New York: Nok Publishers Inc.)

Awolowo; O. (1947). *Path to Nigerian Freedom* (London: Faber and Faber). P. 49

Carter; G. M. (1969), *Politics in Africa,* (New-York: Chicago Burling)

Deutsch; K. (1968), *The Nerves of Government,* (New York: Free Press)

De Vree; J. D. (1972) *Political Integration: The Formation of Theory and it Problems* (The Hague: Montana)

Dudley; B. (1982), *An Introduction to Nigerian Government and Politics* (London: Macmillan

Eckstein; H. (ed) (1964), *Internal War, Problems and Approaches,* (New-York: The Free Press of Glencoe). P. 42

Fanon; F. (1965), *The Wretched of the Earth,* (

Harmondsorth: Penguin Bks. Ltd). Pp.76-77

Finkle; J. & Gable; R. (1961), *Political Development and. Social Change,* (New-York: John Wiley and Bons Inc.). p. 92

Gutteridge; W. F. (1975), *Military Regimes in Africa,* (London: Methue Ltd.). p.124

Huntington; S. (1968), *Political Order in Changing Societies,* (New Haven: Yale University Press). P. 34

Jinadu; L. A. (2005),"Nigerian Federalism and Democracy at bay: Responsibility of Political Science". In Alli; W. (ed) op. cit. p. 7

Na'abba; G. (2004) "Nigerians held hostage by their leaders" (The Lawmaker, vol. 5 no. 107. 2nd half, November). P.21

Nnoli, O. (1980) *Ethnic Politics in Nigeria* (Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers)

Ojiaki; J. (1980), *13 Years of Military Rule 1966-1979* (Lagos: Daily Times Publication). P.199

Post; K. and Vickers; M. (1973), *Structure and Conflict in Nigeria 1960-1966,* (London: Faber and Faber). P.21

Rousseau; J. J. (1979), *The Social Contract,* (London: Everyman's Library). P.42

Newswatch, 5th October, 1987 pp. 52-53