CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1   Background of Study

The human predicament apparently presupposes that things are liable to go badly. Oguejiofor corroborating Warnock's view in the "preface" to his work *Philosophy and African Predicament* juxtaposes the human situation in the African continent with the floundering, uncomfortable and inherent status of humans as conceived by Warnock. This unenviable human predicament stems from natural and human factors such as; limited knowledge, limited resources, limited rationality, limited sympathy.[1] Thus, there is no gain re-emphasising that much of Africa in general and Nigeria in particular is in a precarious state with numerous developmental challenges such as; wide spread corruption, glaring looting of the national treasury, mass poverty, decayed infrastructures, alarming unemployment, wanton insecurity of lives and properties, moribund manufacturing sector, poor state of education and health system, pervasive inequality, food insecurity, compromised judiciary, rampant inflation, confused ideology, crisis of leadership, failed followership, electoral fraud and absolute disregard for due process and the rule of law among others. However, the good news is that, having realized the inherent tendency to the negative, there is tremendous effort by philosophy scholars in Africa to overturn the negatives and proffer countervailing ideologies that will ameliorate the unenviable state of affairs of the Africans. The consequent coheres with Popper's notion that, "all things living are in a search of a better world."[2]

Obviously, these developmental challenges have not only kept the nation 'under-developed' or in a lighter and patriotic note 'developing' for decades, it has equally distorted the tenets and practice of democracy in Nigeria. The resultant effect has been

social disorder and agitation for a revolution by the masses at any given opportunity. Consequentially, the first coup in 1966 which turned out to be a pace setter of pogrom against particular ethnic groups in the country was a revolutionary response by the military against the ineptitude of the First Republic political leaders and it equivocally led to military intervention in governance in Nigeria and as in most African countries. Also, the thirty-month civil war with its unforgettable effect was more or less a response to a revolutionary clarion call due to perceived injustice and marginalization of the then Easterners by the Northern majority. Of recent, the country is plagued with seemingly unending eruptions of religious violence and mayhem against other ethnic groups for little or no provocation; unwarranted destruction of lives and properties by Fulani herdsmen and cattle rustlers, the Boko Haram insurgency, the Shites revolts against constituted authorities (as witnessed in Kaduna State in 2017), revolutionary movement such as Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB), the Movement for the Actualization of the Sovereign State of Biafra (MASSOB), the Niger Delta Avengers (NDA), the Coalition of Northern Groups (CNG), and the multiplicity of ethnic militias. There are glaring indications that the country is in a boiling state with each ethnic group being suspicious of the other on one hand, and the masses generally aggrieved by the wanton looting of their collective wealth by a privileged few which has led to economic stalemate and biting hardship on the other hand. The desire for a revolution by the masses could be summarized thus:

> Since a social organization, however inadequate never disappears by itself, since a ruling class, however parasitic never yields power unless compelled to do so by overwhelming pressures; development and progress can only be attained if all the energies and abilities of a people that was politically, socially and economically disfranchised under the old system are thrown into battle against the forces of the ancient regime.[3]

Invariably, it is pertinent to state that there is a dire need for a dynamic change from the bleak socio-political and economic conditions in Nigeria. Thus, the way and manner the change Nigerians so anticipate would take is central to the research. In fact, the motivation of this research is on how philosophy done by Africans could contribute to amelioration of the Nigerian predicament. The research on Karl Popper's Democratic Ideals and Democracy in Nigeria: A Critical Hermeneutic is a response to the democratic menace in Nigeria and how philosophy can lead to the amelioration of the situation.

Karl Popper's democratic ideals which is founded on liberalism, critical rationalism, non-violence and piecemeal social engineering and aims at ensuring separation of power, of free speech and open discourse, of public control over governmental institutions and of human dignity is an imperative ideology adopted as a panacea that will bring about a paradigm shift in governance in Africa as a whole and Nigeria in particular. Karl Popper (1902 - 1994) rejected the popular question which held sway in almost all the epochs of philosophy 'who should rule?' as the fundamental question of political theory, and replaced it with the new question: ''how can we so organize political institutions that bad or incompetent rulers can be prevented from doing too much damage?''[4]

For Popper, "…the people do not rule anywhere, it is always government that rule."[5] He rejected vox Dei populi vox Dei.[6] Outstandingly, Popper situates the political power in the citizenry. This is sequel to the fact that in democracy, the ball stops in the court of the citizens. The role of the people though simple, is fundamentally to provide a regular and non-violent way to get rid of incompetent, corrupt and abusive leaders. As such, he insists that, "…it is quite wrong to blame democracy for the political

shortcomings of a democratic state. We should rather blame ourselves, that is to say, the citizens of the democratic state."[7] Invariably, this explains who and what is responsible for the successes or failure of democratic state; the citizens. Furthermore, Popper reiterates that public opinion and the institution that influence it could become more rational overtime by embracing the scientific tradition of 'critical rationalism'; that is, the willingness to submit one's ideas to public criticism and habit of giving a listening ear to another person's point of view. Not left out, is Popper's concept of "piecemeal social engineering"[8] which seek to address concrete social problems such as; poverty, violence, environmental degradation, unemployment, income, inequality among others.

However, Popper's ideals clearly differentiate democracy from dictatorship. His theory has a normative aspect that is desirable; the theory can meet the demands of being both realistic and aimed towards advancing many goals. Therefore his conceptions really further the quality of a democracy by making it more effective at measuring and implementing the different and varying objectives of given societies through fair and valid elections that are made possible through people. Thus, this work, will amongst others, elucidate Popper's life, influences and his democratic ideals. Then, the searchlight turns to democracy and the Nigerian experience, and subsequently the implication of Popper's liberalism and non-violent revolution for Nigeria. Finally, based on this research, it is recommended that democrats in Nigeria and Africa have to foster the democratic process by the implementation of Popper's democratic ideals because, as we will prove, Popper's democratic ideals are more suitable for ameliorating on one hand the Nigerian, and on the other hand the African socio-political situation than any other revolutionary ideal.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The thesis statement demonstrate that a modified version of Karl Popper's democratic ideals can enable the Nigerian society curb political violence and usher in the much needed atmosphere for sustainable development. This is premised on the fact that distortion and abuse of the tenets of democracy in Nigeria has led to social disorder in the polity. Invariably, this has re-enforced the agitation for a social and political revolution by the masses who are majorly the victims of the concomitant effect of corruption, underdevelopment and the acquiescence granted to Nigerian leaders to the effect that democratic tenets are sectional. Popper's desire is that democracy as a system should help to prevent the damage brought about by bad rulers in politics through peaceful changes. It follows, that such ideals will equally prevent dictatorship, absolute rule or sit-tight syndrome that has been the bane of Nigerian politics on one hand, and to ensure powerful and focused democracy based solely on the will of the citizenry on the other hand. However, it becomes pertinent to unravel the problematic issues in the research such as; what are the philosophical foundations that surround Karl Popper's democratic ideals? Is the current geopolitical, socio-economic and religious complexity of Nigeria conducive for socio-political and revolutionary change? What ways and manner would such a dynamic change take? Can the Nigerian ruling class rise to the occasion and willingly reform the system for the interest of the masses? Is a violent socio-political revolution a solution to the Nigeria's quest for restructuring? How realistic is the applicability of Popper's democratic ideals and how can it ameliorate the Nigerian predicament? These and other relevant considerations constitute the basis of this research.

1.3   Scope of the study

This work covers Popper's democratic ideals; its elucidation, evaluation, application and recommendations. The work will focus on Popper's ideologies and influences on him; it will consider democracy and practice in Nigeria and ascertain how Popper's democratic ideals can ameliorate the unenviable status of the nation's state of affairs if systematically applied.

1.4   Purpose of Study

This research is premised on the thesis that there is a dire need for a paradigm shift in the socio-political realities of Nigeria. The way and manner this change can be realized is the question that this research attempts to unravel. Karl Popper's democratic ideals which anchor on the possibility of bringing about reform of institutions without using violence is adopted as an imperative ideology. Thus, this work aims at:

1.   elucidating Popper's democratic ideals,

2.   assessing democratisation and the Nigerian experience,

3.   examining the implication of Popper's liberalism and non-violent revolution in Nigeria,

4.   proffering a suitable and workable ideology that will ensure a focused, workable and sustainable democracy in Nigeria.

1.5   Significance of the Study

The work intends to give an insight into the democratic menace in Nigeria that has brought about staggering developmental challenges rather than sustainable development in the nation decades after independence and the role of the masses in

ensuring a liberal and non-violent revolution which ultimately aims at ameliorating their situation. It represents a bold and sincere attempt towards reappraising the Nigerian predicament in one hand, and advancing a suitable and workable ideology that is capable of transforming humanity and ensuring a more integral development of the nation on the other hand. The work will finally serve as a stirrer in re-awakening the consciousness of Nigerians in mastering their destiny for posterity sake. Students, researchers, individuals interested in ameliorating the Nigerian state of affairs, amongst others, stand to benefit greatly from this research.

1.6   Methodology

This work is a qualitative research, specifically a documentary research in which data is sourced from books, journals and other records. That is, Popper's own writing and that of other scholars in political and social philosophy in particular and other related areas of philosophy in general. The critical hermeneutics which is geared at analysing democracy and its practice, as well as interpreting Popper's democratic ideals for a better understanding is employed. The method of documentation used in this work is classical method; there are end notes at the end of each chapter and bibliography at the end of the work. This work will be divided into five chapters. The first is the introduction which will cover the background of study, statement of the problem, scope of study, purpose of study, significance of the study, methodology, and definition of terms. Chapter two will concern itself with the review of related literature. Chapter three will deal with Karl Popper and his democratic ideals which will cover Popper's background, his scientific inclination, the turning point in Popper, Popper's conception of democracy and the state, utopianism and socio-political change, Popper's liberalism, critical rationalism, piecemeal social engineering and projections/modification of

Popper's Democratic Ideals. Chapter four will focus on democratisation and the Nigerian experience. Chapter five will enumerate the implication of Popper's liberalism and non-violent revolution for Nigeria, conclusion and recommendations of the work.

1.7   Definition of Terms

To adequately situate our discourse in this research, it is necessary to conceptualize certain terms, by clarifying the senses in which they are employed within the research work. These terms are; Democracy, Ideology, Liberalism and Revolution. Also, there will be an attempt at identifying and establishing conceptual linkages that exist among the terms.

Democracy

The concept of democracy varies, just as there are as many scholars of philosophy and political thoughts. Etymologically, the word democracy is derived from two Greeks words; "demos" meaning the "the people, the poor people, the masses, the mob", and "kratia" meaning "to rule". Demokratia means therefore "rule by the people" or "rule by the masses."[9] Obviously, Democracy over the decades has undergone several changes both in perception and application which is either different or similar to the original meaning. As such, it is used in different ways to describe different political systems; while one government lays claim to it, another fault the practice. Notwithstanding the ambiguous use of the word, there is a high degree of acceptability of the basic tenets of Democracy: such as popular participation, the supremacy of the power of the electorate, fair elections and representation. Outstandingly, from direct democracy as practiced in ancient Athens to modern/indirect democracy and even the proposed 'our nascent democracy', 'Nigerian democracy', the key concern remains 'the

people's right and well-being'. Therefore, our understanding of democracy as adopted in this work is based on how the masses/citizens can so organize political institutions that bad or incompetent rulers would be prevented from doing too much damage on one hand, and the duly elected representatives governing the people as if they matter on the other hand. More so, democratisation is conceptualised in this research as a process of building democracy by ensuring qualitative participation of the citizenry in governance.

Ideology

Ideology as a concept is difficult to define because of its ambiguous nature. Etymologically ideology according to Ogugua, "could be said to have its root in "ide" and "logos" two Greek words meaning idea or image, and word respectively; so we can hold that it means discourse on idea or image."[10] Also, Blackburn defines it as, "any wide-ranging system of beliefs, thought, and categories that provide the foundation of programmes of political and social action: an ideology is a conceptual scheme with a practical application."[11] Thus, ideology could be seen as any comprehensive and systematic set of ideas by which a social group expresses their understanding of the world. Invariably, there are distinguishing factors between ideology and concepts such as idea, belief system and attitude. This is mostly misunderstood as it is the case in the culturally heterogeneous Nigerian society with misconstrued perception and suspicion within ethnic groups. Summing up his position, Ogugua reiterates that, ideology consists of a syndrome of beliefs, norms and values, functionally linked and weaved into a whole which encourages particular action or behavior.[12] Obviously, the understanding of ideology as adopted in this research is founded on 'a system of ideas that aspire to impact dynamically on the society; socially, politically and otherwise'. As such, an ideology which centers on governing the masses as if they matter is such that

could create an enabling environment for sustainable development. Premised on events from independence till date, it appears that for some Nigerians (Adeola Aderounmu, Ben Nwabueze, Gani Fawehinmi),[13, 14, 15] the Marxist revolutionary ideology which is prone to violence remains an inexorable and imperative option to effect the desired change. But Karl Popper's democratic ideals which anchor on the possibility of bringing about reform of institutions without using violence is adopted as a better ideology that will foster unity in the polity and also ensure sustainable development in Nigeria.

Liberalism

Ideologically, liberalism in its contemporary usage has both political and economic connotations. Politically, it is directly related to democracy, hence liberal democracy. At the economic sphere, liberalism is inextricably linked with capitalism, hence laissez-faireism or liberal economy. The basic ideas about liberal ideology are the preservation of individuals' rights and freedom of choice.

Commenting on the basic features of liberalism, Udokang and Awofeso hold that liberal ideology constitutes the following beliefs:

1. That democracy, the rule of the people, is the best form of government.
2. That the highest good of the society is the ability of the members of that society to develop their individual capacities and talents to the fullest.
3. That people should have full intellectual freedom, including freedom of speech, choice, press and worship (they should have responsibility for their own values, so that they will develop to judge values).

4. People should have freedom of expression and the right to gain and to receive stimulus and to enjoy the equality of being given a chance to participate in the shaping of one's polity policies and to share the benefits secured by their implementation.

5. Government should remain minimal and should regulate people's lives very little (as few decisions as possible should be made for people, so that they learn to make decisions for themselves).

6. In particular, people should be free to regulate their own economic life or activity.

7. Government should be organized so as to guard against abuses of power.

8. Individuals should be given equal opportunity to select their rulers.[16]

Invariably, liberalism is adopted in this research as an ideology which provides enabling environment for true democracy. As such, the principles of liberal democracy guarantees the fundamental human rights of all the citizens in the state, free, fair and periodically elections and it is also founded on majority rule.

Revolution

According to Blackburn, revolution is "any major social and political transformation, sufficient to replace old institutions and social relations, and to initiate new relations of power and authority. Revolutions may or may not be violent, progressive, the result of class conflict, initiated by revolutionary agents, or inevitable."[17] However, revolution does not just happen: there are reasons why people opt for revolutionary approach to effect the desired change and the factors that shape their outcomes. There are various scholarly attempts to rationalize the causes of different revolutionary changes which have metamorphosed into theories of revolutions. They include, crowd psychology

theory, frustration – aggression theory, pluralist or interest group conflict theory, and structural-functionalist theory. In summary, the masses can gain direct power by acting collectively. As such, crowd psychology theory argues that, crowds foster anonymity and sometimes generate emotion and the minds of the group merges to form a way of thinking. Each member's enthusiasm in the collective goal is then increased as a result, and one becomes less aware of the true nature of one's actions. Carl Jung refers to it as "collective unconsciousness."[18]

Obviously, the reason for the desired revolution in Nigeria is not far-fetched. The masses seem to be frustrated with Nigeria's socio-political situation. The Nigerian state has failed to provide sufficient enabling environment for the actualization of her citizenry's potentials and development. There is perceived injustice by the minority ethnic groups, widespread inequality and favoritism in governance and gross sense of deprivation in the polity.

However, the notion of non-violent change is adopted in this research. This is basically founded on Karl Popper's liberalism and critical rationalism which as an ideology provides enabling environment for true democracy and guarantees the fundamental human rights of all the citizens in the state, free, fair and periodic elections and it is also founded on the people's will. Reasons for the adoption of a non-violent ideology is premised on the fact that between 1960- that Nigeria got her independence from the British and now, , violence rather than ameliorating the socio-political and economic state of Nigerians has brought un-ended hardship on the masses notwithstanding their ethnic divide. Who then shall lead this non-violent revolution? Invariably, it is the role of philosophy and philosophers or philosophy scholars to fathom realistic ideologies that will ameliorate the situation of their countries and continent. This is a key

motivation for the research and it corroborates with Oguejiofor's (124-128)[19] submission of the way out of the ugly 'African Predicament'.

ENDNOTES

1. J. Obi Oguejiofor, "Preface" to *Philosophy and the African Predicament*, (Ibadan: Hope Publications, 2001), p. 1.

2. Karl Popper, *In Search of a Better World: Lectures and Essays from Thirty Years*, (London: Routledge, 1994), p. vii.

3. Bade Onimode, *"Class Struggle as a Reality of Nigerian Development,"* in Okwudiba Nnoli, (ed) *Path to Nigerian Development*, (Dakar: CODESRIA Book Series, 1981), p. 166.

4. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2013), p. 115.

5. Karl Popper, *All Life is Problem Solving*, (London: Routledge, 2001), p. 93.

6. Karl Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*. (Cambridge: Routledge, 1989), p. 351.

7. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, p. 120.

8. *Ibid*; p. 148.

9. Oliver Iwuchukwu, "Democracy and Regional Ontologies" in Obi Oguejiofor (ed.) *Africa: Philosophy and Public Affairs*. (Enugu: Delta Publications Nigeria Ltd, 1998), p. 84.

10. Ikechukwu Ogugua, "Ideology, Civil Society and Development" in Ike Odimemegwu, et al (ed.) *Philosophy, Democracy and Conflicts in Africa*. (Awka: Fab Educational Book, 2007), vol. 2. p.187.

11. Simon Blackburn, *Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 2nd edition, p. 178.

12. Ikechukwu Ogugua, Op; cit., p.189.

13. Cosmas Udokang and Awofeso Olu. *Political Ideas: An Introduction*, (Lagos: MacGrace Academic Resource Publishers, 2002), p. 77-78.

14. Adeola Aderounmu, "Re: Nigeria, Revolution is our last option" http://aderinola.wordpress.com/2011/12/28/re-nigeria-revolution-is-ourlast-option.html. Accessed 28/02/12, p.5.

15. Ben Nwabueze, "The imperative of a Bloody Revolution in Nigeria" http://nigeria and Africa renaissance initiative.blogspot.com/2012/02/08html. Accessed 14/10/15.

16. Gani Fawehimi, "Gov's Wives Are not Excellencies", in an interview with Esther Omame, in *The Monitor on Sunday*. Lagos: Aug. 11, 2002, p. 16

17. Simon Blackburn, Op. cit., p. 318.

18. "Crowd   Psychology"   *http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=crowdpsychology &oldid=524513588*" (Accessed, January 15, 2017).

19. *Ibid*; 2.

CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of related literature will focus on what scholars have previously researched and articulated in relation to democracy and democratisation in Nigeria on one hand and Popper's democratic ideals on the other hand. Attempts will be made to present an objective analysis. Also, a synthesis of Popper's democratic ideals and what is obtainable in the Nigerian society will be considered in between.

While it will not be out of place to say that Nigeria's path to sustainable democracy is rough and tortuous as a result of enormous developmental challenges, there is surely a way out which centers on the adoption of Karl Popper's democratic ideals and it's necessary modifications. Popper's desire is that democracy as a system should help the society to prevent the damage brought about by bad rulers in politics through peaceful changes. It follows, that such ideals will equally prevent dictatorship, absolute rule or sit-tight syndrome that has been the bane of Nigerian politics on one hand, and to ensure powerful and focused democracy based solely on the will of the citizenry on the other hand. However, Popper's democratic ideals contradict the unenviable Nigerian state of affairs characterized by imperialism, neo-colonialism, authoritarianism by Nigerian leaders, militarization and suppression, Afro pessimism, tribalism and corruption, etc. that have kept the nation 'under-developed' or in a lighter and patriotic note 'developing' for decades. Since his ideals clearly differentiate democracy from dictatorship, it becomes pertinent to ask; what are the philosophical foundations that surround Karl Popper's democratic ideals? Is the current geopolitical, socio- economic and religious complexity of Nigeria conducive for socio-political and revolutionary change? What ways and manner would such a revolution take? Can the Nigerian ruling class rise to the occasion and willingly reform the system for the interest of the masses?

Is a violent socio-political revolution a solution to the Nigeria's quest for restructuring? How realistic is the applicability of Popper's democratic ideals and how can it ameliorate the Nigerian predicament? These and other relevant considerations constitute the nitty-gritties of this research work. Thus, there arises a need for this review in order to bring to limelight the opinion of selected scholars in relation to democracy and democratisation in Nigeria on one hand and Popper's democratic ideals on the other hand. On our review list includes; Democracy and democratisation in Nigeria, Popper's science and politics, the Popperian Open Society, the Popperian liberalism, Popper on critical rationalism, and Popper's piecemeal social engineering.

2.1   Literature Review

In a democratic setting, the task ahead of both the leaders and the led basically is on how to sustain the democratic values and ensure political and economic developments. Commenting on the concept of democratisation, Benedict Michael opines that:

> Democratization is a process, which leads to a more open, more participatory, less authoritarian society. It is a process of building or creating democracy. The process moves along two distinguishable paths: that is either as a process of diffusion or alternatively as a process by which a democratic community grow via clustering into a larger community of democracy; for the evolution of new types of community. The process is obviously interdependent.[1]

While the institutional framework of democracy include political parties, the legislature, executive, judiciary and all the agencies of the state that aid to enforce the sustenance of individual rights, it follows that as a process, there are variables necessary for democratisation to smoothly transform eventually to democracy.

17

In this light, Benedict Michael corroborates that:

> The diffusion of democratic procedure will produce formal democracy if rooted in and nourished by conditions of greater equality and freedom, where procedural rights are effectively exercised and are seen at work, a society of equality and freedom cannot last without observing democratic procedures.[2]

Ironically, the process of democratisation in Nigeria has been difficult, slow and wobbling. Successive administrations have performed woefully in terms of good governance and empowerment; which is manifested in gross culture of poverty and underdevelopment in all ramification. Thus, with the absence of good governance and lack of respect for democratic values, citizen's dignity and wellbeing which is central to governance in a democratic state is relegated to the background.

Commenting on the need for democracy to be real and down to the roots, Fung Archon and Erik Olin Wright maintain that:

> Democracy as a way of organizing the state has come to be narrowly identified with territorially based competitive elections of political leadership for legislative and executive offices. Yet, increasingly, this mechanism of political representation seems ineffective in accomplishing the central ideals of democratic politics: facilitating active political involvement of the citizen, forging political consensus through dialogue, devising and implementing public policies that ground a productive economy and healthy society, and, in more radical egalitarian versions of the democratic ideal, assuring that all citizens benefit from the nations wealth.[3]

Thus, the apparent decline in the functionality of democratic institutions in Nigeria is as a result of self-centeredness of those in position of authority and the ruling elites on one hand, and the challenge of passive and reactionary followership on the other hand. In this light, Ademola Azzez sums up that, years after Nigeria's existence as an

independent nation, her history is replete with failed and truncated attempts at democracy and democratisation.[4]

Invariably, the unenviable state of affairs in Nigeria is not without concomitant effects and have fostered agitation for violent change which is evidenced in the series of coups and counter coups, the thirty months civil war, seemingly unending eruptions of religious violence and mayhem against other ethnic groups for little or no provocation; unwarranted destruction of lives and properties by Fulani herdsmen and cattle rustlers, the Boko Haram insurgency, the Shites revolts against constituted authorities (as witnessed in Kaduna State in 2017), revolutionary movement such as Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB), the Movement for the Actualization of the Sovereign State of Biafra (MASSOB), the Niger Delta Avengers (NDA), the Coalition of Northern Groups (CNG), and the multiplicity of ethnic militias. In fact, while some Nigerians are indifferent on the way forward, some others have since settled for the Marxists revolutionary ideology which is prone to violence as an imperative to bring about the necessary change in the Nigerian state. Expatiating this point, Olusegun Oladipo opines that:

> African states have become an arena of social conflicts because many of the states lack the legitimacy to exercise political power. Because the state lacks legitimacy, it has to rely on force and manipulation to secure the support and loyalty of the people. In doing this, it denies the people the opportunity of freely participating in the determination of the events that affect or shape their lives. In this circumstance where leaders lack legitimacy and moral basis for governance, a manipulative style of rule becomes the only weapon of sustaining power. It is this style of rule, which lies at the root of the endemic ethno-regional conflicts, which are tearing many African states apart today.[5]

However, there are several factors militating against democracy and democratisation in Nigeria. According to Eric Omazu:

> The first reason why democracy has not worked in Africa stems from the acquiescence granted to the African leaders to the effect that democratic values and norms are not universal but sectional. As a result they argued to be left alone to make democracy conform with the African realities as defined by them.

Invariably, one wonders what really are our peculiar circumstances and needs other than the peculiar circumstances and needs of humanity which centers on equality, freedom and securities. Obviously, the attempts at tinkering with the principles of democracy by African leaders is evident in the flagrant abuse and denial of human rights, abuse of suffrage through election rigging and vote buying and the sit-tight syndrome. Thus, while some African states have gone ahead to abrogate the principles of fixed tenure of office for executives, others have out rightly abuse fixed tenure. For instance, Nigerians had earlier rejected such attempt by former President Olusegun Obasanjo, who is a lead proponent of 'Indigenous Democracy' to arm twist the legislature for a third term in office. The arguments by most of these self-centered African leaders seem to be founded on the claims that in Africa, kings do not retire; as such, they must remain in office till death.

More so, for Fayemi Kazeem:

> The major challenges facing democracy in Africa are the tasks of delivering the democratic dividends in order to improve the quality of life of the citizens, and the challenge of providing sustainable social order where humanity can flourish.[7]

This position is evidenced in the poor state of basic infrastructures, dwindling economy, insecurity of lives and properties, bad road, decayed health and educational facilities, moribund industries, lack of housing and electricity, rising unemployment,

etc. in Nigeria. Thus, leadership deficiency is a major factor fuelling gross underdevelopment in Nigeria years after independence. Corroborating on this point, Godwin Okaneme maintains that:

> Since her political independence till now, Nigeria's democracy has continued to wobble. It has never been firmly established. Though many scholars agree that democracy evolves with time, there is no sign that Nigeria's democracy is making any head way at all…. Many thinkers subscribe to the bitter fact that failure of leadership is the root cause of our numerous social, political, educational and economic problems in Nigeria.[8]

Not left out, is the lack of the basic philosophical orientation that will give the leaders and the led the enablement to translate principles into practice; that is, the question of ideology in Nigeria's democratisation. While Ikechukwu Ogugua sees the challenge as the "crisis of ideology; not in the sense of there being an ideology recognised which we are unable to implement but crisis in the sense of having multiple ideologies each being confused with the other and each fighting for supremacy"[9], T. U. Nwala qualifies the situation as 'poverty of ideology'. According to him, it is surely not correct to say that the Nigerian society is bereft of any ideology. But it is correct to say that the officially declared ideology remains utopian, abstract and irrelevant to what actually goes on in the society.[10] In this light, Augustine Oburota maintains that:

> It is becoming clear every day that Nigerians in general do not understand the heavy responsibilities that go with the modern society. The leaders in particular are more conversant with governance in times of pre-colonial times. Nigerians are very much handicapped to fully grasp the meaning of democracy.[11]

Ignorance, lack of adequate civil education, philosophical insight and passiveness by Nigerians is a catalyst to the current unenviable state of affairs in the polity. Nigerians are still struggling to differentiate politics from governance. The same masses who sell

their votes to politicians, participate in thuggery and end up rigging in morally unfit persons into office of authority, are definitely the same set of people who will suffer all through the unfit individual(s) tenure in office. It is also a fact that most Nigerians are only interested in electioneering and after that they are passive or disinterested in what goes on in the polity until another electioneering period. This is pathetic for democracy and democratisation. Invariably, Ukana Ikpe insists that:

> Though socio-economic wellbeing of citizens cannot be stated in empirical terms in the definition of democracy, nevertheless, it constitute a veritable legitimation factor for democratic regimes. Democracy is hereby pushed beyond the realms of election into policy evaluation. If this is important for democracy retaining its claim to peoples rule, then government responsiveness to the interest of citizens should be made an overt condition/factor in the conceptualisation of democracy.[12]

There is a clarion call for Nigerians to rise and hold their representatives accountable. The manifesto of political parties and individuals occupying elective offices should be taken up after elections and all through their tenure in office. They must either walk their talk or be shown the way out through a recall process as provided for by the constitution, as the pains of enduring an irresponsible representative for four years is better imagined. The essence of the citizens participating fully in democratisation is to keep those in power at check and on their feet, and this will in turn usher in sustainable democracy in Nigeria. Commenting on the requirements of good government, Okon Uya reiterates that:

> Critical to the sustenance of Nigerian democracy is the creation of an appropriate environment in which the basic needs of Nigerians are adequately met. These basic needs can be grouped into those dealing with security, liberty, justice, public welfare, happiness, dignity and identity.[13]

Significantly, it becomes necessary for Philosophy and philosophers or Philosophy scholars to fathom realistic ideologies that will ameliorate the situation of their

countries and continent. At this juncture, the age-long concern with relevance of Philosophy and Humanities to the society resurfaces. Thus, Udo Etuk in his *Riches of Philosophy* argues that:

> Today, Philosophy in Africa cannot afford to be impoverished in abstract, sterile system-building and unproductive debates, when there is so much in our economies, our development efforts, our technology acquisition, our planning and management, our cultural contacts and exchanges, our political struggles and international relations, and so much more beckoning on the professional philosophers to go into dialogue and make their insights known…. The philosopher today need not be a revolutionary to change the world: the rational, critical and radical tools at his disposal are sufficient.[14]

It follows that, there is a great role for the Nigerian philosophers if the Nigerian state must overcome her present unenviable predicament and stand to be counted among comity of nations. This programme corroborates with Obi Oguejiofor's submission of the way out of the ugly 'African Predicament' as he sums up that, "there must therefore be some way in which the philosophy done by Africans must lead to the amelioration of the situation".[15] This is a key motivation to this research which makes a case for Karl Popper's democratic ideals as an imperative ideology for reforms and development of Nigeria and Nigerians.

Obviously, Karl Popper's scholarly foundation is primarily in the sciences. Thus, it becomes pertinent in as much as his democratic ideals is being discussed to venture into his very foundation and further synergize it with his politics. Graham McDonald and Philip Catton opine that:

> Though controversial, the description of science by Karl Popper (1902-1994) stands as one of the most influential achievements of the philosophy of the twentieth century; his falsification hypothesis is a turning point of philosophy of science and divides the field in "before Popper" and "after Popper."[16]

Here, Popper's ingenuity and pioneering effort in falsification and science is affirmed. Corroborating on Popper's ingenuity, Fred Eidlin in *Karl Popper, 1902 – 1994: Radical Fallibilism, Political Theory and Democracy* holds that, "Popper's philosophy of science represents a radical departure from almost all other views about knowledge. This helps account for serious misunderstandings of it among admirers no less than among adversaries."[17]

For Wenceslao Gonzalez:

> Karl Popper is presumably the most influential author in methodology of science in the second half of the twentieth century. In particular, his views on scientific prediction, both in natural sciences and in social sciences, have had a wide influence. Moreover, his thought has directly affected the methodology of economics, due to his influence upon very well-known specialists, such as Mark Blaug.[18]

More so, I. C. Jarvie sums it thus, "Popper's philosophy of science as a theory of the institution of science, explains how the social aspect of his theory developed, and suggests that an updated version of Popper's social theory should be used to study both scientific and nonscientific societies today."[19] The understanding here is that, Popper's contribution to philosophy of science is not limited to science but it is all encompassing in the social sciences and humanities.

On the other hand, Helfenbein and DeSalle maintain that, "Popper's work is not a philosophical analysis of science as it is practiced, but rather a prescription of how the logic of science should proceed."[20] More so, that Popper ignores the practical aspects of scientific research, an endeavour in which practice is primary, is just one critical comment directed toward Popper and his philosophy. These arguments is situated in the proposition that, falsification requires prediction from theory, but prediction does not always follow from a theory, rendering falsification impossible in those cases.[21]

Outstandingly, Alan Ryan identifies the relationship between Popper's conception of science and politics thus; Popper's politics are based on accountability. What is the great virtue of science? It is the notion that we are accountable for our beliefs.[22] As such, Popper's conception of science and politics is closely knitted. Jozsef Malik sums it thus:

> Popper's methodological conservatism, however, involved something progressive, too: for him, science and politics are interlocking with each other. Not in an oppressive sense in which are we usually thinking about the relationship of science and politics, just the fear of abuse by state. In democratic, open society science and politics fit with each other. Popper believed that science is our best kind of knowledge in the same way and for the same reasons that he believed that democracy is our best form of government. Both science and democracy try to influence opinions through rational discussion and without violence. Both science and democracy try to learn from their competitors instead of silencing them.[23]

Having reviewed Popper's scientific inclination, which is indisputably his scholarly foundation, and after a brief synergy between his conception of science and politics, it is pertinent for us to further delve into Popper's conception of the Open Society.

Alan Haworth holds that, the Popperian open society "is a society characterised by institutions which make it possible to exercise the same virtues in the pragmatic pursuit of solutions to social and political problems."[24]   Here, the institutions characteristic of a modern liberal democracy is envisaged.

For Nicholas Maxwell, Popper tackles problems that arise in connection with creating an "open" society, one which tolerates diversity of views and ways of life. Popper argues that some of the greatest thinkers have been opposed to the "open" society, most notably Plato and Marx.[25]

Moreso, Cibangu Sylvain opines that, "Popper distinguished two kinds of societies; the open society is based on critical discussion about such human pursuits as achievements, decisions, goals, and authority, whereas the closed society does not allow for social criticism, and may even exterminate individuals, their ideas, and properties."[26]   In this light, Anthony O'Hear maintains that:

> Popper's open society is contrasted with closed societies, which are societies marked by what Popper would see as oppression and inhumanity. These closed societies may be tribal societies, dominated by tradition, irrational prejudice, xenophobia and rule by hereditary groups or oligarchies. Or they may be more modern types of dictatorship, run by rulers who claim superior (or even infallible) insights into history and society, and who claim on the basis of this knowledge to be able to produce a good (or better) life for everyone. 'Everyone', of course, simply has to submit to this superior knowledge, so there is considerable dictatorial potential in closed societies, which was very much in Popper's mind when he attacked closed societies in the 1940s.[27]

Here, distinction is made between the Popperian open society and closed society. Characteristics of the closed society as adumbrated were not only feasible in the 1940s Europe but a glimpse at the Nigerian state from independence till our present day governance portrays the reality of closed societies and its ills. From the First Republic till date, the country has produced more military Heads of State than democratically elected Presidents. More worrisome, is the fact that the same military oligarchies transform into civilian attires and continue dominating the entire political scene, milking the nation's coffers dry and plunging her into debts and recession, thus, a need for a non-violent revolution that will usher in an open society with its benefits.

O'Hear continues that:

> Open societies, by contrast, are societies in which everything – policies, institutions, traditions, rulers – is open to criticism, and open to criticism from anyone. Anyone may criticise in an open society, especially those directly affected by a given policy or institution. In an open society policies and institutions are modified by continual monitoring of their effects, and in the light of their ability to solve the problems they are supposed to solve.[28]

Invariably, such a society is liberal, treats the people as if they matter; that is, the dignity of persons is given top priority and there is an unconditional protection of citizen's lives and properties, and paves way for sustainable development. The open society is much envisaged in the Nigerian state as it will not only ameliorate the plight of the citizenry but it will equally ensure functional democratic institutions and sustainable development.

In further illustration of the importance of Karl Popper's view, Sam Ghandchi reiterates that:

> The open society had become, in the seven years of its gestation, a major treatise on the intellectual and social ills of the time, offering an explanation of how totalitarianism had gained intellectual respectability and how post war society of it would involve rethinking politics, education and social morality -An open society marks that difference and confronts its members with personal decisions and the opportunity to reflect rationally on them.[29]

Here, the idea is to restore power to the masses or members of the society after a selected few had shortchanged and plundered the commonwealth of all which resulted in strife and warfare. This clearly replicate the sad predicament of the Nigerian society and is a wakeup call for leaders and followers to rise and embrace the open society in order to secure their future and that of the next generation.

Nevertheless, one may question the applicability or functionality of the Popperian open society. In affirming the applicability of Popper's novel ideas, Helmut Kohl said:

> The age of totalitarian ideologies in Europe is drawing to a close. The belief in historic mission of more race or class has proved to be the most devastating fallacy of this. Millions of innocent people fell victim to its sway. Karl Popper ceaselessly fought this fallacy. He is amongst the most significant champions of the open society... the triumph of freedom and democracy in Europe demonstrates that Karl Popper was right.[30]

Thus, if freedom and democracy triumphed in Europe, it can equally liberate Nigerians. It could bring about the needed change; a systematic overhauling of institutions in Nigeria with the aim of strengthening them effectively to carry out their duties for the betterment of all and sundry. Cibangu Sylvain sums it up that, "an open society, however, achieves the unrestricted manifestation and fulfillment of individuals' lives and their worlds."[31] But ours is a culturally and religiously heterogeneous society, thus, is the current geopolitical, socio-economic and religious complexity of Nigeria conducive for an open society? The answer is in the affirmative. All that is needed is for every citizen to transcend the useful but very narrow confines of tribal loyalties to the larger entity called Nigeria. Thus, Nigerians must embrace nationalism, which connotes national identity corroborated by social cohesion, national consciousness and nation building. The feelings of oneness and of belongingness, and other necessary moral virtues such as; love for fellow-man, love of service, self-sacrifice, justice and the fear of God should be top on our priority. This leads us to Popper's conception of liberalism.

The Popperian liberalism is tilted "towards individualism." Buttressing this point, O'Hear in his work, *Popperian Individualism Today* highlights this assumption as one of the five basic ideas that underlies Popper's conception of the open society. His

assumption is that Popper's liberalism endorses only a philosophy that upholds individualism.[32]

For Stefano Gattei, Popper entrenched his liberal philosophy in the importance of the individual; yet averred a vital epistemic value obtained through the social conduct of individuals.[33] According to Oseni Afisi:

> The crucial aspects of Popper's liberal idea of individual freedom must be understood both in ways it presents freedom as belonging to individuals who are free to exercise their freedom devoid of any external constraints, and the implications that individual freedom is exercised in mutual respect with others for the growth of the social community. This is in the light of the argument that individual freedom is entrenched with others in the society, and the individual are not necessarily free from cultural and ideological influences of their community. This point seems to align with merits inherent to the idea of the relational embeddedness of the self that communitarian's defend.[34]

Here, the understanding is that, individuals make up the society and as such, their right is situated side by side with the right of others in the society. Thus, ensuring individual's liberty is sine qua non to the existence of a liberal democratic society.

Also, Kapeler Jacob and Stephan Pühringer corroborate that:

> This emphasis on the importance of basic individual liberties granted by political liberalism as a foundation for democratic conduct illustrates how these basic individual liberties are contained in Popper's conception of a democratic state. Since, without formal equality of citizens (nondiscrimination), free discussion, the right of assembly or the absence of censorship, essential institutions for organizing such a government's dismissal would be absent.[35]

Alain Boyer posits that, "…in his conception of liberalism Popper considers the state, especially its monopoly on force, as an ambivalent institution, a "necessary evil," which represents a precondition of as well as a danger to individual freedom."[36] He further state that Popper "also laid down two important principles: (1) the Liberal Razor

– the state's powers should not be multiplied beyond necessity; (2) the moral necessity of the state (a thesis which seems not to be entirely in harmony with the idea of 'necessary evil')."[37] This position is based on the fact that individual's right to live, and to be protected against the power of the strong, necessitates a state that protects the rights of all.

However, Joszef Malik reiterates that:

> For Popper, open society primarily means the preservation of freedom. He does not identify open society with democracy, *laissez faire* capitalism, and "political correct" ideal of free speech, as many liberals want to persuade others under these catchwords. Popper contrasted open society with closed society. But he did not identify it with any specific political or economic system.[38]

Invariably, freedom is interdependent upon others within one's social environment. This idea of social freedom is central to the idea that the individual 'self' makes meaning only within their intricate relationship with the community. This relationship characterizes what can be termed the 'social individual'.[39]

Thus, it is pertinent to ask if the citizens are adequately informed of their right in the first instance or if they blindly follow the highest political bidder? Etuk readily asserts that, "part of the problem with democracy in African countries is the low level of political education and awareness; which is a factor of under-development."[40] This really is an irony, since power in the democratic system resides in the hands of the masses, yet, ignorance has created an overwhelming lacuna in the system. In this regards, Agu sums up that, the rights of the people to life, property and freedom are inalienable but also affirm that they are *raison d' etre* for the existence of the state and the institution of government.[41]

Outstandingly, freedom must not give room for intolerance and the destruction of lives and properties at any point in time as witnessed in the Nigerian state. As such, Shearmur and Turner opine that:

> In granting freedom and tolerance as the liberal values of an open society, Popper did not, however, view either as unlimited. He averred that even if we guarantee individual freedom to all those who are prepared to reciprocate, we must not include in this guarantee those who seriously propagate intolerance.[42]

Shearmur and Turner sum up that, "these considerations reflect the essential features of an open society, that is, a tolerant society; a society in which the peculiarities of the individual and, more especially, in which critical thought is tolerated."[43] Thus, Popper's liberal values of freedom and tolerance are complementary and not exclusive, it's aimed at ensuring a non-violent revolution through critical rationalism.

According to Nnaemeka Agashi:

> Karl Popper's critical philosophy centred on the way of expanding knowledge through unending process of criticism. For him criticism involves observations and experiments not limited to verbal critical arguments in the sense that both observations and experiments are used to test theories, challenge theories and refute theories.[44]

For Alain Boyer:

> This is Popper's main normative premise. Strongly tied to this approach are the ideas of division of power, of free speech and open discourse, of public control over governmental institutions and of human dignity, which points to the importance of extensive minority rights. This leads Popper to the postulate that the people should be able to 'dismiss' their government by means of the institutional political setting, that is, without the use of force. This last aspect is to be seen as the foundational stone of his conception of democracy.[45]

Thus, for the citizens to secure their fundamental human rights and ensure that there is public control over governmental institutions, education is necessary, as it will

sensitize, illuminate and enlighten the citizenry from societal dogmas and spur them to critical rationalism. Commenting on this, Francis Etim opines that, the aim of this education is to produce thinkers with independence thought. Such education should have ethical content which will facilitate the much needed re-orientation of priorities … such that, any ruler enthroned by injustice will fail, anybody enthroned by brute force as the case of the military in Nigeria politics will fail, anybody enthroned by tribal, religious or colonialist hegemony will fail.[46]

More so, disagreements and conflicts are inevitable in the society. As such, the two major approaches to conflict or disagreement is either violent or non-violent. Buchanan Allen maintains that, "If conflicts are unavoidable and can only be resolved in these two ways, then it is indeed desirable to attach a monopoly of force to the state, and thereby provide citizens with the possibility to engage in non-violent conflict-resolution."[47] The implication is that the citizenry must tame violence as much as possible, unlike what is feasible in our society as every action, inaction and even the perceived body language of other tribes is treated as inciting, and they respond without a second thought is 'violence'. From the events that led to the first military coup and subsequent reprisals to the variables surrounding the 1967 civil war and to our present state that the vilification of ethnicity has in no mean measure diminished the idea of nationhood, the watch word has been 'violence' rather than 'critical rationalism'. Obviously, there has been several Panel of Inquiries, National Constitutional Conferences, Peace Pact and Accord, etc. all being attempts at dialogue but the outcome mostly is decision been taken along 'ethnic' and 'religious' lines.

Thus, Jennifer Nedelsky reiterates that:

> In sum, the best way to tame force is to attach it to a democratic institutional structure (a state), while the best way to tame power is to design institutions, which allow for political change. This argument also provides a coherent answer to the "puzzle [...] of modern constitutionalism", which asks for the reason why we treat "some collective decisions as binding on other collective decisions."[48]

Ironically, democratic institutions in Nigeria over the years are not only weak but divided along ethnic and religious lines and as such they exist to witch-hunt those in the other divide. Else, how then can one substantiate the reason appointments are given based on tribe and religion and not necessarily on merit? Commenting on this rather unfortunate situation that has diminished the idea of nationhood and invariably weakened democratic institutions Etuk (*Humanities*) posits that:

> In Nigeria, however, the "nations" are much smaller units, usually marked by a common language; a common history or ancestry; the mere mention of the name evokes warm feelings; a man will do whatever lies in his power to put this little group to which he belongs on top; there is a feeling of belongingness in every member of this group; and one might even dare to risk one's life in the cause of the group which one holds so dear.[49]

Corroborating on this point, Fayemi Kazeem opines that:

> Ethnicity has been blamed for social disorder in Africa. The argument is that Africa is multi ethnic in form and the differences along ethnic lines are the cause of the crisis of social disorder in Africa. By implication, governments have relied more on ethnic repression to maintain a semblance of unity among the disparate peoples over whom they exercise power. This ethnic manipulation an identity has resulted into bloody clashes between/among different groups in Africa and has threatened survival of nationalism.[50]

Sincerely, ethnicity has thwarted the overall realization of an authentic Nigerianism, and the panacea is for all to imbibe the spirit of compromise and cooperation.

Moreover, Magee Bryam commends Popper for not claiming that he propagated the source of philosophy of criticism but attributed that to pre-Socratics who he understood and claimed inaugurated the tradition of critical discussion as an avenue for expanding knowledge.[51] This portrays the dynamism of ideas which gives room for modifications.

Cibangu analyses the three principles of critical thinking as outlined by Popper thus:

> The first principle is based on the fact that humans are prone to error, even with the best intentions. The second principle highlights the idea that errors can be corrected and appreciated through critical discussion. Error doesn't necessarily mean lack of knowledge. An error can lead to a discovery and/or stronger understanding of that which is being studied. The third principle concerns the idea of journeying, not arriving, towards the truth. Arriving means there is no longer any horizon or vision to head to and long for. We can arrive at a specific location or goal, but we will always need horizons in order to see better and farther.[52]

There appears to be a general distrust and suspicion between the masses and the ruling class on one hand, and within the masses on the other hand which has made the possibility of a round table dialogue near impossible. How do you reconcile the loved ones of soldiers and civilians killed in various military coups and attempted military coups? How possible can the hardships; pogrom, starvation, death, etc. of the nearly three years civil war in Nigeria be corrected? How do you pacify the Biafrans admirers, Niger-Delta adherents, Oduduwa People's Congress demanders, Coalition of Northern Groups, victims of Fulani herdsmen killings/cattle rustlers, Boko haram victims, and above all, victims of religious intolerance/violence? What about victims of politically arranged murder/assassinations? There has been enough blood shed already, thus, it is time to embrace 'critical rationalism'.

The fate of a non-critical thinking society is better imagined than experienced as it is majorly characterized by political instability, violence, loss of lives and properties,

interminable wars, economic misery and staggering development. Little wonder why nothing seems to be sacrosanct to the philosopher or philosophy scholars as they question everything questionable such as; traditions, beliefs, worldviews, convictions, values, goals, standards, decisions, etc. Thus, Obi Oguejiofor posits that, philosophy is a training in rationality appears to be obvious. With its method of not just looking for the answers to the most fundamental human questions, but also giving reasons why one answer is preferred to the other, it is clear that philosophy will elbow its practitioners with special inclination towards rationality.[53] Rationality in turn brings about sustainable reforms which Popper refers to as 'piecemeal engineering'.

According to Simkin Collins, "Popper advocates social engineering as the practical aim of social science, - the shaping of or creation of social institutions in order to achieve or promote desired improvements to social conditions."[54] Here, society policies and institutions are modified by continual monitoring of their effects, and in the light of their ability to solve the problems they are supposed to solve. Rulers or administrators do not attempt to impose blueprints for the good life on the whole of society. Instead they seek to rectify obvious problems and abuses through piecemeal social engineering. Invariably, the aim is that avoidable suffering be minimized, that is; it aims at discouraging leaders and administrators from wasting public funds on 'elephant projects' rather, it implores them to seek out to eradicate the social ills within the society.

For Bryan Magee, the Popperian approach involves subjecting institutions to a permanently critical evaluation in order to monitor how well they are solving the problems they exist to solve – and involves moreover a permanent willingness to change them in the light of changing requirements.[55] It has to do with changing the institution one at a time and not the overhauling of institutions as witnessed in

dictatorship and authoritarian regimes or violence revolution. Also, it seeks to address concrete and feasible social problems such as; violence, poverty, unemployment, income inequality, environmental degradation, etc.

Outstandingly, the piecemeal social engineering gives room for modifications and progressive change. It proposes a trial and error approach to real life situations; that is, a theory or idea is proposed and tested, errors or shortcomings in the theory or idea are detected and subsequently expunged, and a refined and better approach emerges and is adopted for the time being pending any unforeseen circumstance that may arise for another modification. This is an implicit representation of flux in human existence and the need to be proactive at any given point in time. Invariably, followers, leaders and administrators of institutions must be realistic, dynamic, proactive, pragmatic, and people oriented in order to sustain a liberal and non-violent society. Thus, as living beings, we must 'keep searching for a better world'.[56]

In summary, democratisation in Nigeria is in a dire need of a paradigm shift. Popper's democratic ideals, just like every other system of thought, are not without some flaws. There are criticisms and commendations alike. However, most of the criticisms stem from a misunderstanding or misinterpretation of his democratic ideals which the work intends to elucidate in order to ensure a better understanding of how the democratic ideals of Popper with the necessary modifications can ameliorate the Nigerian predicament.

ENDNOTES

1. Benedict Michael, "Democratization and Conflict in an Emerging Civil Society" in Ike Odimegwu (ed.), *Philosophy and Africa. 2006 World Philosophy Day@ Unizik*, Vol 1 (Awka: Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, 2006) pp. 72-80.

2. *Ibid*; p.74.

3. Archong Fung and Erik Wright, *Deepening Democracy: Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. (London: Verso, 2003), p. 30.

4. Ademola Azez, "Democray and Legitimacy Crisis" in Hassan A.S. et al (eds.), *Democracy and Development in Nigeria*, vol. 1, Conceptual Issues and Democratic Practice. (Lagos: Concept Pub. Ltd., 2006), pp. 35-45.

5. Olusegun Oladipo (ed.), "Modernization and the search for Community in Africa: Crisis and Conditions of Change" in *Remarking Africa: Challenges of the Twenty-First Century* (1998), p. 113.

6. Eric C. Omazu, "Crisis and Corrption in Africa; Is Democracy the Solution" in Ike Odimegwu et al (eds.), *Philosophy and Africa. 2006 UNESCO World Philosophy Day@ Unizik*, Vol 2 (Awka: Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, 2007) pp. 263-272.

7. Kayemi Kazeem, "The Tragedy of Psuedo-Democracy and Social Disorder in Contemporary Africa: Any Philosophical Rescue?" in Ike Odimegwu (ed.), *Philosophy and Africa. 2006 World Philosophy Day@ Unizik*, Vol 1 (Awka: Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, 2006) pp. 58-71.

8. Godwin Okaneme, "Poverty and Poor Leadership: Twin Evils of Nigeria's Democracy" in *Essence: Politics and Development*, Vol. 9, No.1, (2012) pp. 36-48.

9. Ikechukwu N. Ogugua, "Ideology, Civil Society and Development" in Ike Odimegwu et al (eds.), *Philosophy and Africa. 2006 UNESCO World Philosophy Day@ Unizik*, Vol 2 (Awka: Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, 2007) pp. 186-204.

10. T.U. Nwala, Nigeria: *Path to Unity and Stability*. (Nsukka: Niger Books and Publishing Co. Ltd., 1997), p. 10.

11. Augustine Oburota, "The Philosophy of Conflict and the Problem of Democracy in Africa" in Ike Odimegwu et al (eds.), *Philosophy and Africa. 2006 UNESCO World Philosophy Day@ Unizik*, Vol 1 (Awka: Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, 2006) pp. 205-217.

12. Ukana Ikpe, "The Delimma of Democratic Theory and Political Participation in the Era of Globalization" in International Journal of Social Sciences, Vol.4, No.1 (June 2005), pp. 244-264.

13. Okon Uya, "Democracy and the requirements of Good Governance: A Welcome Address", in Okon Uya (ed.) *Civil Society and the Consolidation of Democracy of Democracy in Nigeria*. (Calabar: CATS Publishers, 2008), p. 7.

14. Udo Etuk, *The Riches of Philosophy*. (Uyo: Scholars Press, 2000), pp. v-vi.

15. J. Obi Oguejiofor, Philosophy and the African Predicament. (Ibadan: Hope Publications, 2016), p. 124.

16. P. Catton, & G. Macdonald, "Introduction," in P. Catton & G. Macdonald (eds.), *Karl Popper: Critical Appraisals,* (London: Routledge, 2004), pp. 1-15.

17. Fred Eidlin, "Karl Popper, 1902-1994: Radical Fallibilism, Political Theory, and Democracy," in *Critical Review* 10(1), (1996), pp. 135-153.

18. J.W. Gonzalez, "The Many Faces of Popper's Methodological Approach to Prediction," in P. Catton & G. Macdonald eds.), *Karl Popper: Critical Appraisals.* (London: Routledge, 2004), pp. 78-98.

19. I.C. Jarvie, *The Republic of Science: The Emergence of Popper's Social View of Science 1935-1945* reviewed John Wettersten 73(1), (2006), pp. 108-121.

20. Kevin G. Helfenbein and Rob DeSalle, "Falsifications and Corroboration: Karl Popper's Influence on Systematics" In *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution.* 35, (2005), pp. 271-280.

21. H. Putnam, "The Corroboration of Theories," in: Schlipp, P.A. (ed.), *The Philosophy of Karl Popper, Book I.* (Open Court, La Salle, Illinois, 1974), pp. 221–240.

22. Ryan Allan, "Popper's Politics: Science and Democracy" In P. Catton & G. Macdonald (eds.), *Karl Popper: Critical Appraisals.* (London: Routledge, 2004), pp. 174-188.

23. Jozsef Zoltan Malik, "Thinking about Karl Popper and Open Society," in *Jogelmeleti Szemle (Journal of Legal Theory).* 15(4), (2014), pp. 58-66.

24. Alan Haworth, "The Open Society Revisited," in *Philosophy Now.* 38, (2002), pp. 35-37.

25. Nicholas Maxwell, "Karl Raimund Popper (28 July 1902 - 17 September 1994)," in *British Philosophers, 1800-2000,* P. Dematteis, P. Fosl and L. McHenry (eds), (Columbia: Bruccoli Clark Layman, 2002), pp. 176-194.

26. Cibangu Sylvain, "Karl Popper and the Social Sciences," in *Social Sciences and Cultural Studies- Issues of Language, Public Opinion, Education and Welfare.* University of Washington, Seattle. (2004), pp. 1-22.

27. Anthony O' Hear, "The Open Society Revisited," in P. Catton & G. Macdonald (eds.), *Karl Popper: Critical Appraisals.* (London: Routledge, 2004), pp. 189-202.

28. Ibid; p. 192.

29. *http://www.ghandchi.com/index-page6html (10/11/15).*

30. Karl Popper, *Unended Quest: An Intellectual Autobiography.* (London: Routledge, 1976), p. 5.

31. Cibangu Sylvain. *Op; Cit.* pp.1-22.

32. Anthony O'Hear, "Popperian Individualism Today," in Zusanna ParusniKova and R.S. Cohen (eds.), *Rethinking Popper.* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2009), p. 206.

33. Stefano Gattei, "The Ethical Nature of Karl Popper's Solution to the Problem of Rationality," in *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*. 32(2), (2002), pp. 240-266.

34. Oseni Taiwo Afisi, "On Karl Popper's Liberal Principle of Freedom: The Individual and Social Aspects," in *GSTF Journal of General Philosophy (JPhilo)*. 1(1), March, (2014), pp. 4-7.

35. Jakob Kapeller and Stephan Puhringer, "Democracy in Liberalism and NeoLiberalism: The Case of Popper and Hayek," in *ICAE working Paper Series*. 10, November, (2012), pp. 1-21.

36. Alain Boyer, "Is an Open Society a Just Society? Popper and Rawls" in *Learning for Democracy*. 1(2), (2005), pp. 1-30.

37. *Ibid*; p.16.

38. Jozsef Zoltan Malik, *Op; Ci*t., p. 59.

39. Stephen Mulhall and Swift Adam, *Liberals and Communitarians*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1992, p. 13.

40. Udo Etuk, "Democracy as a Pragmatic Political Ideology," *Uyo Journal of Humanities*. 7, (December. 2002), pp. 1-19.

41. S. N. Agu, "The Challenge of Democratisation, An Expository Analysis of Nigeria's Claim to Democracy," in *Uche Journal of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy, University of Nigeria, Nsukka*. 11, (2005), p. 78.

42. Jeremy Shearmur and Piers Norris Turner, (eds) *Karl Popper: After the Open Society: Selected Social and Political Writings*. (London and New York: Routeldge, 2008), p. 273.

43. *Ibid*; p. 136.

44. Nnaemeka Agashi, "Evaluation of Karl Popper's Democratic Theory: An Imperative for Nigerian Democracy," in *Journal of Advances in Social Science-Humanities*. 2(5) (2016), pp. 01-05.

45. Alain Boyer, *Op; Cit*., p. 8.

46. Francis Etim, *Metaphysics for Authentic Nigerianism: The Heideggerian Option*. (Uyo: Inela Publishers Ltd., 2008), p. 114.

47. Allen Buchanan, "Political Legitimacy and Democracy," *Ethics*. 112, (2002), pp. 689-719.

48. Jennifer Nedelsky, "The Puzzle and Demands of Modern Constitutionalism," *Ethics*. 104, (1994), pp. 505-515.

49. Udo Etuk, "Humanities, Humanism and this our Nation," in *Uyo Journal of Humanities. 7,* January, (2004), pp. 1-15.

50. Fayemi Kazeem. *Op; Cit*., p.62

51. Bryan Magee, *Confessions of a Philosopher*, (London: Phonenix, 2003), p. 229.

52. Cibangu Sylvain. *Op; Cit*., p. 34.

53. J. Obi Oguejiofor, *Op; Cit*., p. 124.

54. Collins Simkin, *Popper's Views on Natural and Social Science*. (Orbis: New York, 1993), p. 132.

55. Bryan Magee, "What Use is Popper to a Politician?" in Anthony O'Hear (ed), *Karl Popper: Philosophy and Problems*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 259–274.

56. Karl Popper, *In Search of a Better World: Lectures and Essays from Thirty Years*. (London: Routledge, 1994), p. vii.

CHAPTER THREE
KARL POPPER AND HIS DEMOCRATIC IDEALS

This chapter attempts to x-ray biographically and in an intellectual context Popper's thought and how he arrived at a balanced perspective. Obviously, there already exist many published materials on the biography of Popper. From Popper's *Unended Quest: An Intellectual Autobiography* (Popper 1974) to Malachi Haim Hacohen, who provided a very comprehensive account of the life and times of Popper in his *Karl Popper-The Formative Years 1902-1945* (2000), and from Jeremy Shearmur's *The Political Thought of Karl Popper* (1996), to series of expository and encyclopedic materials on the life, times and works of Popper. However, our task in the present chapter though similar to other works on Popper is unique and innovative; highlighting influences on him and his successes. Precisely, an elucidation of Popper's democratic ideals in order to proffer a good understanding of the tenets of liberalism and non-violent revolution than has hitherto been presented by other scholars is envisaged. The basic features are Popper's conception of democracy and the state, utopianism and socio-political change, Popper's liberalism, the non-violent approach-critical rationalism and piecemeal social engineering. Invariably, Popper's thought are conglomeration of both his philosophy of science and political philosophy. Therefore, the necessary balance in both can best be grasped by perusing Popper's biography and its context, and the sole ambition is on how Popper's democratic thoughts can so ameliorate the African predicament and usher in the much needed sustainable development in the continent in general and Nigeria in particular.

3.1. The Man: Karl Popper

Karl Popper who lived between 1902 and 1994 rejected the popular question which held sway in almost all the epoch of philosophy 'who should rule?' as the fundamental question of political theory, and replaced it with the new question: 'how can we so organize political institutions that bad or incompetent rulers can be prevented from doing too much damage?'[1] Fundamental to Popper's philosophy is the idea that criticism lies at the heart of rationality. Popper, out rightly esteemed open criticism of any idea and liberalism of thought. Invariably, Popper audaciously denounced the highly revered Republic of Plato (c.428-c. 348 BCE), declared David Hume (1711-1776) psychological explanation of the belief in induction unsatisfactory, attacked the ostensibly "scientific" interpretation of history of Karl Marx (1818-1883), terming it unscientific, questioned the scientific status of the theory of psychoanalysis of Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) and of the "individual psychology" of Alfred Adler (1870-1937), countered the verification principle of the Vienna Circle, reassessed the relativity theory of Albert Einstein (1879-1955) and also intellectually opposed the position of the logical empiricists. Popper proposed a paradigm shift in assessing the nature of science, cosmology and whether or not the world is deterministic, what probability entails, the meaning of quantum mechanics, and the qualities of freedom and security in an open society. It is unarguably that criticism is a basic concept of Popper's philosophy. Thus, for Popper, every element of human thinking and human practice should be open to criticism. However, Popper rejects utopianism but applauds the ability to dispatch an already established thought and to invent a bold new form of theoretical thought though with caution. More so, individuals and institutions must

always be open to non-violent reforms and these must be attempted slowly and through piecemeal social engineering.

For Popper, knowledge is hypothetical or conjectural.[2] Also, boldness and courage are significant to knowledge acquisition. Thus, "bold ideas, unjustified anticipations, and speculative thought, are our only means for interpreting nature: our only instrument, for grasping her".[3] However, the concept of courage is more demanding than that of boldness because courage infers settled conviction and established values. Whereas, an insecure person is not apt to act in ways that reflect settled conviction or established values.

Thus, Popper's democratic ideals with its liberalism and non-violent tendencies is an imperative option that will on one hand liberate the masses from the chains of bad governance and dictatorship, and also ameliorate the African predicament and usher in the much needed sustainable development in the continent in general and Nigeria in particular.

3.2 Karl Popper's Background

Karl Raimund Popper was born in Himmelhof, in the district of Vienna (then in Austria-Hungary) on 28th July 1902. Popper was the son of Siegmund Carl Popper who was a doctor of law at the University of Vienna.[4] Popper's mother, Jenny Schiff (1864-1938), came from a musical family, and was herself musical. Popper tells us that she played the piano beautifully; music had an important place in Popper's life.[5] Obviously, both parents, had great influence on him. So did the atmosphere of Vienna of the time. During Popper's early childhood, his parents were prosperous. They lived in a large apartment in an 18th century house in the centre of Vienna, where Popper's

father conducted his legal practice. Popper's father had an enormous library, which included many works of philosophy; books were everywhere, Popper tells us, except in the dining room, where stood a concert grand piano. The father, who was more of a scholar than a lawyer[6] translated the classics, greatly appreciated philosophy, and took a keen interest in social problems. He gave the young Karl numerous opportunities to channel his precocious intelligence; for example, "the portraits of Schopenhauer and Darwin hanging in his father's studio aroused in him a questioning curiosity, even before Karl learned to read."[7] More so, Karl's mother passed on to him such a passion for music that between 1920 and 1922 he seriously thought of taking it upon as a career. Even after this idea was abandoned, his love for music did not diminish and indeed was fundamental in the development of his philosophical thinking.[8] Corroborating on the background influences on Popper, Helfenbein and DeSalle posit that, "the time and place of Popper's birth (Vienna, 1902) may in some part be responsible for Popper's broad interests in music, politics, philosophy, and science."[9] Indeed, Popper grew up in an academic gingered and spiced environment which according to him "was decidedly bookish"[10] and in no mean measure shaped his academic and political prowess.

As a young boy, Popper was much concerned with the poverty he saw all around him in Vienna. In his *Intellectual Autobiography* (1975), Popper recounts that:

> The sight of abject poverty in Vienna was one of the main problems which agitated me when I was still a small child-so much that it was almost always at the back of my mind. Few people now living in one of the Western democracies know what poverty meant at the beginning of this century: men, women, and children suffering from hunger, cold and hopelessness. But we children could not help. We could do no more than ask for a few coppers to give to some poor people.[11]

Also, the events surrounding the First World War (1914-1918) had tremendous influence on the young Karl.

More so, during this period, he attended the local "Realgymnasium", where he was unhappy with the standards of the teaching. In his autobiography he wrote:

> In our famous Austrian secondary schools (called "Gymnasium" and horrible dictum "Realgymnasium") we were wasting our time shockingly… that much of their teaching was boring in the extreme hours and hours of hopeless torture was not new to me… There was just one subject in which we had an interesting and truly inspiring teacher. The subject was mathematics and the name of the Teacher was Philipp Freud.[12]

Popper left school at 16 because of the tedium of the classes, and enrolled at the University of Vienna in 1918. In 1919, Popper became attracted to Marxism and subsequently joined the Association of Socialist School Students. He also became a member of the Social Democratic Workers' Party of Austria, which was at that time a party that fully adopted the Marxist ideology.[13] Eventually, during the street battle in the Hörlgasse where communists organized a demonstration with the intention of freeing communists held in a police station in Vienna; the police opened fire, and some of the demonstrators were killed. Popper became disillusioned by what he saw to be the "pseudo-scientific" historical materialism of Marx, abandoned the ideology, and remained a supporter of social liberalism throughout his life. This led to the writing of his *The Open Society and Its Enemies* years later.

 Incidentally, Popper worked in street construction for a short amount of time, but was unable to cope with the heavy labour; he then tried his hand at cabinet making while continuing to attend university as a guest student, but was distracted by the intellectual problems that he was working on though he graduated as a journeyman. Popper also worked for the psychologist Adler, and as a social worker concerned with neglected children. In 1922, he finally joined the University as an ordinary student and completed

his examination as an elementary teacher in 1924. In 1925, he went to the newly founded Pedagogic Institute and continued studying philosophy and psychology, held informal seminars for fellow students, and duly became qualified to teach physics and mathematics in secondary schools in 1929. Around that time he started courting Josephine Anna Henninger (1906-1985), who later became his wife in 1930.[14] In 1928, he earned a doctorate in psychology, under the supervision of Bühler and Schlick and his dissertation was entitled "Die Methodenfrage der Denkpsychologie" (The question of method in cognitive psychology). Popper became a professional philosopher in 1937. He left Austria for New Zealand where he taught philosophy at Canterbury College, Christchurch between 1937 and 1945. And in 1946 subsequently after the Second World War, he left for England and began to teach in the London School of Economics where he later became a professor of Logic and The Methodology of Science in 1949, more so, he was knighted in 1965.[15] The following are Popper's major works:

1. *Logic de Forschung* (1935) – English translation

2. *Logic of Scientific Discovery* (1959)

3. *The Poverty of Historicism* (1944)

4. *The Open Society and its Enemies* (1945)

5. *Conjectures and Refutations* (1963)

6. *Objective Knowledge* (1972)

7. *Unended Quest: An Intellectual Autobiography* (1974)

8. (A joint work with Sir John Eccles) *The Self and its Brain* (1977)

9. *The Open Universe* (1982)

10. *Quantum Theory and the Schism in Physics* (1982)

11. *Realism and the Aim of Science* (1983)

Popper's reputation and stature as a philosopher of science and social thinker grew enormously until his death on 17th September, 1994 at the age of 91 years.[16]

3.3   His Scientific Inclination

Significantly, as at Popper's birth, the additive, individualistic view of science was the prevailing conception. However, these heroic times for science were not going to last. There began to emerge a new stage of science which called for "total-system models adequately reflecting the intricate interconnectedness of multilevel, multi-goal organisations in which positive and negative feedback processes give rise to alternative decision modes."[17] Remarkably, science is progressive in nature. As such, the heroic image of science was reconsidered by historians and philosophers as well as sociologists of science. Eventually all those interpreters of science got to think that science has in fact always been a profoundly social activity. Popper's lectures influenced Imre Lakatos (1922-1974), Paul Feyerabend (1924-1994), and John Watkins (1924-1999) who number amongst the most prominent philosophers of science in the twentieth century.

Invariably, the development of Popper's philosophy of science can be said to have come as a reaction to some of the doctrines of science upheld at that time. Although his views radically challenge many strands of thought in his time, his philosophy is still an offshoot of some of them. Popper's interest in the problem of induction was nourished in 1923 after reading the works of David Hume. Thus, in his *Conjectures and Refutations*, he writes:

> I approached the problem of induction through Hume. Hume, I felt was perfectly right in pointing out that induction cannot be validly justified …I find Hume's refutation of inductive inference as clear and conclusive. But I felt completely dissatisfied with his psychological explanation of induction in terms of custom and habit.[18]

Thus, Popper evaluated Hume's position in order to expose the problem created by Hume in his attempt to solve the problem of induction on one hand, and to propose a solution to the problem of induction on the other hand. For Popper, Hume's psychological explanation of induction is philosophically unsatisfactory because it is intended as a psychological theory rather than a philosophical one. In other words, Hume's casual explanation is an attempt to constantly conjoin ones believes in laws or regularities to custom and habit. Popper argued that habits rather than originating in repetition, begins before repetition can play its part. He summed it up that, "the idea of induction by repetition must be due to an error – a kind of optical illusion. In brief: there is no such thing as induction by repetition."[19]   At this point, Popper boldly declared that he had solved the problem of induction.[20]

Unlike many early positivists, Popper understood fully and completely that science is fallible. In 1935 he published a book titled *Logik der Forschung* (*The Logic of Scientific Discovery*) in German, which instantly entitled him to be one of the founders of the theory of scientific method. Also, shortly before submitting his Ph.D. dissertation, the focus of Popper's interest switched from the psychology to the methodology of thought and problem-solving, and in particular to the methodology of science[21], and subsequently in 1946, he became the first Professor of Philosophy of Science and Logic at the London School of Economics. In *The Logic of Scientific Discovery,* Popper proposes that any theorem and any theory should be verified, but the statements verifying them should be verified again. Though, however, we are likely going to run into either infinite regress or dogmatism in which the acceptance of unverified statements is a matter of belief or authority. This explains his rejection of inductive logic, because "it does not provide a suitable distinguishing mark of the empirical, non-metaphysical character of a theoretical system; or in other words, that it

does not provide a suitable "criterion of demarcation".[22] More so, of utmost interest to Popper is on how science can be demarcated from non-science (pseudo-science and metaphysics). In Popper's view, a pseudoscientific method may well appeal to observation and experimentation. For instance, astrology claims to possess overwhelming empirical evidence in its favour based on observation. Astrology claims to be about the empirical world. But because there is no potential to use experience to refute astrology, astrology fails to adhere to acceptable scientific standards.[23]   Thus, for Popper, in order to be scientific, a theory must be empirically falsifiable. Reassessing Freud's psychoanalysis and Adler's individual psychology, Popper opined that they had insulated their theories in such a way that made them answerable only to verification or confirmation. Thus, their theory could not possibly be refuted. The problem was not in the practitioners so much as in the theories themselves. For logical reasons to do with what these theories state, the stream of observations or confirmations that were supposed to verify these theories had no bearing on whether these theories are scientific. For, experience had never possessed the potential to falsify these theories.[24] He further illustrates this by two distinct forms of human behaviour: "that of a man who pushes a child into the water with the intention of drowning it; and that of a man who sacrifices his life in an attempt to save the child."[25]   From Freud's perspective, the first man would have suffered from psychological repression, probably originating from an Oedipus complex whereas the second had attained sublimation. Whereas from Adler's perspective, the first and second man suffered from feelings of inferiority and had to prove himself which drove him to commit the crime or, in the second case, rescue the child.[26]   Thus, the distinct feature of scientific knowledge does not reside in the objective laws of nature and society, nor in the ability to verify and

replicate the findings and suggested theories, but in the criticism of proposed theories and related concepts.

Falsifiability comes through critical discussion, a method in which particular situations are examined on the basis of trial and error. Einstein's theory, on the other hand, has testable elements in it so that it stands at risk of refutation. Popper made reference to Einstein's gravitational theory which Popper claimed predicted that "light must be attracted by heavy bodies (such as the sun); precisely as material bodies were attracted"[27] Following from this, stars closer to the sun would appear to have moved a small distance away from the sun, and away from each other. This prediction was particularly striking to Popper because it involved considerable risk. The brightness of the sun prevented this effect from being observed under normal circumstances, so photographs had to be taken during an eclipse and compared to photographs taken at night. Popper stated, "If observation shows that the predicted effect is definitely absent, then the theory is simply refuted."[28] To Popper, the scientific status of a theory depends on its falsifiability, refutability, or testability. More so, Popper insists that you sometimes cannot consider strictly in terms of logic alone whether a way of thinking is falsifiable. As such, Keuth notes that, "every universal statement is falsifiable"[29] since there are no monolithic, universal truths. Scientific statements are and should be falsifiable under specific conditions and circumstances.

Referring to himself as "an unorthodox Kantian"[30], Popper acknowledges the strong influence of Kant on himself as discernible both in Popper's idea of individual freedom and his socio-communitarian elements, and permeating all aspect of Popper's Philosophy; from science to politics. Commenting on individualism that Popper derived from Kantian ethics; that is, that the idea of a lawless free will, that is, a will acting

without any causal structure, is unintelligible, and consequently unacceptable. Therefore, a free will must be a will that acts under laws that it gives to itself [31], Anthony O'Hear maintains that, Kantian ethical individualism was a presupposition of Popper's *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*.[32]

Also adopted in a bid to balance up Popper's individualism with communitarianism is Kant's categorical imperative which denotes:

1. Act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law without contradiction.

2. Act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never merely as a means to an end, but always at the same time as an end.

3. Act as if [you] were through [your] maxim always a legislating member in the universal kingdom of ends.[33]

However, Kant's path between scepticism and dogmatism appeared to Popper much in need of reassessment. Moreover, Popper was more of a realist than Kant. Thus, he dismisses the Kantian distinction between 'phenomena' and 'noumena' as a mistake, and also was more thoroughly fallibilist than Kant.

The Vienna Circle, with the "logical positivism" or "logical empiricism" tradition is significant in the development of Popper's Philosophy of Science, though Popper is highly critical of and differs from the main tenets of the Circle. Invariably, Popper is referred to as, "an inner opponent of Vienna Circle."[34] The Vienna Circle frontiers were Moritz Schlick (1882-1936), Neurath, and Rudolph Carnap (1891-1970). Outstandingly, the verification principle as a criterion of meaningfulness defines the Vienna Circle view. Logical positivism sought to demarcate the meaningful from the meaningless, only those propositions capable of being verified being meaningful, the

hope being that all meaningful factual propositions would be scientific. Also, the logical empiricists had argued that science follows one and the same universal method across all its sub-disciplines and alone is meaningful. Any other kind of inquiry is meaningless, the logical empiricists insisted although, Carnap later changed his orientation from 'verification' to 'degree of confirmation', and Neurath later abandoned the conception that was normally presupposed, there can be basic or merely observational sentences or statements. Popper writes that "[…] positivists, in their anxiety to annihilate metaphysics, annihilate natural science along with it. For scientific laws, too, cannot be logically reduced to elementary statements of experience."[35] Popper understood fully and completely that science is fallible. Thus, he proposed a paradigm shift in the unity of method; that is, he gave up the idea of the foundations of science, and he claimed that scientific knowledge was always hypothetic. However, each theory can be tested, and in this way, they can be refuted. He states: "I shall not require of a scientific system that it shall be capable of being singled out, once and for all, in a positive sense; but I shall require that its logical form shall be such that it can be singled out, by means of empirical tests, in a negative sense: it must be possible for an empirical scientific system to be refuted by experience."[36] Moreso, according to Popper, a new theory, in order to be acceptable, "should proceed from some simple, new, and powerful, unifying idea about some connection or relation (such as gravitational attraction) between hitherto unconnected things (such as planets and apples) or facts (such as inertial and gravitational mass) or new "theoretical entities" (such as field and particles)."[37]

Invariably, the central idea in Popper's replacement of verification with falsification is not so as to explain differently the meaning of sentences but rather to demarcate science from pseudoscience. Thus, Popper used falsification as a criterion for demarcation to

52

distinguish the true scientific attitude from the unscientific. However, the pseudosciences are not meaningless despite the fact that they could be dogmatic rather than critical.

Thus, having dealt with the methodology of the natural sciences, Popper turned his attention again to what had long been of concern to him, politics and the philosophy of the social sciences. This marks the turning point in Popper.

3.4   The Turning Point in Popper

Significantly, the successes of Popper in philosophy of science and the widespread fixation of Popper's work on the field of philosophy of science has led to no small neglect of Popper's social doctrine. Invariably, "most commentators think of Popper and his intellectual legacy primarily in terms of his philosophy of science."[38] In rebuttal against the commonly held idea that Popper's work falls exclusively under philosophy of science, Popper in *The Economist* clarified the focus of his study, thus:

> By inclination and by choice, my fields of study are the natural sciences – physics and biology – and especially their methods. Yet I came to think seriously about [the] problems of our political and social responsibilities… in my sixteenth year…. In 1938 [a year after he migrated to New Zealand], when I heard the news that Hitler had invaded Austria, my homeland, I decided to write down some of my thoughts about political freedom.[39]

Popper had been privately highly critical of policies of socialists in Germany and Austria and this was due, in Popper's view, to the harmful influence of Marxism. Despite the fact that he was attracted to Marxism in 1919 [40], the reverse was the case subsequently. Also, he had kept these criticisms to himself until in March 1938 when Hitler occupied Austria, and Popper felt all grounds for restraint had disappeared. He decided to put his criticisms of Marxism, and his views on the social sciences, into a publishable form. Popper's major concern about Marxism is its violent revolutionary

stands. As an adherent of anti-revolution, Popper had earlier embraced the communist group with the promise of a better world; that is, a progressive social and political change which turn out to be mere propaganda, and an unrealistic tool in the hands of political office seekers. As such, he was appalled and flabbergasted by the radicalness and violence that accompanied Marxism.

Invariably, Popper set out on a progressive methodological conservatism, interlocking science and politics, which covers his democratic ideals and birthed *The Open Society and Its Enemies* (1945). Popper believed that:

> Science is our best kind of knowledge in the same way and for the same reasons that he believed that democracy is our best form of government. Both science and democracy try to influence opinions through rational discussion and without violence. Both science and democracy try to learn from their competitors instead of silencing them. Neither science nor democracy has always succeeded in achieving these goals. But, by historical facts, science and democracy has each succeeded with greater frequency than other forms of knowledge and government.[41]

The distinguishing variables for the success of science and democracy include, critical rationalism, non-violence, liberalism and piecemeal social engineering, among others. Popper criticised historicism and holism, but proffer an ideology which promotes both the freedom of the individual, as well as about public policy and the alleviation of suffering rather than promotion of happiness.[42] This explains his idea of negative utilitarianism: a public policy which aims to alleviate suffering for the greatest number of people than promoting happiness. Also, limited state intervention is proposed. The aim is for the state to fulfill its obligations to the citizenry by taking care of the wellbeing of the individual and the social public so as to ameliorate extreme inequality, which is what the social engineer ought to address. These ideas sums up Popper's democratic ideals which is a paradigm shift from the pre-occupation of the classical

political thought and its influences on scholars, philosophers and the society at large is of no mean significance. However, Popper's rejection of the popular question which held sway in political philosophy 'who should rule?' as the fundamental question of political theory, and replacing it with the new questions: 'how can we so organize political institution that bad leaders can be prevented from doing too much damage?'[43], and 'how is the state to be constituted so that bad leaders can be got rid of without bloodshed, without violence?'[44] sets the pace for a better understanding of what constitute Popper's democratic ideals and significant influences of his ideals on philosophers and the society at large.

3.5   Utopianism and Socio-Political Change

In politics, Popper condemned the method of redesigning society as a whole- Utopianism. That is, he rejected large-scale social reform, which often arises out of the claim that knowledge of the future course of history is possible. Popper emphasised openness of society. He argues that a fundamental problem confronting humanity is that of moving from a closed, tribal way of life to an open society. Popper distinguished two kinds of societies; the open society is based on critical discussion about such human pursuits as achievements, decisions, goals, and authority, whereas the closed society does not allow for social criticism, and may even exterminate individuals, their ideas, and properties. Popper believed that "it [open society] introduces a new and practical view of social methodology,"[45] which resists closed thoughts, structures and actions. Whereas, a closed society is characterised by abstract, repressive, uncontextualised, and disconnected truths, all of which lead to passivity, stagnation, misery, and monotony, the open society, by contrast, tolerates diversity of views, values and ways of life. In the open society learning through criticism is possible just because diverse views and values are tolerated.

Thus, the open society is the civilized society, in which individual freedom and responsibility, justice, democracy, humane values, reason and science can flourish. As such, an open society cherishes creativity and participation of all individuals. For Popper, historicism is a poor method, and is also dangerous to society.

He reiterates that:

> This is a brief description of an attitude which I call *historicism*. It is an old idea, or rather, a loosely connected set of ideas which have become, unfortunately, so much of our spiritual atmosphere that they are usually taken for granted, and hardly ever questioned. I have tried elsewhere to show that the historicist approach to the social sciences gives poor results. I have also tried to outline a method which, I believe, would yield better results.[46]

Popper's preoccupation was to reveal the connection between utopianism and historicism by exposing its essential danger and showing the inadequacies in the historicist ideology. He identifies those who are enemies of individual freedom and the open society as all champions of historicism, who reduce the task of social sciences to prophesying the events of social development. According to Popper:

> The two attitudes, historicism and social engineering, occur sometimes in typical combinations. The earliest and probably the most influential example of these is the social and political philosophy of Plato. It combines, as it were, some fairly obvious technological elements in the foreground, with a background dominated by an elaborate display of typical historicist features. The combination is a representative of quite a number of social and political philosophers who produced what have been later described as Utopian systems. All these systems recommend some kind of social engineering, since they demand the adoption of certain institutional means, though not always very realistic ones, for the achievement of their ends. But when we proceed to a consideration of these ends, then we frequently find that they are determined by historicism.[47]

Popper criticised historical determinism in Plato's republicanism, in G.W.F Hegel's philosophy of history, and in Karl Marx's historical materialism. Historicists regard society as a unified entity by methodological considerations, which is accessible in its totality, and that is why they make an effort for totally altering society. And this leads to radicalism and irrationalism. He refers to their thought as utopia in nature, and a characteristic of the closed society.

Buttressing his point, Popper in *The Poverty of Historicism* maintains that:

> Two characteristics representatives of this alliance are Plato and Marx. Plato, a pessimist, believed that all change- or almost all change- is decay; this was his law of historical development. Accordingly, his Utopian blueprint aims at arresting all change; it is what would nowadays be called 'static'. Marx, on the other hand, was an optimist, and possibly (like Spencer) an adherent of a historicist moral theory. Accordingly, his Utopian blueprint was one of a developing or 'dynamic' rather than of an arrested society. He predicted, and tried actively to further, a development culminating in an ideal Utopia that knows no political or economic coercion: the state has withered away, each person co-operates freely in accordance with his abilities, and all his needs are satisfied.[48]

Obviously, holists do not like to admit their mistakes; they would rather put down their opponents and other critics. As such, holism comes out with totalitarianism as reflected in the works of Aristotle, Plato, Hegel and Marx.[49]

Deeply disturbed by the democracy, and the beginnings of the open society, in contemporary Athens, Plato came to fear all social change as embodying decay and corruption. Plato turned these fears into an entire cosmology and social theory. He teaches that change is evil, and that rest is divine.[50] For Plato, the primary task for the rulers of society is to arrest all social change, and try to keep society resembling, as far

as possible, the ideal Forms of order, justice and the Good. Commenting on Plato's position, Maxwell maintains that:

> Plato's republic is a nightmarish totalitarian, closed society, rigidly ordered, individual liberty, freedom of expression and discussion, art, democracy and justice ruthlessly suppressed. But Plato presents all this with great subtlety, with a kind of twisted logic, so that ostensibly he is arguing for a just, wise and harmonious society, one of legal and moral perfection.[51]

More so, Aristotle modifies Plato's doctrine of the Forms and potentially transforms Plato's pessimistic historicism of inevitable decay into an optimistic historicism of social growth, development and progress. Aristotle understood an entity's essence as a bundle of potentialities that become manifest as the entity develops through time. For example, the oak tree is the final cause of an acorn, the end towards which it strives. Hegel, on the other hand, fully exploits Aristotelianism. Hegel's idea was to depict history as the process of Spirit, the Aristotelian essence and potentiality of the State and the Nation, striving to realize itself through war and world domination. According to Popper *(O.S.E.)*:

> Hegel's success was the beginning of the 'age of dishonesty' (as Schopenhauer described the period of German idealism) and of the 'age of irresponsibility' (as K. Heiden characterizes the age of modern totalitarianism); first of intellectual, and later, as one of its consequences, of moral irresponsibility, of a new age controlled by the magic of high sounding words, and by the power of jargon….The question arises whether Hegel deceived himself, hypnotized by his own inspiring jargon, or whether he boldly set out to deceive and bewitch others.[52]

Hegel depicted history as a kind of pseudo rational or logical dialectical process, thesis giving way to antithesis, which then results in synthesis. As such, his ideas does not give priority to individual liberty or democracy, but rather the triumph of the strongest State on the stage of history, its inner essence interpreted and directed by the Great

Leader by means of dictatorial power. Also, Hegelianism is the renaissance of tribalism. "The historical significance of Hegel may be seen in the fact he represents the 'missing link', as it were, between Plato and the modern form of totalitarianism."[53] Nevertheless, Hegelianism greatly dominated philosophical teaching and discourse, and influenced Karl Marx and other scholars. Popper identifies the rise of totalitarianism with Marxism, links it with fascism, and refers to it as the "purest form of historicism that has so far risen."[54] Popper acknowledges Marx's sincerity, his intellectual honesty, his hatred of moralizing verbiage and hypocrisy, his humanitarianism, his sense of facts and his sincere quest for the truth, his important contributions to historical studies and social science, his burning desire to help the oppressed. In spite of the praises, Popper refer to Marx as one of the most dangerous enemies of the open society, his thought disastrously corrupted by its Hegelian inheritance. He appraised Marx thus:

> He was a prophet of the course of history, and his prophecies did not come true; but this is not my main accusation. It is much more important that he misled scores of intelligent people into believing that historical prophecy is the scientific way of approaching social problems. Marx is responsible for the devastating influence of the historicist method of thought within the ranks of those who wish to advance the cause of the open society.[55]

For Popper, the most damaging feature of Marx's historicism have to do, perhaps, with the severe limitations that it places on the power of politics, on the capacity of people to solve social problems. Marx predicted that the flaws in capitalism would inevitably lead to a violent revolution followed by establishment of communist society. However, Popper argues that a number of elements of Marxist thought are of value, if not taken too far. There is the recognition and depiction of the appalling conditions of life of the poor in the unrestrained capitalist conditions of Marx's time, and the recognition, too, of the hypocrisy of much of the morality, the legal system and the politics of those times. Also, there is the idea that the social cannot be reduced to the psychological,

sociology not being reducible to psychology. Not left out is the thesis that much of history has been influenced by class struggle; conflict and tension between the employers and employees (the bourgeousie and the proletariat to use Marxian parlance), and the idea that the means of production, economic circumstances, play an important role in influencing the development of other aspects of social and cultural life, even something as apparently remote from economic conditions as mathematics.

Invariably, since many cannot bear the burden of freedom and doubt, and long for the false security and certainties of the closed society, Popper envisaged an alternative criterion of moral and political rationality that will bring about a reliable socio-political change as against the pursuits of totalitarianism. In redesigning and reconstructing social institutions, Popper proposed a functional method of small adjustments and re-adjustments always on the look-out for reverse or unintended effects. This is unlike the Utopian social engineering which seeks to attain an ideal social order, one in which all conflicts in social life are resolved and ultimate ends such as happiness, equality, freedom are fully realized by bringing about holistic changes and a radical overhauling of the existing society. Also when Popper argued that historicism was theoretically misleading and fundamentally dangerous, what he was saying is that historical predictions of social development have negative effects on proper social reform because they are similar to unfounded prophecies and revelations. Thus, Utopian engineering, though superficially attractive, is fatally flawed and it leads to multitudinous unintended and usually unwelcome consequences. Popper sums it up in *Poverty of Historicism* that, "The greater the holistic changes attempted, the greater are their unintended and largely unexpected repercussions, forcing on the holistic engineer the expedient of piecemeal improvisation or the notorious phenomenon of unplanned planning."[56] More so, it is not always the case that an idea that what was good in the past (conservatism), good in the present (positivism) would also be achieved as good in the future (futurism). Ironically, achieving utopian engineering naturally presupposes total power, thus, it tilts toward authoritarian dictatorship as witnessed in governance in

Nigeria and other African states. It is also characterized by concentration of power in the hands of the few, or even the one as witnessed in military regimes in Nigeria and other African states. Also, a utopian project that embraces democracy invariably tilt towards authoritarianism in order to achieve its end. Authoritarianism is one of the ills of governance in Nigeria as it encourages hostility to public criticism and freedom. Popper's concern with modern totalitarianism is that it is a perennial revolt against freedom and reason.

However, moving from the closed to the open society imposes a great psychological burden on the individuals involved, this is more or less 'the strain of civilization', and it is the price we have to pay for being human.[57] Instead of the security of the tribe, organic, dogmatic and devoid of doubt, there is all the uncertainty and insecurity of the open society, the painful necessity of taking personal responsibility for one's life in a state of ignorance, the lack of intimacy associated with the 'abstract society' in which individuals constantly rub shoulders with strangers. According to Popper, the revolutionary transition from closed to open society first occurred, with the "Great Generation" of ancient Athens (5th Century B.C.E). Those to be associated with the birth and affirmation of the open society include Pericles, Euripides, Antiphon, Hippias, Herodotus, Protagoras, Democritus, Alcidamas, Lycophron, Antisthenes and, above all, Socrates.[58] But reactionary forces were unnerved by the instability and rapid social change that an open society had unleashed. (Socrates was indicted on charges of corrupting the youth and introducing new gods.) They sought to turn back the clock and return Athens to a society marked by rigid class hierarchy, conformity to the customs of the tribe, and uncritical deference to authority and tradition—a "closed society."

3.6   Popper's Conception of Democracy and the State

The State and its thematic preoccupation is a primary concern of Popper's socio political thoughts. Thus, his understanding of the State and its moral obligation to her

citizens is a pointer to his political conceptualization of socio-political realities. According to Idike, the State is, "an association of persons permitting an orderly government, under a system of law, setting in a particular territory, enjoying territorial integrity and commanding sovereignty as a juristic personality."[59] For Esikot, "it is an organized political community within a clearly defined territory with coercive powers superior to any within it. States are characterized by the existence of a government, laws and people that dwell in it."[60] Invariably, the basic features of the state includes; association of persons, legality of power of coercion or sovereignty, geographical density of jurisdiction known as territorial integrity, and a juristic personality. Also, of the basic underlying elements of the state are the origin of the state and its purpose, and aims and objectives of the existence of the State.

Over the decades, the discourse on origin of the State; wither a natural entity existing on its own or an artificial creation by man, the necessity of the State, and the purpose of the State has been of major concern to political philosophers and thinkers. While Plato expound the organic theory which view the State as an actual individual; here, the State is more real than the individuals, who are members of it. Plato writes that:

> Our aim in founding the state was not the disproportionate happiness of any class, but the greatest happiness of the whole… and therefore we must consider whether in appointing our guardians we should look to their greatest happiness individually or whether this principle of happiness does not rather reside in the state as a whole…. And thus the whole state will grow up in a noble order, and the several classes will receive the proportion of happiness, which nature assigns them.[61]

Here, man is essentially a social and moral being who finds true happiness only within the State. The obligations of the State to the citizens are to educate them in order to liberate them from the shackles of ignorance. Aristotle and Aquinas on the other hand, see the State as a natural entity; that is, it grew naturally without an intention by men to

create same. Thus, Aristotle believed that the State is necessary for the fulfilment of man's desires, as such, it is in and through the State that man can realize himself. Most importantly for him, the primary objective of the State is the production of moral citizens. For Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Rousseau, the State is a child of a contract borne out of the deficiencies experienced in the State of nature. And for Marx, the State is a creation of the bourgeoisie in furthering its property rights, thus, it is an instrument of oppression.

Invariably, Popper argued vehemently against the essentialists and historicists questions such as, "what is the State, its true nature, its real meaning, and its origin"[62], rather, he opted for questions such as, "what do we demand from a State? What do we propose to consider as the legitimate aim of State activity? Why do we prefer living in a well-ordered State to living without a state, i.e. in anarchy?"[63] Popper sees the State as a "necessary evil." As such, its powers are not to be multiplied beyond what is necessary.[64] This Popperian position as a principle is referred to as a "Liberal Razor" analogous to Ockham's Razor, i.e. the famous principle that entities or essences must not be multiplied beyond what is necessary. It is obvious that Popper acknowledges the necessity of the existence of the State, and sees the essence of the State as the protection of lives, rights and property.

He sums it up thus:

> What I demand from the state is protection; not only for myself, but for others too. I demand protection for my own freedom and for others too. I demand protection for my freedom and for other people's. I do not wish to live at the mercy of anybody who has the larger fists or the bigger guns. In other words, I wish to be protected against aggression from other men. I want the difference between aggression and defence to be recognized, and defence to be supported by the organized power of the state.[65]

Thus, Popper refers to his view of the State as 'protectionism'. While he acknowledged that the term 'protectionism' has been deployed in different discipline and sphere of life and its meaning varies correspondingly, he differentiated between his view and others thus:

> The economist means by protectionism the policy of protecting certain industrial interests against competition; and the moralist means by it the demand that officers of the state shall establish a moral tutelage over the population. Although the political theory which I call protectionism is not connected with any of these tendencies, and although it is fundamentally a liberal theory, I think that the name may be used to indicate that, though liberal, it has nothing to do with the policy of strict non-intervention.[66]

Popper's view is free from any elements of historicism and essentialism, and it places the fundamental task of the State as simply preventing crime and protecting the weak from being bullied by the strong, as against the 'natural' rights of the stronger. As such, Popper makes a case for the model of governance which will ensure the fulfillment of the protectionist mandate of the State -'democracy'.

Popper provided his own account of the values and institutions needed to sustain an open society in the contemporary world. He viewed modern Western liberal democracies as open societies and defended them as "the best of all political worlds of whose existence we have any historical knowledge."[67] For Popper, there are two main types of government. First is a government which the masses can get rid of without bloodshed; that is, by way of general elections, the social institutions provide means by which the rulers may be dismissed by the ruled, and the social traditions ensure that these institutions will not easily be destroyed by those who are in power. Second is a

government which the ruled cannot get rid of except by way of a successful revolution.[68] Buttressing his point, Popper holds that:

> The theory of democracy is not based upon the principles that majority should rule; rather, the various equalitarian methods of democratic controls, such as general elections and representative government, are to be considered as no more than well-tried and , in the presence of a widespread traditional distrust of tyranny, reasonably effective institutional safeguards against tyranny, always open to improvement.[69]

Thus, the value of a government resides principally in the individual freedom that they permit and their ability to self-correct peacefully over time. As such, the first type of government is referred to as democracy, and tyranny for the second type. It follows that the central demarcation criterion for differentiating the two main types of political regimes – democracies and tyrannies – is that the former offers the institutional possibility to dismiss a government without resorting to violence as a mode of conflict resolution.

Invariably, Popper advanced a paradigm shift in the approach to the problem of politics. For him, our fundamental obligation as citizens is, "How can we so organize political institutions that bad or incompetent rulers can be prevented from doing too much damage?"[70] Thus, he made a case for institutionalisation of the political system which creates room for a regular medium of getting rid of bad rulers without violent and blood shed, by voting them out of office. Also for him, it is not enough to establish democratic institutions, for if there are no ones who use them as democrats, there will

remain the appearance of democracy or nothing of that. Institutionalisation, according to Popper, can only be achieved through democracy. Popper sums it up that:

> Democracy provides the institutional framework for the reform of political institutions. It makes possible the reform of institutions without using violence, and thereby the use of reason in the designing of new institutions and the adjusting of old ones.[71]

Popper argued against the "essentialists" notion of democracy as 'the rule by the people'. For him, "although 'the people' may influence the actions of their rulers by threats of dismissal, they never rule themselves in any concrete practical sense."[72] Yet, Popper situates the political power in the citizenry. As such, he insists that, "it is quite wrong to blame democracy for the political shortcomings of a democratic state. We should rather blame ourselves, that is to say, the citizens of the democratic State."[73] This is premised on the fact that democratic institutions cannot improve themselves, and the challenge of improving them is a problem for persons rather than for institutions. Invariably, this explains who and what is responsible for the successes or failure of democratic State – the citizens. Also, the basic role of the citizens is simply to strengthen institutional control of power by providing a regular and nonviolent way to get rid of incompetent, corrupt or abusive leaders.

More so, Popper emphasized the importance of instituting checks and balances into the political system. For him, democracies must seek "institutional control of the rulers by balancing their power against other powers."[74] Yet, if the State is to fulfill its function, it must have more power at any rate than any single private citizen or public corporation; and although we might design institutions to minimize, the danger that these powers will be misused, Popper observed that we can never eliminate the danger completely. Thus, checks and balances will ensure fairness, equity and accountability,

and will further ensure the avoidance of absolute power and unrestrained political power which are characteristics of tyrannical government. Stressing the importance of traditions as mediation between institutions, on the one hand, and the intentions and valuations expressed by the individual on the other, Popper reiterates that democracy is certainly not infallible, it's "traditions are the least evil ones of which we know."[75]

Significantly, Popper considered the two-party system as most preferable in juxtaposition with other political models. He further argued that two-party systems, such as found in the United States and Great Britain, are superior to proportional representation systems; he reasoned that in a two-party system voters are more easily able to assign failure or credit to a particular political party; that is, the one in power at the time of an election. This in turn encourages the much needed opposition and fosters self-criticism in the defeated party: "Under such a system … parties are from time to time forced to learn from their mistakes."[76] For these reasons, government in a two-party system better mirrors the trial-and-error process found in science, leading to better public policy. Also, the existence of responsible opposition will ensure the exposure of incompetency and windbaggeryness of the political party in the helms of affairs contrary to proportional representation systems which typically produce multiple parties and coalitional governments in which no single party has control of the government. This makes it difficult for voters to assign responsibility for public policy and thus elections are less meaningful and government less responsive.

However, Popper explicitly rejected *vox populi vox dei* as a "classical myth", but reiterated the need for democratic traditions - laws. "We are democrats," Popper wrote, "not because the majority is always right, but because democratic traditions are the least evil ones of which we know."[77] He insists that, "no liberal utopia can design a

state from scratch; tradition is always required to move from abstract principles to the solution of concrete cases."[78] Thus, Popper envisaged the necessity of Laws; written and unwritten custom that has established itself through everyday practice, that is, a constitution guiding a democratic system. This is sequel to the fact that, "institutions alone are never sufficient if not tempered by traditions. Institutions are always ambivalent in the sense that, in the absence of a strong tradition, they also may serve the opposition purpose to the one intended."[79] As such, laws or a constitution in a democratic society is to guide against the possibility of anti-democratic tendencies latent among the ruled as well as among the rulers[80], and of a democratic process with a majority of popular votes going in favour of tyranny or bad ruler. Laws are therefore needed to safeguard institutions, thereby safeguarding democracy. Popper cautions that, "if democracy is destroyed, all rights are destroyed."[80] For him, democracy creates effective mechanisms for peaceful deposal of leaders, peaceful changes, solving conflicts, and persuading the opponents. Thus, the culture of critical reasoning and incremental but non-violence change are indispensable components of democracy. More so, there is indeed, a clarion call on citizens of a state to prioritise the preservation of the principles of democracy by shunning acts that may thwart efforts already made to establish and protect democracy. Thus, Popper sums up that:

> If the preservation of democracy is not made the first consideration in any particular battle fought out on this battle-ground, then the latent anti-democratic tendencies which are always present may bring about a breakdown of democracy. If an understanding of these principles is not yet developed, its development must be fought for. The opposite policy may prove fatal; it may bring about the loss of the most important battle, the battle for democracy itself.[81]

3. 7   Popper's democratic ideals

These are founded on liberalism, critical rationalism, non-violence and piecemeal social engineering aims at ensuring separation of power, free speech and open discourse, public control over governmental institutions and of human dignity. Popper's desire is that democracy as a system should help the people to prevent the damage brought about by bad rulers in politics by peaceful changes. It follows, that such ideals will equally prevent dictatorship, absolute rule or sit-tight syndrome that has been the bane of African politics on one hand, and ensure powerful and focused democracy based solely on the will of the citizenry on the other hand.

3. 7. 1 Popper's Liberalism

Popper's argument for a free and democratic society apparently anchors in a particular epistemology and understanding of the scientific method. He held that all knowledge, including knowledge of the social world, was conjectural and that freedom and social progress ultimately depended upon the scientific method, which is merely a refined and institutionalized process of trial and error. He emphasised on the importance of basic individual liberties granted by political liberalism as a foundation for a democratic state. Thus, liberal democracies both embodied and fostered this understanding of knowledge and science. According to Popper, "liberalism is based upon the dualism of facts and standards in the sense that it believes in searching for ever better standards, especially in the field of politics and legislation."[82] Here, formal equality of citizens (nondiscrimination), free discussion, the right of assembly, essential institutions for organizing a government's dismissal without violence, minority rights, which should not be subject of popular decisions amongst others are feasible. This latter emphasis on the importance on individual liberties and minority rights is due to Popper's efforts to

resolve the traditional tension between democratic procedures, i.e. majority voting, and personal freedom.[83] As such, the need for preservation of freedom in a democratic society is of great importance, since, democracy is an instrument that does not work if society that runs the system, each citizen does not evaluate properly freedom, tolerance. Thus, Levy asserts that, Popper's concept of freedom is an attempt to discover the conditions under which external constraints upon the individual can be minimized.[84]

Popper's libertarianism rests mainly on his emphasis on freedom and his hostility to large-scale central planning. He insisted that freedom—understood as individual freedom—is the most important political value and that efforts to impose equality can lead to tyranny. "Freedom is more important than equality," he wrote, and "the attempt to realize equality endangers freedom."[85] At this juncture, it is pertinent to ask, is there unlimited freedom? If no, what are the limitations? While the liberal principle of individual freedom presupposes the ability of the individual in an open society to make significant personal decisions within a social universe of choices that are free from the pervasive atmosphere of taboos characteristic of archaic as well as totalitarian societies.[86] Popper argued that, "freedom, we have seen, defeat itself, if it is not limited. Unlimited freedom means that a strong man is free to bully one who is weak and to rob him of his freedom."[87] Thus, the fact that freedom consists in not being prevented by other persons from doing whatever one desires to do, and that one is free to the degree that one is not prevented by another from doing what ones desires to do does not imply constituting obstacles to another's pursuits, interests or desires. For instance, Popper provides a valid analogy; 'should we prevent a pianist from practicing, or prevent his neighbour from enjoying a quiet afternoon'? Both instances of prevention engender a feeling of frustration; the extent to which both of them (the pianist and the neighbour) experience this as an obstacle to attaining satisfaction or as contrary to what they both

desire or want to do. As such, Popper insist, that there is an *a priori* principle in real life which demands limitations to the freedom of each individual and how it can be minimized and made equally applicable as much as possible.[88] This principle is an appeal to existing traditions and customs, to a traditional sense of justice and, above all, to a 'moral framework' (corresponding to the institutional 'legal framework') of a society. This moral framework serves as the basis which makes it possible to reach a fair or equitable compromise between conflicting interests where this is necessary, such as the case of the pianist and the neighbour .[89] Popper, reiterating the necessity for limitations to individual freedom, holds that, "this is why we demand that the state should limit freedom to a certain extent, so that everyone's freedom is protected by the law. Nobody should be at the mercy of others, but all should have a right to be protected by the state."[90] Invariably, there is a clarion call for individuals to come to terms with the fact that their freedom is indeed limited by a concern for the reasonable freedom of others that is effectively codified by morality. Thus, Popper makes a case for tolerance and the respect for individual's dignity. Sheamur and Turner rightly puts it that, for Popper, the idea of tolerance is the seed out of which grew the idea of respect for human freedom and convictions, and thus, the idea of the dignity of all men.[91] Also, in ensuring freedom and tolerance as the liberal values of an open society, Popper averred that even if we guarantee individual freedom to all those who are prepared to reciprocate, we must not include in this guarantee those who seriously propagate intolerance.[92] He maintains that:

> Unlimited tolerance must lead to the disappearance of tolerance. If we extend unlimited tolerance even to those who are intolerant; if we are not prepared to defend a tolerant society against the onslaught of the intolerant, then the tolerant will be destroyed, and tolerance with them.[93]

It follows that; intolerance should not be tolerated in a democratic society because unlimited tolerance is antithetical to the exercise of freedom. Buttressing this point, Popper gave an analogy of the hooligan who protested that, being a free citizen, he could move his fist in any direction he liked, whereupon the judge wisely replied: 'The freedom of movement of your fists is limited by the position of your neighbour's nose.'[94] This answers the question of where freedom ends and crime begins. Popper states categorically that, "in a democracy, the full protection of minorities should not extend to those who violate the law, and especially not to those who incite others to the violent overthrow of the democracy."[95] This point justifies, for instance, a government action against a group or groups of individuals who in their pursuit of individual rights through violent agitations, infringe on the rights of other individuals, as witnessed in ethnic and religious uprising in Nigeria and other African states. It also rejects military intervention in democracy and governance as witnessed in series of coups and counter coups in the Nigerian and other African states. Since no responsible state would tolerate such nefarious activities even if a case of an exercise of individual freedom is established, a state must ensure that a tolerant society is defended. Popper asserts thus:

> I am perfectly ready to see my own freedom of action somewhat curtailed by the state, provided I can obtain protection of that freedom which remains, since I know that some limitations of my freedom are necessary; for instance, I must give up my 'freedom' to attack, if I want the state to support defense against any attack. But I demand that the fundamental purpose of the state should not be lost sight of; I mean, the protection of that freedom which does not harm other citizens. Thus I demand that the state must limit the freedom of the citizens as equally as possible, and not beyond what is necessary for achieving an equal limitation of freedom.[96]

It follows that there is no obligation on the part of the tolerant to tolerate the intolerant. Invariably, individuals must respect the rights and dignity of others and voluntarily submit to the state. This suggests that it is within the purview of the state to determine

the extent to which an individual is able to tolerate the intolerant. The theoretical supposition determining the extent to which the tolerant should go before they can decide to take up arms against anyone regarded as intolerant is what Popper sought to address through the establishment of legal institutions of the state that would implement the necessary laws for the protection of the individual. Liberal tolerance makes possible cooperative action within a democratic society despite variance in substantive ethical values and commitment, tribe, religion, and overall world-view. It aims at fostering unity in diversity especially in heterogeneous society like Nigeria. Thus, Popper summed up that, "liberalism and state-interference are not opposed to each other. On the contrary, any kind of freedom is clearly impossible unless it is guaranteed by the state."[97]

Significantly, Popper insists on the need for the state to educate its people so that they can know their rights and obligations, safeguard their freedom, and fulfil their potentials. According to Popper:

> A certain amount of state control in education, for instance, is necessary, if the young are to be protected against neglect which would make them unable to defend their freedom, and the state should see that all educational facilities are available to everybody.[98]

Obviously, the importance of education to all and sundry need not be overemphasized. It is a truism that a major factor militating against good followership in our society is ignorance and illiteracy. Failure of the citizenry to know what constitute rights, obligations, priviledges, and goodwill has led to lack of accountability by those in helm of affairs of the institutions of the state, and above all, failed leadership. As such, he urges the state to make the education of her citizens free, accessible and mandatory[99] in order to awaken self-realization, self-criticism, critical thought, and to ensure a better future of democracy and the state; since the future of state depends on the younger

generation, and self-awareness will lead to the defense of liberty and a democratic state. However, Popper is against authoritative educational policy, such which attempts to use the apparatus of the state to foist dogmas on the citizenry rather than encouraging independent or critical thought. Invariably, he cautions that, "too much state control in educational matters is a fatal danger to freedom, since it must lead to indoctrination."[100]

More so, for Popper there exists no pure liberalism devoid of any habitual aspects and traditional idiosyncrasies; "the existing democratic states, though far from perfect, represent a considerable achievement."[101] and leads him to emphasize, that liberalism is an evolutionary rather than a revolutionary creed[102], something that is to be developed rather than planned or constructed.

Popper posits thus:

> Are we to believe that politics, or the framework of legal institutions, are intrinsically impotent to remedy such a situation, and that only a complete social revolution, a complete change of the 'social system', can help? Or are we to believe the defenders of an unrestrained 'capitalist' system who emphasize (rightly, I think) the tremendous benefit to be derived from the mechanism of free markets, and who conclude from this that truly a free labour market would be of the greatest benefit to all concerned?[103]

Invariably, Popper acknowledges 'the tremendous benefit to be derived from the mechanism of free markets', he seemed to regard economic freedom as important mainly for its instrumental role in producing wealth rather than as an important end in itself. As such, he argues against centralized large scale planning; that such a society is not marked by rational intellectualism and democratic transformations. Also, it is a society that does not promote freedom, human rights, justice, free-market economy and accountability, and it is closed to freedom of thought, and its institutional systems are often totalitarian.

According to Popper:

> I believe that a free market-economy is more efficient than a centrally planned economy. Yet I hold that it is wrong to base the rejection of tyranny on economic arguments. Even if it were true that a centrally planned state economy is superior to that of the free market, I should oppose the centrally planned economy. I should oppose it because of the likelihood that it would increase the power of the state to the point of tyranny. It is not the inefficiency of communism against which we should fight, but its inhumanity and its inherent hostility to liberty. We should not sell our freedom for a mess of pottage, or for the promise that we shall obtain the highest possible productivity and efficiency — not even if we could be sure that we can purchase efficiency at the price of liberty.[104]

While centralised large scale planning is characterised by unlimited economic power, autocratic rule and government controlled structures, people are indirectly forced against their will to respect this monopoly, and it also nurtures servitude between those who possess surplus and those starving. Such practices are common among totalitarian governments. Thriving here is suppression of the views of, participation of, and potential critical feedback from the populace. There is definitely an absence of personal freedom and of possibilities for citizens to express and determine their wishes and aspirations. Thus, Popper warns of the dangers of unbridled capitalism, even declaring that "the injustice and inhumanity of the unrestrained 'capitalist system' described by Marx cannot be questioned; but it can be interpreted."[105] The state therefore must serve as a counteracting force against the predations of concentrated economic power: "we must construct social institutions, enforced by the power of the state, for the protection of the economically weak from the economically strong."[106] The dire need for state to assume interventionist role in the political, social and economic system is premised on the importance of safeguarding the freedom of all its citizens.

Buttressing this point, Popper reiterates that:

> The principle of non-intervention, of an unrestrained economic system, has to be given up; if we wish freedom to be safeguarded, then we must demand that the policy of unlimited economic freedom be replaced by the planned economic intervention of the state. We must demand that unrestrained capitalism give way to an economic interventionism.[107]

Invariably, the protection of the freedom of the masses is sine qua non to the existence of a democratic state, thus, it cannot be traded for materialism.

Moreover, by combining the normative approach to political philosophy with his conception of liberalism, Popper finally arrives at the viewpoint of *political liberalism.* Strongly tied to this approach are the ideas of division of power, of free speech and open discourse, of public control over governmental institutions and of human dignity, which points to the importance of extensive minority rights. This leads Popper to the postulate that the people should be able to 'dismiss' their government by means of the institutional political setting, that is, without the use of force. This last aspect is to be seen as the foundational stone of his conception of democracy. Popper sums up that:

> Democracy, the right of the people to judge and to dismiss their government, is the only known device by which we can try to protect ourselves against the misuse of political power; it is the control of the rulers by the ruled. And since political power can control economic power, political democracy is also the only means for the control of economic power by the ruled. Without democratic control, there can be no earthly reason why any government should not use its political and economic power for purposes very different from the protection of the freedom of its citizens.[108]

Invariably, Popper argued against leaving the freedom of the masses or placing their freedom at the mercy of economic power; 'economic democracy'. Giving priority to 'money power' rather than freedom and human dignity is the bane of corruption, failed leadership, failed followership, and unprecedented looting of the commonwealth as

witnessed in Nigeria and other African state which has thwarted the development of the states and the ultimate realization of the potentials of its citizens. Not left out, Popper's liberalism considers the state, especially increase in state power and monopoly of force, as an ambivalent institution, a "necessary evil," which represents a precondition of as well as a danger to individual freedom. He cautions that:

> Interventionism is therefore extremely dangerous. This is not a decisive argument against it; state power must always remain a dangerous though necessary evil. But it should be a warning that if we relax our watchfulness, and if we do not strengthen our democratic institutions while giving more power to the state by interventionist 'planning', then we may lose our freedom. And if freedom is lost, everything is lost, including 'planning'. For why should plans for the welfare of the people be carried out if the people have no power to enforce them? Only freedom can make security secure.[109]

The necessity for state intervention to be limited to what is mostly necessary for the protection of freedom is an established fact. Institutions must be design to control the rulers, check and minimize the danger of misusing of power. Also, change of government without bloodshed should be feasible, while public opinion and the institutions that influence it (universities, the press, political parties, cinema, television, and so forth) should become more rational overtime by embracing the scientific tradition of critical discussion—that is, the willingness to submit one's ideas to public criticism and habit of listening to another person's point of view. Thus, Popper's liberalism addresses the question of democracy, the role of reforms, the importance of the modification of existing institutions and the necessity of attachment to certain beneficial cultural traditions or moral standards.

3. 7. 2 The Non-Violent Approach – Critical Rationalism

Popper's notion of openness to mutual criticism is of great practical importance in the political sphere. It's a truism that we all need criticism, in respect of virtually everything we do. Popper gives his views on violence and how it can be controlled. He considers 'reason' as the most effective vehicle that can be used to combat violence. According to him reason, "... is the precise opposite of an instrument of power and violence: he sees it as a means whereby these may be tamed."[110] As such, Popper warned against the classical myth, *vox populi vox dei,* which attributes to the voice of the people a kind of final authority and unlimited wisdom.[111]   He equates it with:

> Faith in the ultimate commonsense rightness of that mythical figure, 'the man in the street', his vote, his voice….They may be right, or they may be wrong. 'The voice' may be very firm on very doubtful issues. And it may waver on issues over which there is hardly room for doubt.it may be well-intentioned but imprudent. Or it may be neither well-intentioned nor very prudent.[112]

Public opinion could emanate from misinformation and ambiguity in happenings within the state. Its mistakes will rebound upon the public who held the mistaken opinion. It could wreck a state or marred democratic processes if not properly managed. Thus, Popper refers to 'public opinion' as "an irresponsible form of power"[113] since it can even decides in favour of tyranny. However, he does not discard public opinion, rather, he applauds the foundational doctrine of *vox populi* that "truth is manifest."[114] It follows that despite the attempt at suppressing truth, it will eventually let itself known, and equally reign out rightly. Thus, Popper identifies rationality as a nitty-gritty of truth as against "the Hegelian doctrine of the cunning of reason which uses our passions as instruments for the instinctive or intuitive grasp of truth; and which makes it impossible for the people to be wrong, especially if they follow their passions rather than their reason."[115]

More so, Popper is skeptical of any kind of 'societal elites', which has its roots in his critique of Plato's political views. He denies the alleged superiority of societal elites and speaks of a 'myth of the elite'.[116] Popper stated more specifically that:

> The platonic idea of the rule of the 'wise' or the 'best' is to be rejected from my point of view. The crucial question is, who decides about the presence or absence of 'wisedom'? Have not the 'wise' and 'best' been crucified – by those, who were deemed to be wise and smart? […] Perceived as a practical political question the problem of the elite is hopeless. Elite and clique are practically indistinguishable. Popper conceives the very idea of an elite as suspicious.[117]

Obviously, power is a delicate concept, whose distribution should be subject to transparent institutional rues instead of informal agreements based on invalid reasoning. Thus the possibility of the fact that the elites may acquire greater amounts of power than other people is constitutive of his skepticism. Invariably, the Popperian imperative in this context is not to construct, not to acknowledge and not to privilege any kinds of societal elites, be in the realm of philosophy, science or politics. Popper reiterates the need for the tradition of rational discussion since it creates the habit of listening to another's point of view; the readiness to compromise, the growth of a sense of justice, and the tradition of government by discussion rather than violence. He acknowledges that he is one amongst the people, "who hate violence and are convinced that it is one of their foremost and at the same time one of their most hopeful tasks to work for its reduction and ... for its elimination from human life."[118]

Significantly, Popper sees criticism or the critical rationalism as a fundamental value and characteristics of democracy. For him, the distinguishing feature of a good system of government is that it should be open to criticism. No system is capable of doing everything right, so no system should have too much power.[119] Also, "democrats who do not see the difference between a friendly and hostile criticism of democracy are

themselves imbued with the totalitarian spirit."[120] Invariably, since no system is capable of doing everything right, social conflict is inevitable. For Popper, the two major cause of conflict are the difference of opinions and difference of interests, both of which needs to be settled down lest it may cause an 'intolerable strain'. Thus he maintains that, "there are many kinds of disagreement in social life which must be decided one way or another. How can a decision be reached? There are, in the main, only two possible ways: argument and violence."[121] Since conflicts are unavoidable and can only be resolved in these two ways, what measures should be adopted by the state in resolving conflict? Is it desirable to attach a monopoly of force to the state in order to provide citizens with the possibility to engage in non-violent conflict-resolution or rather allow violence to thrive? At what point is violence justified?

Obviously, the best way to tame force is to attach it to a democratic institutional structure (a state), while the best way to tame power is to design institutions, which allow for political change. This argument also provides a coherent answer to the "puzzle of modern constitutionalism", which asks for the reason why we treat "some collective decisions as binding on other collective decisions."[122] Here the argument is that those elements, which ensure the possibility of political change and societal transformation, are constitutive for any democratic conduct and, thus, are to be treated as binding. Effective criticism is more desirable, because most fruitful, are those of government, because these are the ones that are put into practice on the largest scale, and with the most powerful backing, and with the greatest effect on peoples' lives.[123] Indeed, Popper develops an argument for the 'rational unity of mankind', according to which we are all considered to be of value, and to be equal in our rationality, because of our role as sources of possible criticism. Criticism is the most effective agent of desirable change. He reiterates the necessity of rationality in conflict resolution in a

democratic state, and insists that, "if things cannot be improved by the use of reason, then it would be indeed an historical or political miracle if the irrational powers of history by themselves were to produce a better and more rational world."[124] It follows that rationality is an attitude that accepts critics.

More so, Popper assigns certain qualities that together make up the personality of a rationalist. He defines a rationalist as, "... a man who attempts to reach decisions by argument and perhaps, in certain cases, by compromise rather than by violence."[125] A reasonable man according to him is not only the one who can persuade others but rather should have the merit to be convinced by others too. It is for Popper an attitude of 'give and take'. A rationalist attitude needs to have what he refers to as 'intellectual humility' where one is humble enough to accept his own mistakes.

Invariably, to choose rationality is therefore a moral choice, and the precondition of rationalist attitude is to admit that:

> I may be wrong and you may be right, and by an effort, we may get nearer to the truth. It is an attitude which does not lightly give up hope that even where people demands and their interest clash, it is often possible to argue about the various demands and proposals, and to reach – perhaps by arbitration – a compromise which, because of its equality, is acceptable to most, if not to all. In short, rationalist attitude, or, as I may perhaps label it, the attitude of reasonableness is very similar to [...] the belief that in search for truth we need cooperation, and that, with help of argument, we can in time attain something like objectivity.[126]

Thus, Popper argues in favour of attaching a monopoly of force to the state in order to provide citizens with the possibility to engage in non-violent conflict-resolution. For him, "democracy provides an invaluable battle-ground for any reasonable reform, since it permits reform without violence"[127], as such, "if the state is to fulfill its function, it

must have more power at any rate than any single private citizen or public corporation."[128] However, force is perceived as an inevitable element of social life, which cannot be eliminated but must be restrained as far as possible. Therefore, institutions must be designed to minimize the danger of possible abuse of monopoly of force in the state. Also, Popper emphasizes the attitude of reasonableness. And the presumption of this behaviour is cooperation, that is, to practice tolerance and to endure critics. Also, one needs to hear from both sides, should be free of bias or authoritarian attitude to cope with violence. He states that, "I believe that we can avoid violence only in so far as we practice this attitude of reasonableness when dealing with one another in social life; and that any other attitude is likely to produce violence...."[129] A rationalist needs to have a clear distinction between resistance or defense and aggression. He should know the limits of tolerance. Equivocally, this is the Popperian tolerance which admonishes keeping up against those who break the rules.

He maintains that:

> You cannot have a rational discussion with a man who prefers shooting you to being convinced by you. In other words, there are limits to the attitude of reasonableness. It is the same with tolerance. You must not, without qualification, accept the principle of tolerating all those who are intolerant; if you do, you will destroy not only yourself, but also the attitude of tolerance.[130]

Rational attitude readily embraces cooperation, always ready to learn from trial and errors, gradual discovery of prejudice but expects the other person to do the same. Popper sees intolerance as the limit of tolerance; "if we concede to intolerance the right to be tolerated, then we destroy tolerance, and the constitutional state. That was the fate

of the Weimar Republic."[131] That is to say, rational people must resist hostile behaviour and unfairness since intolerance eventually leads to anarchy, to unlawfulness; and to the rule of violence. However, Popper gives stringent reasons why a bit of violence could be justified within the state, even though he whole heartedly considers "violent revolution as the most harmful element in Marxism."[132] For him, the acceptance of a state's monopoly on force clings – again – to its institutional setting: If it is not democratic or in danger of losing its democratic character the application of force by the individual might be legitimate or even morally obliging.[133]

Popper corroborates his summation thus:

> I am not in all cases and under all circumstances against a violent revolution. I believe with some medieval and Renaissance Christian thinkers who taught the admissibility of tyrannicide that there may indeed, under a tyranny, be no other possibility, and that a violent revolution may be justified. But I also believe that any such revolution should have as its only aim the establishment of a democracy; and by a democracy I do not mean something vague as 'the rule of the people' or 'the rule of the majority', but a set of institutions (among them especially general elections, i.e. the right of the people to dismiss their government) which permit public control of the rulers and their dismissal by the ruled, and which make it possible for the ruled to obtain reforms without using violence, even against the will of the rulers.[134]

Here, the justification of the use of violence is premised on upturning a tyrannical regime; that is, a regime which makes reform without violence impossible. Also, the aim must be that of instituting and sustaining a state of affairs which makes reforms without violence possible. Popper cautions that attempting to achieve more than the establishment of a state that embraces critical rationalism rather than violence is self-

destructive and counter-productive, since "such an attempt involve the risk of destroying all prospects of reasonable reform."[135] More so, excessive and prolonged use of violence may subsequently lead to loss of freedom, abuse of reason and the enthronement of another tyranny. This has been the case of Nigeria and other African states. From the first coup, which brought about military intervention in politics to subsequent counter coups which bolded the dotted ethnic lines and further plunged the Nigerian state further into ethnic chauvinism.

Furthermore, Popper justifies the use of violence in the state thus:

> I mean the resistance, once democracy has been attained, to any attack (whether from within or without the state) against the democratic constitution and the use of democratic methods. Any such attack, especially if it comes from the government in power, or if it is tolerated by it, should be resisted by all loyal citizens, even to the use of violence.[136]

Apparently, it is anti-democratic for a government to attempt to misuse its powers or tilt towards tyranny; either by tolerating the establishment of tyranny by others or doing so itself. Such a government absolutely outlaws itself, and warrant violent resistance by the citizens. However, Popper reiterates that, "such violent resistance to attempts to overthrow democracy should be unambiguously defensive. No shadow of doubt must be left that the only aim of the resistance is to save democracy."[137] Invariably, doing otherwise or attempting to take advantage of the situation in order to establish a counter-tyranny is a disservice to democracy and out rightly condemned as the original

attempt to introduce tyranny. Thus, Popper insists that, "a successful democratic policy demands from the defenders the observance of certain rules."[138] He sums up that:

> A consistent democratic constitution should exclude only one type of change in the legal system, namely a change which would endanger its democratic character. In a democracy, the full protection of minorities should not extend to those who violate the law, and especially not to those who incite others to the violent overthrow of the democracy. A policy of framing institutions to safeguard democracy must always proceed on the assumption that there may be anti-democratic tendencies latent among the ruled as well as among the rulers.[139]

Critical rationalism is a necessity for the sustenance of a democratic state since it ensures peaceful reforms as against irrationalism which is characterised by violence. Thus, democrats admit that:

> …in all matters, we can only learn by trial and error, by making mistakes and improvements; we can never rely on inspiration, although inspirations may be most valuable as long as they can be checked by experience. Accordingly, it is not reasonable to assume that a complete reconstruction of our social world would lead at once to a workable system. Rather we should expect that, owing to lack of experience, many mistakes would be made which could be eliminated only by a long and laborious process of small adjustments.[140]

3. 7. 3 Piecemeal Social Engineering

Having established a democratic society which embraces liberalism, critical rationalism, and confers the citizen with the pivotal role of removing bad leaders, it becomes pertinent to ask: how then is public policy to be forged and implemented? Who forges it? What are its goals? Here Popper introduced the concept of "piecemeal social engineering", which he offered as a superior and "only rational"[141] approach to

the utopian engineering. Popper categorically stated thus; "I (He) wish to outline another approach to social engineering, namely, that of piecemeal engineering. It is an approach which I (He) think to be methodologically sound.[142] Invariably, he made a crucial distinction between the principles of democratic social reconstruction called "piecemeal social engineering" and "utopian social engineering". According to him, "the piecemeal engineer will, accordingly, adopt the method of searching for, and fighting against the greatest and most urgent evil of society, rather than searching for, and fighting for, its greatest ultimate good."[143] Thus, while utopian engineering aims for lofty and abstract goals (for example, perfect justice, true equality, a higher kind of happiness), piecemeal social engineering seeks to address concrete social problems (for example, poverty, violence, unemployment, environmental degradation, income inequality). In further attempt to contrast "piecemeal social engineering" and "utopian social engineering" Popper notes that:

> The difference between a reasonable method of improving the lot of man and a method which if really tried, may easily lead to an intolerable increase in human suffering. It is the difference between a method which can be applied at any moment, and a method whose advocacy may easily become a means of continually postponing action until a later date, when conditions are more favourable. And it is, also the difference between, the only method of improving matters which has so far been really successful, at any time, and in any place and a method which, wherever it has been tried, has led only to the use of violence in place of reason, if not to its own abandonment at any rate to that of its original blueprint.[144]

Also, Popper compared piecemeal social engineering to physical engineering. Just as physical engineers refine machines through a series of small adjustments to existing

models, social engineers gradually improve social institutions through "piecemeal tinkering." In this way, "the piecemeal method permits repeated experiments and continuous readjustments."[145] This allows for self-criticism, tactfulness, self-realisation, and improvements. Only such social experiments, Popper said, can yield reliable feedback for social planners. In contrast, social reform that is wide ranging, highly complex and involves multiple institutions will produce social experiments in which it is too difficult to untangle causes and effects. Thus, the utopian planners suffer from a kind of hubris, falsely and tragically believing that they possess reliable experimental knowledge about how the social world operates. But on the other hand:

> The piecemeal engineer knows, like Socrates, how little he knows. He knows that we can learn only from our mistakes. Accordingly, he will make his way, step by step, carefully comparing the results expected with the results achieved, and always on the look-out for the unavoidable unwanted consequences of any reform; and he will avoid undertaking reforms of a complexity and scope which make it impossible for him to disentangle causes and effects, and to know what he is really doing.[146]

Whereas, the holistic social experiments based on the theory of utopianism are doomed to failure because of the fallibility and unpredictability of the human nature and its endeavours.

Piecemeal social engineering must be 'small scale', Popper argued. That is; "without revolutionizing the whole of society"[147], how best alterable socio-political order can be changed peacefully without tempering with the established traditional structures of the society, and "without risking the repercussions of a gravity that must endanger the will for future reforms."[148] Also, policies and institutions are modified by continual

monitoring of their effects, and in the light of their ability to solve the problems they are supposed to solve, and social reform is focused on changing one institution at a time. This is done through the creation of new social institutions or the redesign of existing ones. These new or reconfigured institutions are then tested through implementation and altered accordingly and continually in light of their effects. More so, the crucial point about Popper's argument for piecemeal social engineering rests principally on its compatibility with the trial-and-error method of the natural sciences: a theory is proposed and tested, errors in the theory are detected and eliminated, and a new, improved theory emerges, starting the cycle over rather than a prior historicist vision. He reiterates the necessity of learning by trial and error, by making mistakes and improvements….[149] Through piecemeal engineering, the process of social progress thus parallels scientific progress. Indeed, Popper says that piecemeal social engineering is the only approach to public policy that can be genuinely scientific: "This—and no Utopian planning or historical prophecy—would mean the introduction of scientific method into politics, since the whole secret of scientific method is a readiness to learn from mistakes."[150]

Significantly, Popper vested power to forge and implement policies on institutions of the state through the citizens, such as, "the establishment of institutions for securing civil peace, i.e. for the prevention of crime within the state."[151]   Also, he maintains that:

> Democratic institutions cannot improve themselves. The problem of improving them is always a problem for persons rather than for institutions. But if we want improvements, we must make clear which institutions we want to change….While the problems of the day are largely personal, the building of the future must necessarily be institutional.[152]

It follows that blueprints for piecemeal engineering should be comparatively simple, less risky, easily re-adjusted, designed for single institutions and should embrace the use of reason, instead of violence in executing the programme. This led Popper to argue that:

> The theory of democracy is not based upon the principle that the majority should rule; rather, the various equalitarian methods of democratic control, such as general elections and representative government, are to be considered as no more than well-tried and, in the presence of a widespread traditional distrust of tyranny, reasonably effective institutional safeguards against tyranny, always open to improvements, and even providing methods for their own improvement.[153]

As such, Popper cautions that, "We must reform its institutions little by little, until we have more experience in social engineering."[154] He further admonishes that, "measures should be planned to fight concrete evils rather than to establish some ideal good. State intervention should be limited to what is really necessary for the protection of freedom."[155]

Popper equally introduced a concept that he dubbed "negative utilitarianism", which holds that the principal aim of politics should be to reduce suffering rather than to increase happiness. "It is my thesis," he wrote, "that human misery is the most urgent problem of a rational public policy."[156] For him, it is easier to reach political agreement to combat suffering than to increase happiness, thus making effective public policy more likely. "For new ways of happiness are theoretical, unreal things, about which it may be difficult to form an opinion. But misery is with us, here and now, and it will be with us for a long time to come. We all know it from experience."[157] Popper thus calls for a public policy that aims at reducing and, hopefully, eliminating such readily identifiable and universally agreed upon sources of suffering as "poverty, unemployment, national oppression, war, and disease."[158]

Importantly, unlike the revolutionary and violent model of socio-political order as articulated by Marxists, Popper favours reforms and social stability through piecemeal social engineering as it rejects violent holistic social change. His piecemeal approach does not propose to mold the whole society according to a plan established in advance based on historicist interpretation, precisely because it recognises the unpredictability of the "human factor."[159]

Summing up his democratic ideals which anchors on liberalism and non-violence, Popper affirms:

> It is not reasonable to assume that a complete reconstruction of our social world would lead at once to a workable system. Rather we should expect that, owing to lack of experience, many mistakes would be made which could be eliminated only by a long and laborious process of small adjustment; in other words, by the rational method of piecemeal engineering whose application we advocate. But those who dislike this method as insufficiently radical would have again to wipe out their freshly constructed society, in order to start anew with a clean canvas; and since the new start for the same reasons, would not lead to perfection either, they would have to repeat this process without ever getting anywhere. Those who admit this and are prepared to adopt our more modest of piecemeal improvements, but only after the first radical canvas-cleaning, can hardly escape the criticism that their first sweeping and violent measures were quite unnecessary.[160]

Popper continued to write and speak about politics until his death in 1994. His lectures and books continue to have prolific and significant influences on many contemporary philosophers. There are however, refinements and modifications of Popper's ideals which has further solidify his libertarianism and non-violence approach to politics and the society. His democratic ideals which anchors on liberalism and non-violence, and its characterised by self-criticism, self-realization and self-fulfillment is of tremendous significance to peaceful coexistence and sustainable development. This justifies the

recommendation of Popper's democratic ideals with the necessary modifications as the panacea for the unenviable Nigerian predicament which is in dire need for sustainable development and effective democratic practice.

3. 8   Projections and Modification of Popper's Democratic Ideals

Philosophical reflection on how best to arrange our collective life; political philosophy, has witnessed a powerful revival over the decades. With rapid technological development and other changes in the contemporary world, the relevance of liberalism, non-violence and its various methods has soared due to its unprecedented benefits to humankind as a whole. Also, the desirability for responsible leadership and inclusive governance has propelled modifications and refinements of Karl Popper's democratic ideals in order to further address the political concerns of the citizenry. However, the undesirability of violence within the polity gives credence to the notion of 'Civil Disobedience', as it does not only allow criticism of governmental policies by the citizens, but it places an obligation of conscientiously and deliberately disobeying the laws of the state in order to bring about a change in governmental policies, thereby allowing for peaceful reforms in the state; especially, where the laws disobeyed are themselves intolerably unjust or where obedience to law would facilitate or support the state's unjust policies. For instance, Thoreau's refusal to pay his taxes was, Bedau argues, a refusal to participate in the state's injustices against third parties (since Thoreau knew that his tax money would be used by his government to carry out unjust policies), and so constituted a strategy for avoiding partial responsibility for those wrongs.[161] Invariably, it becomes pertinent to give an overview of what constitute Civil Disobedience. Civil Disobedience was coined by Henry David Thoreau in his 1848 essay *Civil Disobedience*, originally titled *Resistance to Civil Government* that entails to describe the refusal to pay the state poll tax. However, Thoreau did not invent the

concept 'civil disobedience', for there abound myriad examples throughout history. Transcendent law appeared in the writing of Socrates as well as in many of the Greek Tragedies. Significantly, civil disobedience has been used as an effective vehicle for enforcing social change throughout history. Michael Walzer, for example, describes civil disobedience as "a non revolutionary encounter with the state" which does not challenge the legitimacy of the existing order.[162] For Hannah Arendt "the civil disobedient accepts, while the revolutionary rejects, the frame of established authority and the general legitimacy of the system of laws."[163] In summary, civil disobedience is a reformist practice which aims at strengthening the existing societal order and the concept of civil disobedience is fundamental in upholding the practice of control in a polity, since its appearance of dissent provides the liberal system with more legitimacy. Invariably, it challenges some laws, policies or even brings down a government, but it does not and should not threaten to erode the foundations of the liberal order. However, the boundaries of civil disobedience lies in hostility, which arises as soon as practices of dissent transgress existing levels of tolerance and attempt to challenge the foundations of the established political and social order. Thus, considerations will be given to thoughts on civil disobedience by John Brodley Rawls, Jurgen Habermas and Joseph Raz.

John Brodley Rawls: Justice and Civil Disobedience

John Brodley Rawls is an American philosopher and a prominent figure in moral and political philosophy. He is one of the major thinkers in the tradition of liberal political philosophy. He was born in Baltimore, USA in 1921, and died in 2002. His major works deal with the theory of justice as fairness such as; *A Theory of Justice* (1971), *Political Liberalism* (1993), *The Law of Peoples* (1999), and *Justice as Fairness* (2001) which all serve to be landmarks in the history of political philosophy. The two central

ideas of Rawls' *magnum opus, A Theory of Justice* are the 'original position' and the 'veil of ignorance'.[164] Rawls gives a suitable way of how to arrive at the decision of which principles of justice would be fair. For him, a just society will first of all ensure its members same set of basic rights like freedom of expression, of religion, of association etc. Thus, he refers to the first principle of justice as equality of citizenship. In the second principle he holds that power and offices would be open to all under condition of equality of opportunity and sums up that only such inequalities would be allowed at all if they overtime tend to maximize the position of the worst off members of the society. This he terms as Difference Principle.[165] Also, Rawls in his collection of lectures entitled *Political Liberalism* (1993) treats the question of stability of a society ordered by the two principles of justice discussed in *A Theory of Justice.* His account of political liberalism addresses the legitimate use of political power in a democratic setup which aims to show how enduring unity may be achieved despite the diversity of world views that free institutions allow. Here, Rawls focuses on the problem of legitimacy and stability that arises out of imposing law on people who hold different views. He seeks order in society but not through fear or force but with liberal views especially with the conviction that individual ought to be free from the use of power by the state. The basis of order in Rawls' theory is overwhelming support of a society's members for the institution under which they have and for the principles through which they regulate their social interactions. Thus, for Rawls there are three basis ideas surrounding all liberal political conception of justice; that is, people in a democratic framework are 'free', 'equal', and that 'society should be a fair system of cooperation'. Rawls in his *A Theory of Justice* reassesses liberal thoughts and shifted attention from utilitarian tradition to neo-Kantian resurrection of contract theory. In the context of this reassessment, Rawls also articulated a theory of civil disobedience. Here too, Rawls'

contribution is deemed path-breaking. Bedau considers Theory of Justice "the most influential contemporary philosophical discussion on civil disobedience," a text which has, through its hegemonic position, framed much of the subsequent discussion on the subject.[166]

The foundation of Rawls theory of civil disobedience is the Socratic tradition. Socrates on one hand protested against an unjust law and on the other showed his fidelity to political system by accepting the consequence of the dissent by refusing to escape from the prison.[167] Out rightly, Rawls follows this tradition by accepting the legal system as the frame work and at the same time defending civil disobedience. Invariably, it becomes pertinent to ask, what does Rawls precisely mean with civil disobedience? How far does his advocacy of dissent go? What are his commitments to nonviolence? According to Rawls, civil disobedience is "a public, non-violent, conscientious yet political act contrary to law usually done with the aim of bringing about a change in the law or policies of the government."[168] The target of civil disobedience for Rawls is a change in particular laws or policies, rather than a total overhauling of the system. It follows that, civil disobedients willingly accept the legal punishment for their action which shows their faith to the rule of law. According to Rawls one of the chief reasons for people to indulge in the act of civil disobedience is for justice. Through the act of civil disobedience they wish to draw the attention to such policies or laws that they consider to be reassessed or rejected. He assumes that people before entering into a society agree on some fundamental principles of justice that would control or rather govern their interaction; that is, free, equal and rational beings establish certain basic principles that become the framework within which they interact. Civil disobedience then becomes necessary when the principles of justice governing cooperation among free and equal person have not been respected by the policy makers. Civil

disobedience, Rawls argues, becomes necessary when "the conditions of free cooperation are being violated."[169] Rawls reiterates that a theory of civil disobedience:

> Attempts to formulate the grounds upon which legitimate democratic authority may be dissented from in ways that while admittedly contrary to law nevertheless express a fidelity to law and appeal to the fundamental political principles of a democratic regime.[170]

As such, he sees dissent only in the context of a democratic state in which citizens accept the overall legitimacy of the constitution. Thus, the three features of Rawls civil disobedience namely non-violence, publicity and willingness to accept the consequences are the hallmark of the disobedient's fidelity to the legal system in which they operate. Conscientiousness in civil disobedience points out at the sincerity with which the civil disobedient breaks the law. For Rawls civil disobedience is never a covert action. It should always be open and public with a prior notice to the legal authorities.[171] Nevertheless, the threat of publicity hampering the aims of the disobedient's is considered, but openness in civil disobedience is a clear sign of the disobedient's willingness to deal fairly with the authorities.

However, the injustice of a law does in itself not provide enough reason to engage in justified resistance. Rawls cautions that "when the basic structure of society is reasonably just, as estimated by what the current state of things allows, we are to recognise unjust laws as binding provided that they do not exceed certain limits of injustice."[172] Thus, civil disobedience only becomes necessary when violations of justice exceed these limits. It then is an act through which a minority appeals to a majority to reconsider a particular issue within the limited context of an existing constitution and a commonly shared perception of rights and duties. Non-violence is yet another chief feature of civil disobedience which has been defended by Rawls.

Rawls points out, "indeed any interference with the civil liberties of others tends to obscure the civilly disobedient quality of one's act."[173] For Rawls, civil disobedience and violence can never go together. Violence hinders the communicative quality of a disobedient's action while the positive aspects of the use of non-violence in civil disobedience are many fold. It not only prevents antagonism but also thwarts the distraction of public and checks the use of violent counter methods from the government. On when it is appropriate to embark on civil disobedience, Rawls maintains that in situation that peoples' have repeatedly used legal actions but it turns out to be futile and the majority seems immovable then the people can effectively conclude to have reached the last resort and in such case use of civil disobedience becomes fully justified. Furthermore, coordination among minority groups is yet another feature defended by Rawls in civil disobedience. He defends coordination since in most cases it produces good results and is necessary to regulate the overall legal of dissent. Thus, the justification of civil disobedience in Rawls is premised on conditions that civil disobedience should be non-violent and open, and it must be used as the last resort; that is, the notion of civil disobedience held by Rawls is that in a nearly just society people have a right to indulge in Civil Disobedience in response to a clear case of injustice, in which civil disobedience is used as a last resort and which takes place in coordination with other minority groups. In all, Rawls civil disobedient is anti-violent, pro-democratic, aims at ensuring checks and balances in a democratic society in order to eliminate injustices, and act as a stabilizing and sustainable factor for reforms in a democratic society.

Jurgen Habermas: Democracy and Civil Disobedience

Jurgen Habermas was born in 1929. He is a German socialist and philosopher, and is widely known for his *Theory of Communicative Action,* which was published in 1981 in two volumes namely *Reason and the Rationalization of Society* and *Life world and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason.* The basis of the theory is that the key to emancipation lies in 'communication'; that is, in free moral discourse between individuals and deliberate discourse amongst equal citizens. His 'Theory of Communicative Action' is geared towards transmitting and renewing cultural knowledge in a process of achieving mutual understanding. Also, it coordinates action towards social integration and solidarity, thus, it is a process through which people form their identities.

Habermas places 'discourse' at the center of his democratic theory. His conception of 'discourse' is both as a means of resolving conflicts and enabling collective action and also as a means of justification of democratic institutions. Here, people are made to obey not by use of police or state power but by political force which is generated by 'discourse' which not only compels but also legitimizes any action. Invariably, his three principles of Discourse Ethics can be described as follows: The first being the principle of universalization, one that intends to set the condition for impartial judgment insofar as it, 'constrains all affected to adopt the perspectives of all others in the balancing of interests.'[174] The second being that only those norms can claim to be valid that meets with the approval of all affected in their capacity as participants in a practical discourse.[175] Finally consensus can be achieved only if the participants participate freely.[176] It follows that Habermas's *Discourse Ethics* allows every subject with the ability to speak and act to participate in a discourse. Also, all participant are allowed to introduce any assertion whatever into the discourse and to express their attitude, desire

and needs without any form of internal or external constraint. Significantly, he reiterates that all these rules must be added by a sense of solidarity between participants. For Habermas, discourse is a form of debate where proposals are critically tested, information are shared in a public way, where no one is left out and all have equal opportunity to participate. Thus, the above listed conditions of discourse; freedom to participate, freedom from coercion when complemented with sense of solidarity describes the necessary conditions of democratic polity. Summarily, Habermas conception of democracy is founded on following the procedure of open public argument and discourses through which complex societies could engage in moral and political decision making. This infers institutionalisation of the rational discourse through the system of rights and law making, and portraying politics as a process of collective opinion and will formation characterized by reason through dialogue. Habermas's justification of democracy anchors on rationality, non-violence, liberalism and tolerance; that is, however different individuals may be in terms of their religious or traditional background, reason stands as a universal shared capacity of humanity. This reason is marked by freedom and is capable of giving laws and norms in the moral and political domains. This freedom solely requires respect from others for our choices and also respects from us for others freedom. Thus, for Habermas democracy resting on consent of governed can only provide fundamental rights to its citizens, and this requires an enthusiastic civil society. Such society according to him is, 'a suspicious, mobile, alert and mobilized public sphere'[177] which provides an effective safeguard against the growth of illegitimate power. However, he suggests that spontaneously energizing social movements are essential for democracy. The significant of such movement is mostly feasible in period of crisis, and aims at checking the excesses of those in helm of affairs in order to ensure the growth and

sustenance of democracy and its tenets. Habermas puts great emphasis on direct, immediate forms of popular action; that is, civil disobedience.

In his major works Habermas discusses about civil disobedience, which is a method of non-violent action. He is inclined towards nonviolence and its importance in constitutional democracy, and desires to solve every socio-political problem through this peace and goodwill. In his article entitled *Civil Disobedience: Litmus Test for the Democratic Constitutional State*, Habermas refers to civil disobedience as a crucial and essential element of a mature political culture. Further in *Between Facts and Norms,* Habermas supports this view and holds that civil disobedience constitutes the self-consciousness of a vibrant civil society which is confident that, " ... at least in a crises situation it can increase the pressure of a mobilized public on a political system."[178] As such, he defines civil disobedience as an, "... expressions of protest against binding decisions that, their legality notwithstanding, the actors consider illegitimate."[179] For Habermas, the role of civil disobedience in a democratic set up is tilted towards preventing the institutionalised political sphere from becoming a complacent system and one which is completely free from the hold of civil society from which it has originated. Civil disobedience according to Habermas is an extraordinary means of popular action which is essential for the survival of a constitutional state that hopes to remain true to itself. Therefore for him, civil disobedience plays an indispensable and vital role in the survival of constitutional democracy. At this juncture, one may asked what conditions for Habermas justified civil disobedience? Firstly, the actors must express their disapproval through 'nonviolent that is symbolic means'.[180] Secondly it should be marked by dissenter's complete 'identification with the principles of democratic republic.'[181] Habermas' emphasis on the dissenters' identification with the constitutional principles leads him to argue that only those acts can be categorized as

civil disobedience if they do not 'place the existence and fundamental significance of the constitutional order into question'.[182] Invariably, Habermas argues against violence, and as such, he draws the line of demarcation between the acts of protest undertaken by the German peace movement of early 1980s with that of students' revolts of late 1960s. According to him the former belongs to the category of civil disobedience while the later simply to an act of resistance inspired by false revolutionary ideas. It implies that for Habermas, like Rawls too civil disobedience is inseparable with non-violence.

Joseph Raz: Liberalism and Civil Disobedience

Joseph Raz; born in 1939 figures prominently among contemporary relevant political thinkers. He is a legal, moral and political philosopher, and a proponent of Perfectionist Liberalism. In his work, *The Authority of Law* Raz defines civil disobedience as, "...a politically motivated breach of law designed either to contribute directly to a change of a law or of a public policy or to express one's protest against, and dissociation from, a law or a public policy."[183] It follows that, civil disobedience is essentially a public action designed to have a political effect. For Raz, civil disobedience may be aimed to be effective, expressive or in some cases both. Thus, "it is designed to be effective if it is justified as part of a plan of action which is likely to lead to a change in law or public policy."[184] Also, civil disobedience is made public with the participants voluntarily submitting to punishment as this, 'proves the purity of one's motives.'[185]

However, Raz maintains that civil disobedience can sometimes be justified or even become an obligation but to take it as right cannot be justified altogether. In right to civil disobedience Raz places great importance upon the kind of regime in which the dissenters work or in which the civil disobedience takes place. Civil Disobedience according to Raz is not morally justified in a liberal state while it may be justified in an

illiberal one. What according to Raz constitute a liberal and an illiberal state? A liberal state for Raz is one in which the liberal principle is adequately recognized and protected by law, whereas, the opposite is the case for an illiberal state. As such, he states:

> Given that the illiberal state violates its members' right of political participation, individuals whose rights are violated are entitled, other things being equal, to disregard the offending laws and exercise their moral right as if it were recognized by law.... members of the illiberal state do have a right to civil disobedience which is roughly that part of their moral right to political participation which is not recognized in law.[186]

Invariably, Raz argues that since a liberal state right to political activity is adequately protected by law; as such the right to political participation cannot ground a right to civil disobedience. More so, Raz submits that the above assumption does not infer that, 'civil disobedience in a liberal state is never justified....'[187] He reiterates that sometimes civil disobedience may be justified in liberal states to protest against bad and iniquitous laws or against bad public policies.

According to Raz:

> The obligation to obey the law is a general obligation applying to all law's subjects and to all the laws on all the occasions to which they apply. To look for an obligation to obey the law of a country is to look for grounds which make it desirable, other things being equal, that one should always do as the law requires. Theses grounds need not be the same for everyone or for every occasion, but they should be of sufficient generality so that a few general sets of considerations will apply to all on all occasions. The search for an obligation to obey the law of a certain country is an inquiry into whether there is a set of true premises which entail that everyone (or every citizen? every resident?) ought always to do as those laws require and which include the fact that those actions are required by law as non-redundant premises.[188]

Invariably, Raz opts for no obligation to obey the law, whether absolute or prima facie, not even in a good society whose legal system is just. His contention is that there are no

general and true premises or conditions that are sufficient to establish that everyone ought to do what the law requires in all circumstances. More so, Raz is against violence and thus observes that, non-violence avoids the direct harm caused by violence, and non-violence does not encourage violence in other situations where violence would be wrong, something which an otherwise warranted use of violence may do. Moreover, as a matter of prudence, non-violence does not carry the same risk of antagonising potential allies or confirming the antipathy of opponents.[189]

Obviously, violence within the polity is frowned at; by committees of nation, while demand for non-violence, piecemeal, and critical rationalism approach to reforms in the polity on the other hand is fast becoming a consensus for all and sundry. This is a pointer that an adoption of Karl Popper's democratic ideals with its modifications by the African states will stimulate and ensure sustainable democratic culture and good governance in Africa.

ENDNOTES

1. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2013), p. 115.

2. Karl Popper, *Unended Quest: An Intellectual Autobiography*, (London: Routledge, 1976), p. 86.

3. Karl Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery,* (London: Routledge, 1972), p. 280.

4. Andrew Uduigwomen, "Karl Popper's Evaluation of the Humean Problem" in Ozumba, G.O. (ed.) *The Great Philosophers.* Vol. 11. (Aba: Vitalis Books, 1997), pp. 314-326.

5. Nicholas Maxwell. "Karl Raimund Popper (28 July 1902 - 17 September 1994)," in *British Philosophers, 1800-2000,* P. Dematteis, P. Fosl and L. McHenry (eds), (Columbia: Bruccoli Clark Layman, 2002), pp. 176-194.

6. Karl Popper, *Unended Quest*. Op; cit. p. 11.

7. Roberta Corvi, *An Introduction to the Thought of Karl Popper*, (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 3.

8. Ibid; p. 3.

9. Kevin G. Helfenbein and Rob DeSalle. "Falsifications and Corroboration: Karl Popper's Influence on Systematics" in Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution. 35, (2005), pp. 271-280.

10. Karl Popper. *Unended Quest*. Op; cit. p. 30.

11. *Ibid*; p. 9.

12. *Ibid*; p. 32.

13. "Stephen Thoronton, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy" *Plato.stanford.edu*. Retrieved 21st June, 2016.

14. "Karl Popper" *www.wikipedia.com* Retrieved 3rd July, 2016.

15. Andrew Uduigwomen, *Op; Cit*. pp. 314-326.

16. "Sir Karl Popper is Dead at 92 – Philosopher of Open Society." *New York Times*, 18th September, 1994.

17. Milton Marney and Paul Schmidt, "Evolution of Scientific Method," In Jantsch Erich, Waddington, C. H. (eds.) *Evolution and Consciousness: Human Systems In Transition*, (1976), pp. 191, 185-197.

18. Karl Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*, (New York: Basic Books, 1962; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963), p. 42.

19. *Ibid*; pp. 6-7.

20. Karl Popper, *Objective Knowledge: An Evolutionary Approach*, (Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press, 1972), p. 1.

21. Karl Popper, *The Logic of Scientific* Discovery, (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), p. 11.

22. Nicholas Maxwell. *Op; Cit*. p. 5.

23. Karl Popper. *Conjectures and Refutations…*Op; cit. P. 44.

24. *Ibid*; p. 34.

25. *Loc; Cit.*

26. *Loc; Cit.*

27. *Ibid*; p. 36.

28. *Loc; Cit.*

29. U. Keuth, *The Philosophy of Karl Popper*. Cambridge University Press: New York, 2000, p.31.

30. Karl Popper, *Unended Quest*. Op; Cit. p. 82.

31. Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals (1785)*. Trans. James Wesley Ellington. (Cambridge, M.A.: Hackett Publishing, 1993), p. 6.

32. Anthony O' Hear, *Karl Popper: Philosophy and Problems*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 283.

33. Immanuel Kant, *Op; Cit*. pp. 30-43.

34. Jozsef Zoltan Malik, "Thinking about Karl Popper and Open Society" In *Jogelmeleti Szemle (Journal of Legal Theory)*. 15.4. (2014), pp. 58-66.

35. Karl Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery,* Op; Cit. p. 13.

36. *Ibid*; p. 17.

37. Karl Popper. *Conjectures and Refutations…* Op; Cit. p. 241.

38. Raphael Sassower, "Popper's Legacy: Rethinking Politics" *Economics and Science*. (Stockfield: Acumen, 2006), p. 7.

39. Karl Popper, "Popper on Democracy: The Open Society and its Enemies Revisited". *The Economist.* April 23, (1988), p. 355.

40. Malachi Hacohen, *Karl Popper- The formative Years, 1902-1945*. 2001: Politics and Philosophy in Interwar Vienna. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p.23.

41. Malik, *Op; Cit*. p. 61.

42. Karl Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*. p. 361.

43. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Op; Cit. p. 115.

44. Karl Popper, *The Economist.* Op; Cit. pp. 23-26.

45. *Ibid*; p. 110.

46. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Op; Cit. p.7.

47. *Ibid*; p. 23.

48. Karl Popper, *The Poverty of Historicism*, (London and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd. 1979), pp. 73-74.

49. Karl Popper; *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Op; Cit. p. 219.

50. *Ibid*; p. 355.

51. Nicholas Maxwell, *Op; Cit*. p. 18.

52. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Op. cit. p. 243.

53. *Ibid*; p. 245.

54. *Ibid*; p. 272.

55. *Ibid*; p. 294.

56. Karl Popper, *The Poverty of Historicism*. Op; Cit. pp. 68-69.

57. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Op; Cit. p.176.

58. *Ibid*; p. 175.

59. Emmmanuel Idike, *Introduction to Social and Political Philosophy*, (Nsukka: Goodseed Publishers, 2000), p.15.

60. Idorenyin Esikot, *Socio-Political Philosophy: The Basics and the Issues*, (Uyo: Minders International Publishers, 2002), p. 128.

61. Plato, *The Republic*. Trans. by Desmond Lee. (London: Penguin Books, 1987), p. 420.

62. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Op; Cit. p. 104.

63. *Loc; Cit.*

64. Karl Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations...* Op; Cit. p. 350.

65. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Op; Cit. pp. 104-105.

66. *Ibid*; p. 106.

67. Karl Popper, *All Life is Problem Solving*, (London: Routledge, 2001), p. 90.

68. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Op; Cit. p. 118.

69. *Ibid*; p. 119.

70. *Ibid*; p. 115.

71. *Ibid*; p. 120.

72. *Ibid*; p. 118.

73. *Ibid*; p. 120.

74. *Ibid*; p. 116.

75. Karl Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations...* Op; Cit. p. 351.

76. Karl Popper, *All Life is Problem Solving*. Op; Cit. p. 97.

77. Karl Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations...* Op; Cit. p. 351.

78. *Loc; Cit.*

79. *Ibid*; p. 352.

80. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Op; Cit. p. 369.

81. *Loc; Cit.*

82. *Ibid*; p. 506.

83. Dennis Thompson, "Democratic Theory and Global Society," *Journal of Political Philosophy*. (1999), pp. 111-125.

84. David Levy, "Karl Popper: His Philosophy of Politics," *Modern Age*. (1978), pp.151-160.

85. Karl Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations…* Op; Cit. p. 31.

86. David Levy, *Op; Cit*. p. 153.

87. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Op; Cit. p. 333.

88. Karl Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations…* Op; Cit. p. 351.

89. *Ibid*; p. 273.

90. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Op; Cit. p. 333.

91. Jeremy Shearmur and Piers Norris Turner, eds. *Karl Popper: After the Open Society: Selected Social and Political Writings*, (London and New York: Routeldge, 2008), p. 27.

92. *Ibid*; p. 273.

93. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Op; Cit. p. 581.

94. Karl Popper; *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Op; Cit. p. 105.

95. *Ibid*; p. 368.

96. *Ibid*; p. 105.

97. *Ibid*; p. 106.

98. *Loc; Cit.*

99. *Ibid*; p. 124.

100. *Ibid*; p. 106.

101. *Ibid*; pp. 107-108.

102. Karl Popper, *In Search of a Better World: Lectures and Essays from Thirty Years*, (London: Routledge, 1994), p. 157.

103. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Op; Cit. pp. 332-333.

104. Alan Ryan, "Popper's Politics: Science and Democracy," *Karl Popper: Critical Appraisals*. Eds. Philip Catton and Graham MacDonald. London, (New York: Routledge. 2004), pp. 174-188.

105. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Op; Cit. p. 333.

106. *Loc; Cit.*

107. *Ibid*; 333.

108. *Ibid*; 335.

109. *Ibid*; 338.

110. Karl Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations...* Op; Cit. p. 363.

111. Karl Popper, *In Search of a Better World...* Op; Cit. p. 151.

112. *Ibid*; pp. 152-154.

113. *Ibid*; p. 154.

114. *Ibid;* p. 152.

115. *Ibid*; p. 153.

116. *Ibid*; p. 154.

117. Ibid; p. 155.

118. Karl Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations...* Op; Cit. p. 335.

119. David Harper, *The Political Thought of Karl Popper by Jeremy Shearmur*, (London: Routledge, 1996), p. 2.

120. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, Op; Cit. p. 178.

121. Karl Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations...* Op; Cit. p. 478.

122. Jennifer Nedelsky, "The Puzzle and Demands of Modern Constitutionalism" *Ethics.* 104, (1994), p. 500.

123. Bryan Magee, "What Use is Popper to a Politician?" Anthony O'Hear (ed.) Karl Popper: Philosophy and Problems. Supplement: 39, Royal Institute of Philosophy. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 352.

124. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, Op; Cit. p. 352.

125. Karl Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations...* Op; Cit. p. 356.

126. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Op; Cit. p. 431.

127. *Ibid*; p. 369.

128. Karl Popper, *In Search of a Better World…* Op; Cit. p. 155.

129. Karl Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations…* Op; Cit. p. 356.

130. Ibid; p. 357.

131. Karl Popper, *In Search of a Better World…* Op; Cit. p. 190.

132. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Op; Cit. p. 359.

133. *Ibid*; pp. 166-167.

134. *Ibid*; p. 360.

135. *Ibid*; p. 160.

136. *Ibid*; p. 360.

137. *Loc; Cit.*

138. *Ibid*; p. 361.

139. *Ibid*; p. 368.

140. *Ibid*; pp. 156-159.

141. *Ibid*; p. 147.

142. *Ibid*; p. 148.

143. *Loc; Cit.*

144. *Loc; Cit.*

145. *Ibid*., p. 153.

146. Karl Popper, *The Poverty of Historicism*, (London and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1960), p. 152.

147. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Op; Cit. p. 152.

148. *Ibid*; p. 152.

149. *Ibid*; p. 156.

150. *Ibid*; p. 153.

151. *Ibid*; p. 151.

152. *Ibid*; p. 120.

153. *Ibid*; p. 119.

154. *Ibid*; p. 156.

155. *Ibid*; p. 338.

156. Karl Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations…* Op; Cit. p. 361.

157. *Ibid*; p. 346.

158. *Ibid*; p. 361.

159. Roberta Corvi, *An Introduction to the Thought of Karl Popper*, (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 71.

160. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Op; Cit. p. 157.

161. Hugo Adam Bedau (ed), "Civil Disobedience and Personal Responsibility for Justice" *Civil Disobedience In Focus,* (London: Routledge, 1991), p. 52.

162. Michael Walzer, *Obligations: Essays on Disobedience, War, and Citizenship*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970), p. 24.

163. Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972), p. 77.

164. Adam Swift, *Political Philosophy: A Beginners' Guide for Students and Politicians,* 2nd edition. (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006), p. 21.

165. Andrew Levine, *Engaging Political Philosophy: From Hobbes to Rawls,* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2002), p. 189.

166. Hugo Adam Bedau (ed), *Civil Disobedience in Focus*, (London: Routledge, 1991), p. 4.

167. Plato, The Last Days of Socrates, trans. H. Tredennick. (London: Penguin Books, 1969),   pp. 46-47.

168. John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), p. 364.

169. *Ibid*; pp. 382-3.

170. *Ibid*; pp. 385-6.

171. *Ibid*; pp. 366.

172. *Ibid*; p. 351.

173. *Ibid*; p. 366.

174. Jurgen Habermas, "Discourse Ethics: Notes on Philosophical Justification" *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action.* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1990), p.65.

175. *Ibid*; p. 66.

176. *Ibid*; p. 93.

177. Jurgen Habermas, *Between Facts and Norms*. Cambridge, (Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1996), pp.441-2.

178. *Ibid*; p. 383.

179. *Ibid*; pp. 382-383.

180. *Loc; Cit.*

181. Jurgen Habermas, "Civil Disobedience: Litmus Test for the Democratic Constitutional State" *Berkley Journal of Sociology. 30,* (1985), p.99.

182. *Ibid*; p. 105.

183. Joseph Raz, *The Authority of Law: Essays on Law and Morality,* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1979), p. 34.

184. *Ibid*; p. 35.

185. *Ibid*; p. 36.

186. *Ibid*; p. 37, 272-273.

187. *Ibid*; p. 38.

188. *Ibid*; p. 234.

189. *Ibid*; p. 267.

CHAPTER FOUR
DEMOCRATISATION AND THE NIGERIAN EXPERIENCE

The need to re-examine how Nigeria as an African state has fared democratically is of no mean significance at this point in time as there are agitations for secession by some of the ethnic enclaves that makes up the nation state on one hand, and clamors for restructuring of the entity on the other hand. From the Northern to the Southern regions, and from the Western to the Eastern regions of what makes up the present day Nigerian state, there are cries of injustice, victimization, and marginalization. These invariably has led to distortion of realities, division and suspicion among the major tribes, which in turn has further foster the proliferation of ethnic militias and bigots and has nourish nepotism in governance. The result has been a total precarious state with numerous developmental challenges such as; wide spread corruption, glaring looting of the national treasury, mass poverty, decayed infrastructures, alarming unemployment, wanton insecurity of lives and properties, moribund manufacturing sector, poor state of education and health system, pervasive inequality epitomized in an abysmal lacuna between the rich and the poor, food insecurity, compromised judiciary, rampant inflation, crisis of leadership, failed followership, electoral fraud and absolute disregard for due process and the rule of law among others. At this juncture, it becomes pertinent to ask, how did we get here? Is there a way out of this unenviable and precarious socio-political quagmire? This chapter attempts a biographically and an intellectual x-ray of the past and present democratic experience of the Nigerian state in one hand and the implications of Popper's democratic ideals for Nigeria on the other hand. More so, our task in the present chapter having elucidated Popper's democratic ideals in order to proffer a good understanding of the tenets of liberalism, non-violent approach and piecemeal social engineering is to re-examine the Nigerian democratic experience in

contradistinction with Popper's democratic ideals. The basic features are the Nigerian predicament, democracy and political development in Nigeria, democracy and corruption in Nigeria, the leadership versus followership question, the ideological question, and wither liberal democracy in Nigeria or perhaps, an indigenous Nigerian democracy. Invariably, the sole aim is not on adumbrating the ills of the Nigerian state, which is the obvious, rather, it is the bold, sincere and critical attempt of proffering a way out of the precarious state of affairs of the Nigerian polity as recommended by Oguejiofor in his *Philosophy and the African Predicament* that, there must be therefore be some way in which the philosophy done by Africans must lead to the amelioration of their situation[1]. Thus, how Popper's democratic thoughts can so ameliorate the African predicament and usher in the much needed sustainable development in the continent in general and Nigeria in particular is our utmost priority.

4.1   The Nigerian Predicament

The Nigerian state is blessed with tremendous wealth, articulated minds and noble personalities that radiates intellectual prowess. Yet a contradistinction between the Nigerian state and other states formerly grouped within the title 'third world' shows remarkable progressive changes taking place in most of these states contrary to the Nigerian predicament which for the past five decades appears bleak. On one hand, the nation has remained scientifically and economically backward, which explains the reason the Nigerian socio-political and cultural conditions have consistently been unable to adequately sustain her citizens; thus, fueling violent agitations along ethnic lines. On the other hand, the agencies of the state charged with the responsibility of making laws, interpreting laws and executing laws are inconsistent in their activities, as such, deferring the logic of their establishment and further fueling social disorder within the polity.

Prior to independence, the negatives were assigned to the colonial masters. Nationalists, scholars, religious and traditional leaders among others from Nigeria, Africa, and even foreigners sympathetic to the Nigerian cause wrote volumes to support their claims, thereby heaping blames for the many woes befalling the nation on the colonial master. From being labeled exploiters to agents of under-development, the blame game continued till Nigeria got her independence on the 1st October, 1960. Thus, while Rodney posits that, African civilization, culture, beliefs and values were trodden under the feet. For the European invaders to effectively realize their objectives, they had to establish themselves firmly on the continent of Africa by introducing and imposing on Africans, their religious, political, economic, social, linguistic and administrative systems, thereby upstaging the noble and enviable African institutions.[2] Falaiye sums up that:

> The European aggressive incursion and subsequent imposition of colonial domination on Africa had both traumatic and destructive consequences on the political, social and cultural situation of the continent. Africa did not only lose her political freedom; but more fundamentally, the structures of political power were weakened, retarded and even dismantled in some occasions and replaced with those of the metropolis that were considered more "enlightenment" and "sophisticated" without any consideration whatever for the people's worldview[3].

Ironically, decades after independence people still recall nostalgically the developmental plans and strides of the times of the colonial masters. More so, other countries in different continents of the world that simultaneously experienced colonialism has since rose, dusted up and reckoned in the comity of nations. Invariably, the following questions are continually begging for answers; why has the socio-political and economic conditions in Nigeria and most African states continued to be bleak since independence? Is it due to poverty of ideology or lack of the will to

implement lofty policies? Is it a result of failed leadership or is it rather failure in the path of followers?

Obviously, the staggering and pathetic state of affairs in Nigeria is evidenced in the numerous developmental challenges facing the state since independence, and has led to clamors for a social and political revolution by the masses at any given opportunity. It is a truism that no one in his normal senses enjoys creating social disorder for its sake, and that the right to dissent is innate in man. Thus, Etuk posits that:

> The easiest way to understand a willful act on the part of individuals or groups of persons to cause social disorder, is to see it as an attempt on their part to make a statement, to make a protest which cannot but attract attention and maybe rouse feelings in others and cause them to act. The same kind of impulse presumably shows itself in a child who, denied of adequate attention, throws a tantrum and scatters things about the house. Since people cannot tolerate disorder, they will have to find out what went wrong and possibly look for solutions.[4]

It follows, that the yearning for revolution in Nigeria at every given opportunity is not unconnected with the events immediately after independence which witnessed the early leaders/nationalists constituting themselves into neo-colonialists, thereby sustaining the imperialist ideologies that are ontologically and intrinsically unacceptable to Nigerians. Consequentially, the first coup in 1966 which turned out to be a pace setter of pogrom against particular ethnic groups in the country was a revolutionary response by the military against the ineptitude of the First Republic political leaders and it equivocally led to military intervention in governance in Nigeria and as in most African countries. Also, the thirty-month civil war with its unforgettable effect was more or less a response to a revolutionary clarion call due to perceived injustice and marginalization of a section/region of the country by the majority tribe. Of recent, the country is plagued with seemingly unending eruptions of religious violence and mayhem against

other ethnic groups for little or no provocation; unwarranted destruction of lives and properties by Fulani herdsmen and cattle rustlers, the Boko Haram insurgency, the Shites revolts against constituted authorities, revolutionary movement such as Odua People's Congress(OPC), Independent People of Biafra (IPOB), the Movement for the Actualization of the Sovereign State of Biafra (MASSOB), the Niger Delta Avengers (NDA), Ijaw Youth Congress(IYC), the Coalition of Northern Groups(CNG), and the multiplicity of ethnic militias. There are glaring indications that the country is in a boiling state with each ethnic group being suspicious of the other on one hand, and the masses generally aggrieved by the wanton looting of their collective wealth by a privileged few which has led to economic stalemate and biting hardship on the other hand. However, it is a fact that even in the pre-colonial Nigeria, there was some level of orderliness and civility amongst the people. According to John in his *Man and the State: Issues in Socio-Political Philosophy*:

> In traditional African society there was a viable and fruitful political system that was built on a uniquely African sense of communalism, founded on kingship or extended families, in a proportion unequalled and unrivalled elsewhere outside Africa.[5]

However, the resultant effect of leaders going contrary to these cherished and revered cultural values was disastrous. Corroborating this point, Francis Offor maintains that in pre-colonial Nigeria:

> The people had their existential values with which they developed a culture and politics that they considered adequate for positive living and progressive development. In addition, the structures for checks and balances including those that guarantee the right of dissent were well institutionalized. For example, it is on records that the legendary Oba Ewuakpe of the famous Bini kingdom was forced to abdicate the throne and go into exile when the Bini people withdraw their allegiances to him and civilly disobeyed his proclamations.[6]

Invariably, the distinctive variable between the clamors is in the approach. The pre-colonial structures and even the concessions gained during the colonial administration by nationalists were achieved through non-violence approaches, while the post-independence Nigeria could be justifiably identified with violent approach which is significantly influenced by government's suppression of the right of citizens to freely express dissenting opinions.

4.2   Democracy and Political Development in Nigeria

The lowering of the 'Union Jack' and the hoisting of the Nigerian flag on 1st October, 1960 affirmed the independence of the Nigerian state. Expectations were high, but self-rule came with its own challenges which the nation is still grappling with decades after independence. As Ojo rightly observes:

> At independence in 1960, Nigeria was hailed worldwide as the Africa's giant, the hope for the future. Indeed, not only did our founding fathers believe in democracy, they deliberately set out to cultivate it. And so they adopted all the institutional paraphernalia of liberal democracy-political parties, open elections, parliamentary system of government, recognized opposition, belief in independent judiciary, rule of law and human rights.[7]

Thus, with a parliamentary system of government in place, which was an outcome of the 1958 Constitutional Conference, Nnamdi Azikiwe of the National Convention of Nigerian Citizens formerly known as National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroun (1948)   was the President, while Sir Abubakar Tafawa Belewa of the Northern People's Congress was the Prime Minister. Eventually in 1963, Nigeria became a republic, thereby breaking all ties of dominance from the British government. Significantly, there was a change from the British influenced parliamentary system of government to the American influenced presidential system of government. As such, Nnamdi Azikiwe became the first President of Nigeria.

The first challenge to the republic was and is still national unity or nation-building. Obviously, the colonial conquest brought together many ethnic groups with different languages, cultures, custom and traditions. The fact that Nigeria was divided into three regions geopolitically; the northern region, the western region and the eastern region did not only oil the wheels of division in the republic but birthed an endemic precedent that there seems to be no panacea for in the short run. As such, political parties towed the ethnic lines, as each of them carried out their activities coherently with the tribal ideologies of each of the region which portray the fact that there was no complete integration of the various ethnic groups into a nation-state before independence was achieved. With tribalism and ethnic particularism digging deep into the polity and paving way for inter-tribal rivalry for political power, public offices and public wealth; invariably, mistrust and political instability overrides the system as elections no longer serve the useful purpose of empowering the people with the opportunity of electing their representatives on the basis of the capacity of the contestant but on grounds of tribes and religion, as national consciousness is replaced with tribal consciousness with its disintegrating tendencies. The consequent is a resort to violent methods of changing governments which is not without concomitant effects.

Invariably, it was not surprising when few years after independence Nigeria became a theatre of coups. January 16th 1966 was the date; the military intervention was spearheaded by Kaduna Nzeogwu and Emmanuel Ifeajuna. Indeed, the coup was bloody, many people died as a result, including Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Ahmadu Bello, Samuel Akintola, Festus Okotie-Eboh, and institutions of government were taken over by the military as General J. T. Aguyi- Ironsi became the Head of State. Thus, the 1958 Constitution was suspended and a unitary system of government introduced. Barely six month after the first blow and precisely on July 29th 1966, there

was a counter coup, equally bloody which was planned and executed mainly by military men from the northern part of Nigeria; the major causalities was General Ironsi and Adekunle Fajuyi. As such, Lt.-Colonel Yakubu Gowon took over as Head of State, re-asserted Nigeria's federalism, and restructured the federation into 12 States. The Nigerian coups have been the bloodiest of coups in West Africa.[8] Then came the 30 months civil war of 1967 to 1970, another 9 more years of military rule with General Murtala Mohammed ousting out the Gowon led administration in a coup on July 29th, 1975, and eventually the 1979 elections which ushered in the Second Republic. The 1979 elections was preceded by the convocation of a Constituency Assembly that drafted the 1979 Constitution, restructuring into 19 States, the assassination of General Murtala Mohammed and the subsequent take-over of power by General Olusegun Obasanjo, lift in ban of political activities and registration of five political parties who took part in the elections. Alhaji Shehu Shagari of National Party of Nigeria (NPN) was elected President and Alex Ekueme the Vice President, sworn into office on October 1st, 1979 and a new Constitution also promulgated. The duo were re-elected in August 1983 for a second term. The elections however, were marred by violence and allegations of widespread rigging and other electoral offences. Invariably, the tenure of the Second Republic ended with yet another military coup in December 31st, 1983 which brought in General Muhammadu Buhari led administration. In a sinister coup, General Badamasi Babangida took over power in August 27th, 1985 till 1993 when he eventually stepped aside after ensuring a review of the 1979 Constitution which brought into existence the 1989 Constitution, creation of 2 additional States, etc., and nullifying the June 12th, 1993 elections which many refer to as the 'fairest and freest election in Nigeria's history' with a two political party Social Democratic Party (SDP) and National Republican Convention (NRC) in place.

At this juncture, a new term 'Interim' Government was introduced into governance in Nigeria as a palliative for the tensed political atmosphere at that time which brought in Ernest Shonekan on August 27th, 1993. The fact that the Interim Government had no popular support, and with the already established precedence, the military led by General Sani Abacha struck once more on November 17th, 1993 forcing out the Interim Government. Abacha died in office on June 8th, 1998, but not without the convening of the 1994 - 1995 National Constitutional Conference which subsequently produced the 1999 Constitution, paving way for General Abdusalami Abubakar, who set the machinery for a return of the country to democratic rule; elections were conducted, Olusegun Obasanjo, a retired Army General and one time military Head of State was declared the winner under the platform of People's Democratic Party (PDP) and was sworn in on May 29th, 1999 as the President, with Alhaji Atiku Abubakar as Vice President. After two tenure of 4 years each and in 2007, Nigeria witnessed for the first time a civilian to a civilian hand over of government. Umaru Musa Yar'Adua of People's Democratic Party (PDP) was elected President and Goodluck Jonathan Ph.D as Vice President.

However, the 2007 elections were so contentious that the then winner, Umaru Musa Yar'adua admitted that the election that brought him to power was marred by electoral irregularities. Umaru Musa Yar'adua died barely a year in office and his former Vice President – Goodluck Jonathan was sworn into office as President until he was voted out of office in 2015 in a keenly contested election that brought into power President Muhammadu Buhari of The All Progressive Congress (APC), a retired Army General and one time Head of State and Vice-President Yemi Osibanjo. Thus, it is obvious that Nigeria has witnessed more of authoritarian and dictatorial regimes than democratic government, since independence in 1960. In fact, out of the 59 years of Nigeria's

independence, the military alone had ruled for not less than 29 years encompassing seven military regimes. On the other hand, the civilians have ruled for a total of 30 years, comprising seven democratic governments.

Nigeria's attempted effort towards democratic governance has been slow, tedious, intriguing, and disappointing. Despite the fact that democratic practices in Nigeria is patterned along the Western liberal democracy which allows for competitive parties, popular sovereignty, majority rule, rule of law, separation of powers, among others, the reverse has been the case in the country. Corroborating this point, Ajayi opines that:

> One therefore expects that democratic norms ought to have become part of the enduring characters of Nigeria's political tradition. Ironically, such traditions are yet to evolve. The growth of democracy in the country has therefore remained stunted.[9]

Thus, from the Westminster parliamentary model of the First Republic to the American democratic model based on the presidential system of government and currently in practice, the tale has been that of authoritarianism, nepotism and violence. With tribal consciousness fully established and embraced in the polity instead of national consciousness, and with the aggressive and ambitious military always in the waiting to strike, democratic practices in Nigeria has been an unfortunate experience. In this regards, Azeez affirms that, in years of Nigeria's existence as an independent nation, her history is replete with failed and truncated attempts at democracy and democratisation.[10] It appears that either democracy is yet to be fully entrenched in our body politics or the values that go with a democratic society is yet to be fully internalised in the people's way of life. As such, Awa insist that:

> The Nigerian society and political system are not democratic in the modern sense of the term…. Democracy in Nigeria can best be described as the government of the people by the elites essentially in the interest of the elites.[11]

Thus, the citizen in Nigeria's democratic experience rather than being central to the act of governance is relegated to the background, their rights trampled upon and left in the state of helplessness which has resulted in loss of confidence in the government, series of violence and social disorder in the polity.

Ironically, every new regime; whether military or civilian make a lot of mouth-watering promises on assumption of office. From restoring human dignity, revitalizing the economy, sustainable development, respect for rule of law and constitutional provisions, a quick hand-over of power to civilian (in the case of the military), etc. but the reverse has been the case in most cases. For instance, Major Patrick Chukwuma Kaduna Nzeogwu who played a leading role in the first military coup in Nigeria insisted that they acted with the aim of salvaging the nation from the incompetency of the First Republic leaders. According to Nzeogwu:

> The aim of the Revolutionary Council is to establish a strong united and prosperous nation, free from corruption, and internal strife. Our method of achieving this is strictly military but we have no doubt that every Nigeria will give us maximum cooperation by assisting the regime and not disturbing the peace during the slight changes that are taking place….Our enemies are the political profiteers, the swindlers, the men in high and low places that seek bribes and demand 10 percent; those that seek to keep the country divided permanently so that they can remain in office as ministers or VIPs atleast, the tribalists, the nepotists, those that make the country look big for nothing before the international circles, those that have corrupted our society and put the Nigerian political calendar back by their words and deeds….But what we do promise every law abiding citizen is freedom from fear and all forms of oppression, freedom from general inefficiency and freedom to live and strive in every field of human endeavor, both nationally and internationally. We promise that you will no more be ashamed to say that you are a Nigerian.[12]

Also, in 1970, Gowon gave the whole world the impression that 1976 would be the last year of military disengagement from politics in Nigeria. But when it appeared that the

conditions were no longer favourable to him, he bracketed his conscience, rejected his earlier stand and rather held that military disengagement in 1976 would be irresponsible.[13] Thus, the failure by Gowon to respect his promise of relinquishing power in 1976 according to James Ojiako, is because he wanted to impose himself as an indefinite military dictator on Nigeria.[14] More so, in General Muhammadu Buhari's maiden broadcast in January, 1984, he accused the Shagari led regime of massive corruption, nepotism, etc. and promised, among other things "to put an end to the serious economic predicament now affecting afflicting our nation."[15] However, the reverse was the case. And as General Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida toppled the Buhari led regime in August, 1985, he accused the former of high handedness and promised, "to restore hope in the minds of Nigerians, renew aspirations for a better future and fight corruption … since our action is in the interest of the nation."[16] Subsequently, he promised to terminate his regime on October 1st, 1990, he quashed such hopes in 1987 and extended his reign to 1992, and yet again to August 2nd, 1993 after annulling the general elections. In an attempt to justify his stay in power and to prolong it, Babangida cajoled Nigerians and the rest of the world thus:

> It would be dereliction of an obligation to run away from the stage in order to simply retain its credibility. It would amount to irresponsibility to repeat old mistakes, which are correctable. If running away from the problems would solve them, we would have preferred the easier option of a hurried departure by 1990.[17]

General Abacha is not left out in the list of failed promise. He did not just institute and manipulate the constitutional conferences, but promised a speedy and uninterrupted transition programme to civil rule which he shall not be a participant. The reverse was the case as he funded all the five political parties with the aim of being nominated and adopted as the sole presidential candidate.

Democratic experience in Nigeria continues to be bleak even in the eventual return of civil rule and uninterrupted civil government from 1999 till date. How democracy is to be practically translated into a functioning statehood in the Nigerian society appears extremely difficult. This difficulty has led to the serious contention on the link between democracy and development. Claude Ake for instance, sees democracy as a *sin qua non* for development in Africa, because he believes that there is a causal relationship between democracy and development.[18]

P.A. Nyong'o corroborates thus:

> There is a definite correlation between the lack of democratic practices in African politics and the deteriorating economic condition. If governments are not accountable to the people they govern, then they are very likely to engage in socio-economic practices which are not responsive to people's needs. Questions of development and problems of economic crises cannot therefore be meaningfully discussed without discussing problems regarding the nature of state power, the form of popular participation in the processes of government and the question therefore, of democracy.[19]

Notably, the development strands of the military regimes seem to be firmly rooted than that of most civilian regimes. From the economy to infrastructures, from health to education, and from institutionalism to leadership, the blueprint of the various military regimes is feasible while that of civilian regimes is more or less characterized by failed and unfulfilled promises on one hand, and systematic mismanagement of national assets and gross neglect of societal problems on the other hand.

In this light, John observes that:

> During his inauguration on May 29, 1999, Obasanjo promised, among other things, to fight poverty, to stabilize power supply within six months, reduce the exchange rate of the US dollar from the then prevailing rate of N95.00 to N70.00, repair old, and provide new Federal highways in all geo-political zones of Nigeria….[20]

Yet again, the reverse was the case, as the country remained underdeveloped during Obasanjo's regime with poverty in the center, power supply was a farce, and federal roads had turned to death traps, while the US Dollar as at 2007 stood at about N145. All these took place despite oil boom portraying misappropriation of funds, unaccountability and corruption. Nigeria according to the 2002 Human Development Report (HDR), an annual report of the United Nations Development Programme, UNDP, is ranked 148th in a league of 178 countries worldwide. This reports places Nigeria among the lowest bracket of poor nations. According to the report, it follows that, at least, 70 percent of Nigerians live below the poverty line and survive on less than S1.00 per day.[21] Invariably, this trend has continued uninterruptedly from the Obasanjo led administration to Musa Yar'Adua's, and to Goodluck Jonathan's administration. In short, despite the fact that President Buhari of the All Progressive Congress came into power largely on the heels of fighting and eradicating corruption which has since appeared to be the Nigerian way of life, there is little that has been done to salvage the enormous decay in the system as life of the average Nigerian is still poor, brutish and short. While the economy is biting hard with recession, exchange rate fluctuating between N350 to about N500 per US Dollar, there is violence and killings from the North to the South, and from the East to the West. In fact, there is anger and hunger in the land. This unenviable state of the nation would not have been so if democratic leaders were accountable to the citizens. The President Buhari led administration has since inception on May 29th, 2015 accused the Goodluck Jonathan's regime and the People Democratic Party of overseeing the most corrupt regime in the history of Nigeria in a period the price of crude oil, the major source of state revenue was all time high and trillions of naira were brazenly looted from the state treasury. How this endemic and cancerous vice-corruption has contributed in no mean measure

to failed governance and underdeveloped in Nigeria is of grave consequence to the entity-Nigeria. Nnamani sums up thus:

> Nigeria is a country perpetually great, almost permanently in crises, regularly threatened with disintegration, prolongingly plundered and mismanaged, forever talking about democracy and development but retreating from democracy.[22]

4.3   Democracy and Corruption in Nigeria

Obviously, corruption is not new in Africa and in other parts of the world, but an ancient global phenomenon.[23] As such, the scourge was, and still is, not restricted to the African continent. It remains a challenge to America, Europe and Asia as well. The abundant natural and human resources bestowed on the Nigerian state if effectively utilized would have sufficiently catered for and transform the lives of her citizens and also launch the nation into the community of developing nations. But what is the fate of the commonwealth of all handed over to political office holders? Achebe aptly response to the question thus:

> Stolen and salted away by people in power and their accomplices. Squandered in uncontrolled importation of all kinds of useless consumer mechanize from every corner of the globe (and) embezzled through inflated contracts to an increasing array of loyalists who have neither the desire nor competence to execute their contracts.[24]

Also, Ikubaje observes that:

> Comparatively speaking, while corrupt Asians re-invested their capital built through primitive accumulation back into their continent, corrupt Africans continue to stash their ill-gotten wealth in Swiss and other foreign banks. Fortunately for these countries where the money is hidden and unfortunate for the Africans, the looted resources from Africa are utilized as capital investment for these developed countries.[25]

Undoubtedly corruption, thrives more where it is tolerated, and where the possibility of detection and consequent punishment is slim.[26] This underscores the persistence and endemic nature of the vice in the Nigerian polity. In fact, corruption is a bane of development in Nigeria. It permeates every sector of government and public life, and it is fast becoming popular among members of the society to rationalize corruption with the flimsy and irrational excuse that corruption is present in every society, as such, Nigerians need not wash their dirty linen in the public. Thus, it is pertinent to ask, what really constitute acts of corruption? The excerpts from Article 4, clause 1 of the African Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption and Related Offences does justice to what constitute acts of corruption directly and indirectly thus:

1. a. The solicitation or acceptance, directly or indirectly, by a public official or any other person, of any goods of monetary value, or other benefit, such as a gift, favour, promise or advantage for himself or herself or for another person or entity, in exchange for any act or omission in the performance of his or her public functions.

2. b. The offering or granting, directly or indirectly, to a public official or any other person, of any goods of monetary value, or other benefit, such as a gift, favour, promise or advantage for himself or herself or for another person or entity, in exchange for any act or omission in the performance of his or her public functions.

3. c. Any act or omission in the discharge of his or her duties by a public official or any other person for the purpose of illicitly obtaining benefits for himself or herself or for a third party.

4. d. The diversion by a public official of any other person, for purposes unrelated to those for which they were intended, for his or her own benefit or that of a third party, of any property belonging to the state or its agencies, to an independent agency, or to an individual, that such official has received by virtue of his or her position.

5. e. The offering or giving, promising, solicitation or acceptances, directly or indirectly, or any undue advantage to or by any person who directs or works for, in any capacity, a private sector entity for himself or herself or for anyone else, for him or her to act, or refrain from acting, in breach of his or her duties.

6. f. The offering, giving, solicitation or acceptance directly or indirectly, or promising of any undue advantage to or by any person who asserts or confirms that he or she is able to exert any improper influence over the decision making of any person performing functions in the public or private sector in consideration thereof, whether the undue advantage is for himself or for anyone else, as well as the request, receipt or the acceptance of the offer or the promise of such an advantage, in consideration of that influence, whether or not the influence is exerted or whether or not the supposed influence leads to the intended result.

7. g. The significant increase in the assets of a public official or any other person that he or she cannot reasonably explain.

8. h. The use or concealment of proceeds derived from any of the acts referred to in this article, and

9. i. Participation as a principal, co-principal, agent, instigator, or accomplice after the fact, or in any other manner in the commission or attempted commission of, in any collaboration or conspiracy to commit any of the acts referred to in this article. [27]

Collaborating the fact that corruption thrives in Nigeria because society sanctions it, Maduagwa posits that, no Nigerian official would be ashamed, let alone condemned by his people because he or she is accused of being corrupt. The same applies to outright stealing of government or public money or property. On the contrary, the official will be hailed as being smart. He would be adored as having 'made it'; he is a 'successful man.' And any government official or politician who is in a position to enrich himself corruptly but failed to do so will, in fact, be ostracized by his people upon leaving

office. He would be regarded as a fool, or selfish, or both.[28] This is the sad tale of a nation so blessed, yet underdeveloped decades after independence.

How did we let it go so bad? In Africa, corruption was a big challenge during the colonial era. For example, different anti-corruption committees of enquiries were set up by the different colonial governments on the continent to investigate cases of corruption and come up with recommendations on how the challenge could be successfully dealt with.[29] Colonial governments themselves were criticized for being corrupt and the legacy of corruption was part of what the new African political elites inherited at independence in late 1950s and early 1960s. Also, the democracy perspective adduces the long absence of democracy caused by military rule as the cause of corruption and underdevelopment.[30] As such, Kew notes:

> the giant was brought to its knees by [twenty years] of brutal and corrupt military rule, which left a legacy of executive dominance and a political corruption in the hands of Nigeria's so-called 'godfathers'—powerful political bosses sitting atop vast patronage networks who view the government primarily through the lens of their own personal enrichment.[31]

Obviously, corruption and bad governance were the two main reasons often cited by the military to rationalise their incursion into Nigerian politics with a promise of eradicating the vice.

Thus, Ogbeidi sums up that:

> Widespread corruption, where government officials looted public fund with impunity and flaunt their wealth with reckless abandon provided the pretext for a group of young middle-rank army officers to sack the Nigerian First Republican politicians from power through a coup d'état on 15th Jan. 1966.[32]

The reverse became the case as the military were driven by selfishness and hobbled by cronyism, military elites, aided by civilians' minions as the brazenly looted state

property, diverted state funds into their private accounts, and awarded outrageous contracts to companies owned by them and their cohorts. In fact, unfettered by the rule of law, the military elite corrupted ideals of meritocracy and circumvented virtually all mechanisms designed to promote accountability. Thus, wealth accumulation was all that mattered, and no effort or means was spared in pursuance of that ignoble goal.[33] Paranoid by this development, the eminent Nigerian playwright, Soyinka maintains that, "only a community of fools will entrust its most sacred possession – nationhood – yet again to a class that has proven so fickle, so treacherous and dishonorable."[34] More so, the good reception of the military intervention in governance over the years did not mean a preference of military against civilian rule. Rather, it reflected a total disenchantment with the uncertainty, violence, corruption and waste that had marred civilian rule since 1960. With the return of civilian rule and uninterrupted democracy in Nigeria, and from 1999 till date, has the fortunes of Nigeria and Nigerians improve? It is critical to state that with the return to democracy in 1999, mismanagement and mis-rule in government has continued unabated as the elites have hijacked the democratic process as they govern the people with impunity, outright disregard to the rule of law, engage in open manipulation of the electoral process, rigging of elections to subvert the will of the people and other electoral malpractices. The civilian leadership has failed to deliver the dividends of democracy to the nation's mostly poor masses. Since independence, according to Save Nigeria Group, Nigeria has made US$ 1 trillion dollars, of this US$ 600 billion has been stolen by our leaders; in 1999, the poverty level was 45 percent and in 2012 it was 76 percent all due to mismanagement of our resources through corruption; the money made from oil from 1999 to 2011 was more than all that was made from 1960-1999, but squandered by our leaders with nothing to show for it in terms of improving the living standards of the people.[35] The hope that the

dawn of democracy in 1999 would mark an appreciable breakaway from the past, including the country's perennial problem of corruption, largely remains elusive and a mirage. Notable international rating institutions, like Transparency International, ranked Nigeria as the most corrupt in 2002, the second most corrupt in 2003, and the third most corrupt in 2004. In its 2005 survey carried out on 159 countries, Nigeria was ranked the sixth most corrupt nation in the world. The TI's survey of 2006/2007 carried out on 163 countries ranked Nigeria as 17th and 33rd most corrupt nation in the world.[36] Meanwhile, the civilian regime of Olusegun Obasanjo, an ex-military leader and respected international statesman who had handed power back to civilians in 1979, was expected to be, "a new broom who would sweep out the corruption and abuses of military brass hats who had lost any sense of purpose beyond plundering the national treasury and brutally pummeling innocent citizens into submission".[37] Despite allegedly spending more than $2 billion in reconstructing roads and over one trillion naira on the power sector[38], Obasanjo failed to revive the country's decrepit infrastructure and epileptic power sector, and the country's oil refineries were producing less when he left office in 2007 than when he was first elected in 1999.[39] The Obasanjo regime also announced that it had lost $4 billion in potential oil revenues in 2006 to insecurity and the damage of pipelines by armed militants in Nigeria's volatile Niger Delta region.[40] Then came the Umaru Yar'Adua's led administration with a remarkable 'Seven Point Agenda'. Though, the regime was short lived, as he died barely two years in office with developmental projects spread across the country. Significant among the achievement of the regime was the kick-starting of the amnesty programme which re-absorbed the Niger Delta militants into the society and rehabilitated them, and most importantly brought relative peace to the Niger Delta region, while reducing in no mean measure the destruction of oil facilities and the threat to lives and properties of oil workers and

expatriates. The result was improvement in oil production, which led to the oil 'wind fall' era that witnessed oil boom and the highest generation of oil revenue by the Federal government, with the Jonathan led administration being the sole beneficiary. Also, there was a radical move to diversify the economy through agriculture, transportation, and opening up of the water ways which brought about the dredging of the River Niger bank, Abuja metro line, Abuja-Kaduna rail and the Abuja-Kano rail, among other promising projects. Yar'adua reversed the fraudulent sale of Nigeria's assets by the Olusegun Obasanjo government, which sold the assets to cronies of Obasanjo at give-away prices, and which could have mortgaged Nigeria's future into the hands of a few. He pioneered the policy of returning unspent funds to the national treasury at the end of the fiscal year. He is also the first president in the history of Nigeria to declare his assets before assuming office. These policies and actions endeared him to majority of Nigerians. Yar'adua courageously released the N10 billion Lagos state local government council funds withheld by the Obasanjo administration because of political differences with the then governor of Lagos state, Asiwaju Bola Ahmed Tinubu.[41] With his demise; his Vice President-Goodluck Jonathan became the President. According to John, "the regime of President Goodluck Jonathan further brought Nigeria to her knees as corruption became unlimited in scope and dimension."[42] Else, what can we say about the $2.1 billion arms deal? The money which was budgeted for the purchase of arms in the fight against Boko Haram insurgency group in the country all of a sudden disappeared. Whether the fund developed legs and ran away is what the Jonathan led administration is yet to explain to the citizenry. Also, the stain of corruption did not spare anti-graft agencies.

Thus, Mayewa observes that:

> Corruption among law enforcement Officers was a major problem responsible for failure of the Federal Government's anti-corruption campaign. It went so bad that in some cases, law enforcement Officers were found to be the principal perpetrators of the crimes.[43]

For example, a former Chairman of the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC), Ibrahim Lamorde, was accused of fraudulently diverting over N1tn proceeds from corruption funds recovered by the agency.[44] This is incredible as those who were appointed to fight corruption in the country are also found as the victim of the same problem they fight. That is to say, that trust is difficult in the country. While the former minister of petroleum - Mrs. Alison Madueke is alleged to have looted the oil industry blue and black with her cohorts, the legislatures and judiciary are not spared in this 'beautiful menace'- corruption. More so, corruption is not only experienced among the Presidents of the country because many governors have been found guilty of it. It is like a disease that spreads from mother to children. The News Agency of Nigeria (NAN) reports that Nyako, the former governor of Adamawa and seven others, including companies, are standing trial before Justice Okon Abang on a 37-count charge bordering on money laundering.[45] The governor opened 30 different accounts in Zenith bank of Nigeria using different names whose aim is to siphon funds. Among the offenses tendered against the ex-governor are a criminal conspiracy, abuse of office, and opening of multiple bank accounts and stealing to the tune of N29 billion (twenty-nine billion naira). The cases of Ibori, Joshua Dariya, Depreye Alamiyeseigha, and

others yet to be convicted are tangible evidence of state governors plundering and milking the states coffer's dry, with outrageous debt at the end of their tenures. Though uproarious, it is on record that President Jonathan is said to have declared that, "stealing is not corruption."[46] On the other hand, former president of Nigeria, Olusegun Obasanjo, confirmed the endemic nature of corruption in Nigeria thus:

> There was corruption! Corruption! And corruption! Everywhere and all the time! Corruption was not only rife, it had eaten so deeply into the marrow of our existence that looters and fraudsters had become our heroes, and it seemed we could no longer place any faith in honesty and decency and hard work.[47]

Also, Olusegun Obasanjo, on November 24, 2016, while speaking at the first Akintola Williams Annual Lecture in Lagos, reacted negatively on the level of corruption going on among the members of the House of Assembly and House of Representatives. According to Jola Sotubo, "Former President, Olusegun Obasanjo described the National Assembly as a den of corruption."[48] More so, part of the speech deliver by the ex-president which hammered on the level of corruption among the members of the house has it that:

> Members of the National Assembly pay themselves allowances for staff and offices they do not have or maintain. Once you are a member, you are co-opted and your mouth is stuffed with rot and corruption that you cannot opt out as you go home with not less than N15 million a month for a senator and N10 million a month for a member of the House of Representatives.[49]

Similarly, The Chairman of the Presidential Advisory Committee Against Corruption (PACAC), Prof. Itse Sagay flays members of the National Assembly for what he described as hostility towards the war against corruption.

According to him:

> Lawmakers, senior lawyers, especially Senior Advocates of Nigeria (SANs), and some "hostile and powerful judges" work against efforts to rid the country of corruption. While the United States President earns $400,000 per annum, a Nigerian senator earns over $1.7million, beside a basic salary of N2.4million per month, they earn allowances such as hardship (50 per cent of basic salary), newspaper allowance (50 per cent), wardrobe allowance (25 per cent), entertainment (30 per cent), recess (10 per cent), and leave (10 per cent), among others which amounts to N29.5million per month and N3.2billion per annum.[50]

Thus, with the emergence of a new government in the year 2015, many Nigerians had great faith that corruption in the country will be minimized. In that year, power left the hands of People's Democratic Party (PDP) to the All Progressive Congress (APC). One of the campaign promises made by the present President Muhammadu Buhari was the massive eradication of corruption in the country. Irrespective of the campaign promises, John opines that, the situation has not changed, and this is very regrettable.[51]

John reiterates that under the civilian regime of President Buhari:

> Corruption is thriving very strongly and successfully, especially among the cabals of the All Progressive Congress (APC) He (Buhari) is corrupt and his cabinet corrupt. His fight against corruption is nothing more than a case of witch-hunting members of the opposition party (Peoples Democratic Party).[52]

However, John's position on the alleged witch-hunting of members of the former ruling but now the main opposition party (PDP) is contestable since it remains a fact that for 16years (1999-2015), the People's Democratic Party (PDP) were at the helms of affairs in Nigeria and this was a period that oil revenue was at its peak with little or nothing to show for it in terms of improving the living standards of the people, and a time frame that Nigeria was ranked between the "1st and 39th most corrupt country in the world."[53]

Invariably, the President Buhari's administration prosecution of PDP members who had occupied one office or the other in the past is simply a request for accountability while in office and it is justifiable. Today, the Nigerian nation is characterized by massive infrastructural decay unimaginable as depicted in dilapidated roads, epileptic power supply, and lack of access to portable water, poor health care services, poor sanitation, massive poverty, hunger, malnutrition and unemployment. Invariably, Nigeria's politics is one characterized by moral and amoral dimensions of corruption. As such, A Professor of International Law and Jurisprudence, University of Lagos, Professor Akin Oyebode has warned that "If drastic measures are not put in place urgently to contain it, corruption might ultimately result in the mortality of Nigeria as a nation-state."[54]

However, it is important to understand that there are two sides to corrupt practices; the giver and the taker, which explains the big players involved in corrupt practices in Nigeria. According to Bond, the majority of the developed countries have been alleged to be benefactors of corruption in Africa.[55] In the same vein, the developed countries have also been accused of being the givers of bribes in Africa, which happen to be one of the major manifestations of corruption.[56] This according to Cockcroft, led to the promulgation of Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Convention on corruption to discourage western companies from bribing government officials in developing countries to get contracts.[57] America was the first country to come up with this type of law; but then it discovered that some companies outside of America were involved in bribing bureaucrats in developing countries to get contracts to the detriment of American companies' fair tendering.[58] It then decided to encourage the Europeans to be part of developed countries in promoting healthy and competitive contract bidding in Africa and in other developing countries.[59] This was not just a manifestation of Europe and America acknowledgement that they and their companies

had played a role in contributing to corruption in Africa and developing countries, but a sincere move to nib the bud of corruption. Also, there is no gain reiterating that corruption remains a global issue though it has taken different dimensions across the globe. But, it appears that the western and Asian countries have been able to constructively manage corruption in order to promote development, while Africa in general and Nigeria in particular is still romancing and paying lip service to the menace. This is by no means justifying or making a case for developmental corruption. In Nigeria, there is a plethora of laws against corruption. While some newly elected leaders come determined to clean out the stables; the intentions are genuine but are frustrated by the mess with which they are confronted, other leaders simply grandstand, making speeches and signing laws in the absence of any expectation that any meaningful change will follow. Despite the Criminal and Penal Codes, Code of conduct tribunal, promulgation of the Anti-Money Laundering Act, and the establishment of anti-graft agencies, such as Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Commission (ICPC) in 2000, and Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) in 2003 after the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering (FATF) named Nigeria amongst the twenty three non-cooperative countries frustrating the effort of international community to fight money laundering (EFCC(Establishment) Act, 2002), corruption has continued to weaken institutions, discourages investment and retards economic development because of a total lack of seriousness on the part of government. Thus, it is a fact that the problem of corruption in Africa is not inadequate anticorruption policies and legal frameworks but, in many cases, non-implementation or ineffective implementation of the anti-corruption policy and programmes.[60] This is evidenced by the many investigations not complemented with any effective prosecution. Secondly, and perhaps relatedly, is inconsistency in government posture

across regimes, thereby sending the wrong signals to the citizenry and creating a soft landing for the culture of corruption. Not left out, is the role of the masses, religious and traditional institutions that tend to celebrate looters and even confer titles on them without questioning the source of their income. Thus, from 1960, venality in terms of corruption and bad leadership have drown the destiny of the Nigerian nation, and has always been part of the Nigerian government (whether military or civilian regime). Corruption has also led to diversion of developmental resources of the society to private or personal use. This has contributed to the leakage of capital from Nigeria for illegal deposits abroad. In fact, the civilian leadership has failed to deliver the dividends of democracy to the nation's mostly poor masses. However, the implementation of the Treasury Single Account (TSA), the proposed designation of special courts to handle cases of corruption in addition to the establishment of a scheme for whistle-blowers and witnesses protection by the President Buhari's administration are clearly pointers to the resolve of the present Nigerian government to aggressively confront the ogre of corruption if not overwhelm by party and tribal sentiments.

4.4   The Leadership versus Followership Question

In the face of the unenviable state of affairs in Nigeria that has led to bitterness by the masses, agitations for succession by ethnic enclaves and calls for restructuring of the existing Nigeria's structure by majority of the citizenry, the leadership versus followership question arise. Whereas, democracy as a system of government thrives so much on not just good political leadership but responsible followership, who is to blame for failed governance, underdevelopment, wide spread corruption, glaring looting of the national treasury, mass poverty, decayed infrastructures, alarming unemployment, wanton insecurity of lives and properties, moribund manufacturing

sector, poor state of education and health system, pervasive inequality epitomized in an abysmal lacuna between the rich and the poor, food insecurity, compromised judiciary, rampant inflation, injustice, marginalization, electoral fraud and absolute disregard for due process and the rule of law among others? Is the mismanagement of the commonwealth of all a consequent of crisis of leadership, failed followership or both?

Obviously, with the emergence of Nigeria as a product of the nexus of different tribes facilitated by the exigencies of colonialism, the leadership question began to acquire a disparaging and obfuscating posture. This stem basically from the salient distinctions in the traditional political systems and orientations of these amorphous ethnic enclaves (majorly; Igbo, Yoruba, Hausa-Fulani), and also from the perturbing pattern of colonial administration and transfer process. Therefore, at the attainment of independence, it became apparently difficult to pragmatically synergise in order to evolve pragmatic and integrative political institutions that are formidable enough to obliterate the already established ethnic bigotism and illusive unity as a result of the amalgamation of agglomeration of disparate linguistic and cultural groups which later became Nigeria. Corroborating this point, Arthur Nwankwo rightly states that:

> The leadership question in Nigeria was simply a clear demonstration of the erstwhile nationalist movement, once political independence was achieved. The pilfering motive in the Nigerian government was laid bare. A parasitic gang of public officials, protected by clan solidarity, were ill-prepared for the task of ruling the sprawling super tribe called Nigeria.[61]

Invariably, the transfer of power by the British to Abubakar Tafawa Balewa rather than a firebrand nationalists sparked suspicion of neo-colonialism and a calculated attempt to vest power in the Northern enclaves by other ethnic enclaves. According to Arthur Nwankwo, the valid argument about this crude colonial transfer process is that the colonialists themselves laid the foundations of political instability in Nigeria by

spearheading the formation of a sympathetic elite configuration capable of preserving colonial structures, polarized this elite formation along ethnic rather than ideological lines.[62] This, in no mean measure, was a time bomb which eventually exploded in 1966 through a bloody coup. The first indigenous leader and only Nigeria's prime Minister was accused thus:

> Despite the cloud of disillusionment permeating the entire system, Balewa showed no savvy to the deteriorating realities of Nigerian political environment. His actions in the Western crisis of 1962, the cancellation of the 1962/3 census result and the intensity of electoral malpractices committed during the 1964 general election by his party stirred other contenders to inflict insuperable assault on the leadership.[63]

Indeed, this sowed the seed of leadership crisis in independent Nigeria. Thus, the essential preoccupation of the Nigerian leaders became solidarity to one's ethnic enclave rather than national loyalty, this further brought about organized sectional liquidation of the national resources. The politics of divide and rule: group exclusion and inordinate sets in turning the entire system into a battle field, politicians embroiled in antagonistic struggle for resources thereby turning the impervious to expected norms of political morality. How else can one explain the rationale behind the then President, the Rt. Hon. Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe and the then Prime Minister Sir Abubakar Balewa seeking the loyalty of the military individually and separately during the post-independence constitutional crisis?[64] It portrays the problem of attempting to answer the political question who should rule? Thus, Oguejiofor observes that, "the emergent African leaders, instead of working for national cohesion, further worsened the political quagmire by using ethnic jealousy and conflict for their selfish ends."[65] For instance, political parties from the First Republic were ethnically based, financed and patronized. While the Northern Peoples Congress (NPC) evolved from Jamiyyar Mutane Arewa-Association of Northern People; the Acton Congress (AG) evolved from Egbeomo

Oduduwa- Yoruba Cultural Association; and the Igbo State Union identified more with

the National Convention of Nigerian Citizens (NCNC), particularly when Zik assumed

its leadership.[66] Commonsensically, the name Northern Peoples Congress clearly

depicts a party formed by the Northerners, for the common good of the Northerners. As

such, non-Northerners were not welcomed in the party. Also, with the introduction of

the quota system in Nigeria military, meritocracy was replaced by tribal sentiments.

Summing up on the foundation of failed leadership in Nigeria, Coleman posits thus:

> The net result was that Nigeria entered its national era,
> politically conscious leaders became acutely aware of the
> relative position of their groups and regions on the scare
> of modernity. This awareness unleashed competitive
> drives on the part of the groups and regions. Unevenness
> in development sharpened the awareness of group and
> regional differentiation, which in turn intensified inter-
> group and inter-regional competition and tension. In most
> instances appeal for united action for self-improvement
> was made to the Kinship's, tribal group or nationality,
> and to a limited extent the region.[67]

With the diverse phenomena gradually established, sustained and perpetuated by the

political elites, political instability permeated the Nigerian political system, the military

was not left out as enlistment and promotion was chunked out based on nepotism.

Obviously, the place of good political leadership in every democratic set up needs not

be overemphasized, as such, the progress of a nation is judged by the quality of its

leadership. Okolo examines the quality of leadership in Nigeria thus:

> When everything, is said and done, Nigeria's, as Africa's
> fate, lies principally with her leaders: the type of people
> they are, their lifestyle, values, and the type of image they
> create for the people. For there is no question of changing
> the values of the society from below, so to speak, that is
> to say, those of the common man, if little or no changes
> occur from the top: the nation's leaders. But in Nigeria as
> in many African nations, the big problem is leadership.[68]

Embellishing the menace of leadership in Nigeria, Achebe categorically asserts that:

> There is nothing basically wrong with the Nigerian
> character. There is nothing wrong with the Nigerian land,
> or climate or water or air or anything else. The Nigerian
> problem is the unwillingness or inability of its leaders to
> rise to the responsibility, to the challenge of personal
> example which are the hallmarks of true leadership.[69]

From the First Republic till date, the country is still grappling with leadership crisis with no immediate panacea. The regionalization of Nigeria aggravated the division along ethnic lines, as the dominant ethnic groups of Hausa/Fulani, Yoruba and Ibo overshadowed other minority ethnic groups foisting on them the fear of domination, marginalization and alienation. It could be stated categorically that the root cause of leadership crisis in Nigeria is the inability to transcend tribal loyalties to the Nigerian state; ethnicity on a lighter note, and tribalism in the Nigerian context. Thus, how else can one reconcile Chief Awolowo's recognition of Nigeria as a mere geographical expression but not a nation?[70] Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe's declaration that "the God of Africa has created the Ibo nation to lead the children of Africa from the bondage of the ages."[71]

Zik furthered that:

> The marital prowess of the Ibo nation at all stages of
> human history has enabled them not only to conquer
> others but also to adapt themselves to the role of a
> preserver, the Ibo nation cannot shrink its responsibility
> from its manifest destiny.[72]

And Sir Ahmadu Bello remark that his political party, the Northern People's Congress, composed entirely of the feudal class ensconced on the seat of power in Northern Nigeria, would rule Southern sea willy nilly?[73] The leadership question further arises in the series of political violence that has engrossed the Nigerian state since independence. Failed leadership and the inability of successive Nigerian leaders to sincerely settle

conflicts within the Nigerian state deteriorated into disharmony, political violence and general instability of the country. The lack of political will to listen to agitation for fairness and equity in the polity brought about an array of political crises such as the Tiv riots of 1960, Western regional crisis of 1962, the census crisis of 1962/63, the federal election crisis of 1964 and the Western election crisis of 1965, the subsequent massacre of thousands of then Easterners (currently referred to as South-South and South-East geo political zone) in the North which prompted hundreds of thousands of them to return to the South East where increasingly strong Biafran secessionist sentiment emerged. The malodorous effect of these early political agitations is yet to be nib in the bud, as it debarred the course of political/economic stability in Nigeria and established violence as the bane of political interaction.

According to Okibe Hyginus:

> Therefore, a breach of order and tranquility in the country had become a culture and underlining pattern of political interaction between and among parties. This was evidenced in the census result which in contravention of the objective statistics was callously cancelled to the advantage of the North whose hegemonic control of the polity had become tenuous. Coincidentally, the entire configuration of violence in the Nigerian polity changed in dimension. It became the primary preoccupation of individuals, parties and ethnic groups.[74]

Invariably, it was not surprising that every minor misunderstanding or grievances within the polity orchestrated into full blown inter-ethnic violence thereby paralyzing the already weakened foundation of institutionalized order in the polity. In a reaction to the embraced deflating political situation, Azikiwe exclaimed that, "if they have decided to destroy our national unity they should summon a round table conference to decide how our national assets should be divided… for it is better that we should disintegrate in peace and not in pieces".[75]

The thought of succession by Azikiwe barely few years after Nigeria's independence, though a sincere and conscientious attempts at defending the security of lives and properties of the Easterners on one hand and every other part of the country on the other hand, in no mean measure foisted revolutionary consciousness on Nigerians and the agitation for secession up till date. For instance, in a move towards greater autonomy to minority ethnic groups, the military divided the four regions into 12 states. However, the Igbos rejected attempts at constitutional revisions and insisted on full autonomy for the East. Consequently, on May 29, 1967, Lt. Col. Emeka Odumegwu Ojukwu, the Military Governor of the Eastern region who emerged as the leader of Igbo secessionist movement, declared the independence of the Eastern region as the Republic of Biafra on May 30, 1967. This action resulted into a civil war that caused death of millions of Nigerians, destruction of infrastructures, and a further division of the country along ethnic line. However, Okibe observes that:

> Azikiwe in his state of dismay had thought that the immediate past political impasse would serve as a deterrent to future political upheavals in the country but the bewilderment and demoralizing activities of Nigerian National Alliance (NNA) impregnated the polity with revolutionary tendencies, such that the United Progressive Grand Alliance resorted to a chronic demagogue of assault on our leadership.[76]

It is no longer news that the patterns of power struggle among individuals, political parties and ethnic groups in Nigeria have gradually transformed the political atmosphere into mini-battles, with no regards for the sanctity of human lives and the continuous corporate existence of the nation. The essence of political party formation and alliance which is ideology based is defeated in the Nigerian context, rather, violence and bloodshed is the order of the day. In the past, military intervention in governance seemed to be a temporary panacea for the political instability of the country but after years of military rule, which witnessed series of coups and counter coups, and

eventually, the thirty-month civil war with its unforgettable effects, it became obvious that the military have no solution to the quagmire as they are incorrigible, if not worse than the civilian leaders. The big question for Okaneme is, how can Nigeria be on the march with the kind of visionless, myopic, ineffective and ineffectual leadership that has been her lot for the past years 50 years plus of her political independence? He concludes that, "the concept of leadership as service is simply alien to Nigerian leaders especially the political class.[77]

Not left out in the leadership question, is the revenue allocation crisis. It appears the political leadership in Nigeria lacks the political will to formulate and implement a just and equitable revenue allocation formula on one hand, and a viable national development plan on the other hand. While it is obvious that no government can meet its obligation to the governed or aspire to greater heights of self-reliance without a firm grip on the economy, the unresolved fiscal crisis in Nigeria is a scourge that needs to be resolved for development to thrive. And whereas:

> Political leadership requires aligning individual and national aspirations and interests to ensure consummate cooperation of all interest groups, attenuating of ethnic problems especially in multi-ethnic nations like Nigeria and securing equitable distribution of national resources and superior performance by the public.[78]

The reverse is rather the case in Nigeria. The harnessing and distributing of the national resources has become a perennial channel for crisis. Indeed, Nigeria's fiscal question is in the fore of her disunity due to the marginalisation of the host communities and state where natural resources are process. In all, leadership in its true sense has eluded Nigerians over the years. While Bola Tinubu remarked that, "we are… a people without a leader, a country with no truth worthy men at the helm of affairs and a nation lost at sea"[79] Obasi notes that, "leadership in Nigeria has largely being hypocritical"[80]

Invariably, the implication of this leadership deficit is the pitiable state of ordinary Nigerians who are compelled to exist in the condition that shames and dehumanizes them. Summing up, Soyinka posits that:

> We are living in; the condition of enslavement to a class that is bereft of solutions, an incontinent, spend thrift, power-besotted class, a class that lacks the will, even the integrity, to embark upon policies for the amelioration of the parlous existence of multitudes that cushion their existence, a class that has raised corruption to Olympian heights and made a sacred duty of deceit, imposes on us no other course but that of our own rescue mission.[81]

What should the masses who are alienated from good leadership, basic amenities, security of their lives and properties do? This brings us to the followership question.

There is no gain reiterating that democracy is a game of number and the only system of government that allows the masses to contract government. In fact, the followers in any democratic society remain the largest bloc. And on the basis of this numerical supremacy to leaders, they wield (or ought, in the Nigeria's example, to wield) a lot of power in determining leadership; molding and shaping leadership, checkmating leadership and thereby stemming the tide of bad governance. It is a fact that throughout the ages, and in every society that has evolved successfully, social reform and change is initiated by followership and not necessarily the leadership. For instance, the French revolution was initiated by aggrieved peasants, wage-earners and intellectuals fed up with the status quo. In the old Soviet Union, the policy of pereistroika was being taken up by the masses, people emerging from a state of apathy and alienation, for the purification of the atmosphere in the society that had been fouled by long years of stagnation. More recently, the Arab Spring has successfully forced rulers from power in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya and Yemen. In contradistinction, the Nigerian society is far more evolved; Nigeria boasts of some of the most educated (Harvard, Oxford, Cambridge)

trained, enlightened, widely travelled, religious (largest number of pastors, imams, babalawos, social reformers etc), talented (athletes, artistes and performers) in Africa and even in the world. Quite a large number of these individuals are widely acclaimed as giants in their fields of endeavor; a few have even occupied sensitive positions in the global pedestal and performed remarkably well. Yet, we cannot hold our leaders accountable. One wonders if the leaders in Nigeria are from planet Jupiter. Don't they come from our families, villages, local government areas, states and constituencies? Even at the most basic levels, do we demonstrate and model good followership by demanding good governance? In the electoral process, do we go out to register for Permanent Voter's Card (PVC), do we subsequently ensure we vote and defend our votes during elections, and also ensure that individuals that rightly won elections are supported through mass support in their redress process? Do we participate in the legislative process or do the followers have regard for the laws, norms customs and traditions? Obviously, Nigeria is burdened by followership deficit. The near under-emphasis of the role of followership in the democratization process in both formal and informal discourses with regards to Nigeria is disturbing. As such, Ayoade posits that, "politics is too important to be left to politicians…. Government is prone to crime and a government devoid of citizen control is a potential criminal."[82]

Invariably, followers should live up to their responsibilities by being critical about the way they are governed, and actively involving in politics – be available in and for politics, curious, concerned, and not joining force with failed leaders to further alienate themselves and other citizenry from good governance. Moreover, the realization that the Nigerian government will never 'put the issue to the people,' the people should grab the issue, it is theirs. The hub of this inquisitiveness lies on the fact that responsible followership unavailability is a paramount factor explaining leadership deficit in

Nigeria. In fact the solutions to leadership problems in Nigeria can only come through followership. Thus, citizens should not expect good leadership without good followership, since they have become accomplices in the destruction of the nation. Rather than monitor the activities of leaders, some citizens/followers coin excuses defending leader's action simply because they are bought over, while others are passive and uninterested about the goings-on in the political arena in Nigeria, and then be bitter when things are not going on well. What readily comes to mind when issues of electoral malpractices, corruption and other societal ills are raised is the 'people'. Who rigs election for failed leaders? Who runs away with ballot boxes? Who sells vote to failed leaders? Who are political thugs? Who applauds and reward 'thieves 'with honorary degrees, religious and traditional titles? Who are the herdsmen killing farmers? Who is blowing up oil installations? Who are the armed robbers, kidnappers and cultists? Invariably, it is the failure on the path of followers that have fuelled, nourished and sustained bad leadership in Nigeria.

Summing up, Ademola-Olateju maintains that:

> We have a crisis of followership. As Nigerians, we don't obey the law and we do not follow the rules. We are anyhow people, who do things anyhow and do anyhow things. Responsible followership is made more difficult because Nigerians pretend to be religiously yet they are not godly…. It is absurd, blaming the leadership for everything when these leaders were bred among us. It is even more scandalous to vote time and again for leaders who have failed. It is irresponsible when we follow these leeches blindly, fail to call them to account and demand their removal. It is a failure of followership, when we elect politicians who are not fit to be head of households to high office. It is a patent lack of self worth, when we mortgage our present and the future of our children by taking inducements in cash and kind from politicians in exchange for our votes.[83]

Thus, responsible and responsive followership capital is the only needed resource for political transformation and taming the elite menace. For according to Offor, Francis:

> Where therefore citizens persistently refuse to act in the face of unjust laws and immoral decisions and policies of government, such citizens would not only have given room for government to further perpetrate acts that are detrimental to the well being of the citizens, but most importantly, such citizens would be reneging in their duties as morally continuously agents.[84]

How then should the people act in the face of unjust laws, should they adopt a violent or non-violent ideology?

4.5   The Ideological Question

The ideological question is of utmost significance because of its centralistic nature. The drastic failures of development plans in Nigeria in particular and Africa in general is not unrelated to the poverty of ideology. Corroborating, Chinua Achebe insists that:

> In spite of conventional opinion Nigeria has been less than fortunate in its leadership. A basic element of this misfortunate is the seminal absence of intellectual rigour in the political thought of our founding fathers – a tendency to pious materialistic wooliness and self centred pedestrianism.[85]

Also, Uche Chukwumerije maintains that:

> The absence of clearly distinct and different ideologies in our political parties is the bane of Nigeria's political development. Political parties constitute the arteries and veins that feed the blood of political of political values into Nigeria's body politic. Without such nutrition, the body will at best remain weak and atrophy.[86]

Thus, the question is directed to all and sundry; from the political parties to the leaders and to the citizenry, what ideology? As already stated, the understanding of ideology as

adopted in this research is founded on 'a system of ideas that aspire to impact dynamically on the society; socially, politically and otherwise'. According to Marx:

> …in the social production of life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness.[87]

It follows that, the ideology in any given society and the mode of production of that society is related, to each other in a dialectical manner. Also, the ideology of the ruling class reflects the prevailing mode of production of a particular society. This is the sad tale of the Nigerian society with her fate in the hands of heartless and myopic ruling class. For instance, starting from the nationalist movements which metamorphosed into divisive political parties at independence, the story has been the same till date. Corroborating, Irele notes that:

> These nationalist movement galvanized the people for the attainment of independence only. They have as their ultimate goal the attainment of political freedom. It is not surprising therefore that their tactics and strategies were weaned around this ultimate goal.[88]

The ideologies of these political parties were predicated on sectionalism and tribalism. While the Action Group (A.G.) espoused the notion of cultural nationalism; believing that political stability could be achieved only if the ethnic groups that make up the Nigeria state were grouped together to form a single self-administering political units, the Northern People's Congress with its self-explanatory motto: "One North, One People; Irrespective of Religion, Rank or Tribe" believed that its party was mainly for the interest of Northerners. Other political parties equally identified by tribes, such as, Northern Elements Progressive Union (N.E.P.U), the United Middle Belt Congress

(U.M.B.C), the Bornu Youth Movement (BYM), the Kano People's Party (KPP), and the Midwest Democratic Front (MDF). Subsequently, the National Convention of Nigerian Citizens (N.C.N.C.) proclaimed its ideology as "pragmatic socialism", while the action Group (A.G.) adopted "democratic socialism." Irele rightly observes that:

> Those ideologies did not take cognizance of the class struggle and the contradistinction in the social formation. Further these ideologies were eclectic deriving from many sources and this made them unsystematic and incoherent. In the specific case of N.C.N.C. its ideology of pragmatic socialism was an amalgamation of pragmatic philosophy and Utopian socialist ideas, to be specific, Fabianism…. On the social realm, this philosophy is a sort of social Darwinism: it is those who are fit that will survive and those who are not will be left by the wayside to fend for themselves. It promotes a savagely unbridled competitive ideal, hence it is meant to foster individualism. In a nutshell, it encourages exploitative culture.[89]

Irele further that the socialist doctrine of the Action Group ignored the objective reality of Nigeria. According to him:

> The ideology of the party, if one were to characterise its position on the ideological spectrum was centrist…. The ideology of the party did not come to grips with the Nigerian situation then by analysing the social system from a scientific perspective. The party, like other democratic socialist parties which it aped, believed that welfarism was the answer to the economic problem of the country. It believed that the freely competitive market economy should be changed into a planned, centrally managed and state directed economy. Further, the party advocated social justice based on egalitarianism and redistributive system. This position sits well on paper, but the fundamental question remain: where does the economic power lies; is it concentrated in few hands or in the broad masses…. What we find in the final analysis is that the party was not seriously committed to socialist ideals.[90]

Invariably, the ideologies of these political parties did not take cognisance of the primary condition of the Nigerian masses since they were not still tailored towards freeing the Nigerian economy from the neo-colonial dependency. Thus, with a

parliamentary system of government in place, Nnamdi Azikiwe of the National Convention of Nigerian Citizens was the President, while Sir Abubakar Tafawa Belewa of the Northern People's Congress was the Prime Minister. And in 1963, Nigeria became a republic, thereby breaking all ties of dominance from the British government. This brought a change from the British influenced parliamentary system of government to the American influenced presidential system of government. As such, Nnamdi Azikiwe became the first President of Nigeria. In short, the parties' ideologies were a reflection of basically the interest of the ruling class in Nigeria, which brought about a socio-economic system fostered by exploitation and inequality as reflected in the various parties' programmes and even the first development plan (1962-1968), and subsequent ones.

More so, at the lifting of ban on political activities in 1978, the following five registered political parties emerged with their ideologies; the National Party of Nigeria (N.P.N.), an offshoot of Northern People's Congress was made up majorly of compradors and tilted towards capitalism, the Unity Party of Nigeria (U.P.N.) was a reincarnation of the Action Group (AG) and tilted towards welfarism as a socialist party, the Nigerian Peoples Party (NPP) replaced the National Convention of Nigerian Citizens (NCNC) and espoused a liberalism which emphasized individualism, the Peoples Redemption Party (PRP) adopted socialism and favoured a mixed economy, and the Great Nigeria Peoples Party (GNPP) based its programmes on consensualism. Yet again, the political parties failed to question the existing social order in the Nigeria polity as they were still ethnic and confrontational in nature, thus accepting the status quo. Invariably, their ideological perspectives did not address the social realities of adequately developing strategy to tackle the perennial problems in the Nigerian economy which left majority of her citizens in abject poverty. As such when Alhaji

Shehu Shagari of the NPN - a reactionary party won the 1979 and subsequently the 1983 Presidential elections and became the President of Nigeria, the inequalities in Nigeria's social structure widened, while corruption, inflation, unemployment, and gross marginalization of the masses thrived. Also, party politics in the Third Republic was not much different in terms of ideology, though it brought about merging of political interest among ethnic groups. The two government sponsored parties; the Social Democratic Party (SDP) and the National Republican Convention (NRC) were still without a well-defined ideology. According to Nwosu in *Laying the Foundation for Nigeria's Democracy: My Account of the June 12*, "in terms of ideological divide, there was hardly much difference between the two parties, SDP and NRC with the exception that the SDP was a "little to the left," while the NRC was a "little to the right."[91] The elections was subsequently annulled by Babangida and an interim National Government led by Ernest Shonekan inaugurated. More so, the Abacha regime witnessed an extreme case of absolute lack of ideologies, which manifested in the 5 registered political parties each nominating General Abacha as their presidential candidate. Subsequently, and in 1999, about 50 political parties were registered by INEC and they participated in the Presidential elections. While the Accord Party, Peoples Democratic Party settled for capitalism, the Action Congress, Alliance for Democracy, All Progressive Grand Alliance adopted welfarism. The All Nigeria's Peoples Party settled for Nationalism, e.t.c.

The following facts emerge from the survey conducted by Uche Chukwumerije:

     i.   Only three out of the 50 registered parties offer clear statement on the character of existing political and social system and ideas on its improvement.

     ii.   All except four are content with existing mode of economic development and have offered, at best, vague platitudes about improvement.

     iii.   On income re-distribution, eleven offered minimal welfare schemes in forms of limited free facilities in education and health, or modification of improvement of labour condition.

     iv.   All, except five, are blank on initiatives in sectoral reforms.[92]

As such, he observes that there is, "a general lack of explicit political ideology as a general statement outlining the principles that inform a party's view of Nigeria and its remedial political programme."[93] And of recent, despite the merging of about four political parties to form the ruling All Progressive Congress (APC), there is no ideological difference between the APC and the PDP, except maybe in the personal goal of fighting corruption by the President Buhari led administration; the socio-economic structure has remained the same.

Commenting on the development, Chukwumerije reiterates that:

> The subordination of ideological principles to individual goals has leeched negative values into the body politic. A highly amoral opportunist social order in which end is glorified above means, and unearned wealth above labour now reigns. The nation as degenerated to a society of mercenaries and diamond-diggers. The negative values of the wider civil society mirror the astronomical rise of electoral irregularities, switches of party allegiances, corruption and cynical disregard for the rule of law in the polity. Democracy has degenerated into plutocracy and kleptocracy.[94]

Obviously, the wobbling pace and unclear direction of Nigeria's national integration coupled with lack of ideologically driven political parties after almost sixty years of independence has continued to haunt the peace and future of Nigeria.

However, despite military intervention and initiation of some palliative measures aimed at correcting the abnormalities in the Nigerian social system, they still ended up proclaiming the ideology of the ruling class and promoting private accumulation of capital by the ruling class, while the masses keep waxing in abject poverty. Thus, it is a fact that the ruling class ideology in Nigeria (both civilian and military) has been of no significance to the development of Nigeria. Nwala commenting on the ineptness of Nigerian leaders maintains that, "their preoccupation with power and its material benefits, political ideologies as to how a society can be organized and rule to the best advantage of all hardly entered into the calculation."[95] Thus, there is no gain reiterating that from the time of the nationalists to this point, Nigerians have over time constituted themselves into neo-colonialists by nourishing and perpetuating the imperialist ideologies that are ontologically and intrinsically inimical to the common good of all Nigerians. Examining this thought pattern, Chinua Achebe captured the poverty of thought of our nationalists as represented in the biographies of Dr. Azikiwe and Chief Awolowo in contrast to the expression of ideology to be found even in the more informal works of Mboya, Nyerere and Nkrumah. Achebe notes that in a solemn vow made by Azikiwe in 1939 he pledge, "that henceforth I shall utilize my earned income to secure my employment of a high standard of living and also to give a helping hand to the needy."[96] Achebe further that, Chief Obafemi Awolowo was even more forthright about his ambitions thus, "I was going to make myself formidable intellectually, morally invulnerable, to make all the money that is possible for a man with my brains

and brawn to make in Nigeria."[97] Achebe concludes that "thoughts such as these are more likely to produce aggressive millionaires than selfless leaders of their people" and that, an absence of objectivity and intellectual rigour of the critical moment of a nation's formation is more than an academic matter. It inclines the fledging state to disorderly growth and mental deficiency.[98] Thus, the glaring inequalities, economic disparities between the bourgeoisie and the people, and the ineptness of the ruling class has consistently led to dissatisfaction among the masses. Summing up, Ogugua posits that:

> Our problem cannot rightly be said to be lack of ideology, rather it is crisis of ideology, not in the sense of there being an ideology reorganized which we are unable to implement but crisis in the sense of having multiple ideologies each being confused with the other and each fighting for supremacy.[99]

Invariably, the lack of a precise ideology which centers on governing the masses as if they matter and the creation of an enabling environment for sustainable development is the reason behind the agitation for revolution by the masses at every given opportunity; obviously, revolution is usually caused by injustices rendered by corrupt leaders or a corrupt system that oppresses the people.

Corroborating, Nwankwo posits that:

> History shows that a once disorganised group gains some level of consciousness after certain traumatic experience which then compels that group to rise for collective action. …in fact, many groups have, at certain stage of their chequered history, discovered that unity for survival is indispensable for the human and material development of the group.[100]

Premised on events from independence till date, it appears that for many Nigerians, the Marxist revolutionary ideology which is violence incline remains an inexorable and imperative option to effect the desired change.

This is not unconnected to Viktor Kalu's position that:

> What is clear from Nigeria's historical experience is that a few individuals have consistently tried to animalize the majority, thereby losing their own humanity in the process. These individuals have failed to deploy the natural wealth and the so-called political freedom accorded by the state apparatus to the fruitful task of de-animalizing the Nigerian Population.[101]

However, Adeola Aderounmu expresses worry at the resilient attitude of most Nigerians. For him "the greatest crime ordinary Nigerians are committing against themselves is their collective passivity and their continuous hope even in the face of outright hopelessness."[102] He reiterates that:

> Unless something drastic happens in Nigeria (something with magnitude and effect greater than the Northern African revolutions) mass poverty and penury will remain the portion of the larger percentage of the people. In general the decadence in the society and the hopelessness that affects more than 90 million Nigerians today will persist. More than any other country in the world Nigeria needs a revolution.[103]

Corroborating, Ben Nwabueze posits that "Nigeria needs a revolutionary change and it has to be bloody. Those who survive it will pick up the pieces. I can't' see Nigeria survive any other way."[104] More so, those who see violent revolution as the way out of the Nigeria's predicament seems to be justified by Ngugi Wa Thiongo proclamation that, "Violence in order to change an intolerable, unjust social order is not savagery, it purifies man. Violence to protect and preserve an unjust oppressive social order is criminal."[105]

It is a fact that the yearning for socio-political revolution in Nigeria has reached a deafening crescendo in recent times. There are those who vehemently believe that the desired change in Nigeria is only realizable through a revolution, and they even accept bloodshed not minding the consequences of such. Their argument is hinged on the fact

that the revolutionary variables that birthed and nourished revolution in other places are feasible in Nigeria such as; corruption, visionless leadership, injustice and the moribund nature of critical institutions, etc. that are imperative for national stability and development. However, the problematic questions remain; is the current political, religious and socio-economic complexity of Nigeria suitable for a revolution? Is violent revolution the way out of the unenviable Nigerian predicament?

4.6   Wither Liberal Democracy in Nigeria or perhaps, an Indigenous Nigerian Democracy

It is a fact that democratic template in Nigeria is patterned along the Western liberal democracy which allows for competitive parties, popular sovereignty, majority rule, rule of law, separation of powers, fundamental human rights, periodically elections, among others. But, is it the case in practice? Ogugua rightly ask:

> What actually do we practice? Is it democracy? Is it semi-democracy? Is it welfarism? Is it conservatism? Is it socialism? Or is it anarchism? Or is it mixed to the point that one ceases to know what we practice?[106]

However, there is no gain reiterating that the practice of democracy has not really been feasible in the Nigerian polity. Thus, the fact that Britain colonized Nigeria, and ensured that the country inherited liberal democracy at independence has not translated to the practice of democracy in Nigeria 'sensu stricto', as the values that go with a democratic society is yet to be internalised in the people's way of life. While, Okafor, F. rightly observes that, the African version of democracy is redefined, manipulative and elusive[107], Aderibigbe, M. and Onyibor, M. opines that, in Africa, especially Nigeria, democracy has turned into violence, assassination, impeachment, corruption and a field better left to rascals and greedily ambitious fellows.[108]

158

Significantly, from the 1958 Constitutional Conference which set the date for Nigeria's independence to the 1999 Constitution which is currently in use with the necessary amendment, the Constitutions of Nigeria is based on the principles of liberal democracy with power and sovereignty entrusted to the people. Thus, the preamble to the 1999 Constitution of Nigeria clearly states that, "It is established to promote good governance and the welfare of all on the principles of freedom, equality and justice."[109] It follows as stated in section 14, subsections 1 and 2 that Nigeria be administered on the principles of democracy and social justice and that:

> (a) Sovereignty belongs to the people of Nigeria from whom government through this constitution derives all its powers and authority.

> (b) The participation by the people in their government shall be ensured in accordance with the provisions of this constitution.[110]

Also, Chapter 2, Sections 14- 18 provides that Nigeria shall be administered on such fundamental objectives and directive principles that will ensure democracy, social justice, security and welfare of all Nigerians through:

> …the promotion of a planned and balanced economic development…that is not operated to permit the concentration of wealth…in the hands of a few individuals or of a group, and that suitable and adequate shelter and food, reasonable national minimum living wage, old age, care and pensions, and unemployment, sick benefits and welfare of the disabled are provided for all citizens…there are adequate medical and health facilities for all persons, children, young persons and the aged are protected against any exploitation whatsoever, and against moral and material neglect, that there are equal and adequate educational opportunities at all levels and government shall as and when practicable provide free universal primary university education; and adult literacy programme.[111]

In practice, the reverse has definitely been the case. There is a systematic neglect and undermining of democracy in Nigeria; thus, a lacuna between the principles of democracy as provided for in the Nigerian Constitution and the practice of democracy in Nigeria. Frowning at this unprecedented turn of events, Awa declares that:

> Universal suffrage has been in operation in the country for a long time but this has little democratic value. For, rigging in one form or another, had characterised the elections since independence, and severe violence had accompanied some. What this makes clear is that the voters are in fact denied the right to vote for the candidates of their choice. All these mean that those who rule are not truly representatives of the population of the country.[112]

Obviously, governmental programmes and policies in Nigeria are hardly sincerely geared towards the realization of the tenets of democracy. There is consistent flouting of the rule of law by the institutions of the state, a total disregard to the principle of constitutionalism, corruption, failed leadership, contrived judicial processes, utter insecurity of the citizens, suppression of the civil societies, raping of the nation's treasury with the consequent being abject poverty, wide spread illiteracy, unemployment, and all features of underdevelopment. From the executive to the legislature and eventually the judiciary, it has been tale of bad governance, massive corruption, human rights abuses and deprivations. In short, the judiciary that claims to be the last hope of the common man has become a torn in the flesh of the common man by becoming an instrument of oppression in the hands of the elites. The independence of the judiciary is challenged by the enactment of ouster laws or decrees by the executive, and the practice of judgment for sale by the judiciary. Invariably, the citizen

who in a democratic state is central to the act of governance is relegated to the background in Nigeria.

Corroborating, Asiegbu, Martin maintains that in Nigeria:

> Extreme equalities divide the well-connected and the rich on the one hand, the poor on the other. …the well-connected easily secure an employment, even when they are unable to hold down a job. Whatever their qualification, the poor, however, get frustrated when faced with the bureaucracies of some state agencies and organisations. They are denied their retirement benefits, basic allowances, medicare, e.t.c. What is worst of all- they are denied justice. Oft, the judiciary is unspeakably slow, tortuous, awfully expensive and sometimes corrupt. In criminal proceedings, the courts often leave the poor to languish in prison without trial.[113]

In this light, it is not out of place to assert that, the practice of democracy in Nigeria has revealed disobedience to both constitutive and regulative rules of democracy. However, it seems that since independence, the task ahead of both the government and the governed has been how to practice democracy and not actually practicing democracy itself. This is sequel on the fact that the tenets of democracy are universal, and coheres with Nnamani's position that; Nigeria is always "talking about democracy and development but retreating from democracy."[114] Also, Agundu maintains that:

> Democracy has appeared in Nigeria to be a toddler, too timid to walk, and ideology too vague to be realized and too shy to make her debut. Contrary to the true tenets and basic values of democracy, the one practiced in Nigeria has embraced certain features which are absolutely foreign to democracy.[115]

He further substantiates his position with the following posers:

> In which democracy could the result of an election be settled even before the election is conducted? In which democracy would the votes cast ever outnumber the voters? In which democracy would you find an independent electoral body, highly dependent? In which democracy, would you find morally bankrupt and disgruntled elements with high proclivity for assassination, theft, embezzlement, prodigality and all sorts of virulent acts occupying sensitive political offices and being flooded with enviable accolades and recognition?[116]

While failed leadership has distorted the tenets of democracy in Nigeria, poor followership has nourished such distortions. Ethnicity and lack of a precise ideology by the political parties, ruling class and even the citizens has further withered the tenets of democracy in Nigeria. Not left out is the concomitant effect of corruption and underdevelopment on the polity. Invariably, one of the key factors militating against the practice of democracy in Nigeria is the acquiescence granted to Nigerians leaders to the effect that democratic tenets are sectional. In this light, Fayemi opines that:

> Democracy as a concept is not cast in iron. Consequently, in practice, it cannot be a perfect system…. While democracy could have some universal features, the presentation of liberal democracy as the political messiah to rescue Africa out of her multifarious proclivities can be seen as an integral part of the cordiality package of neocolonialism…. Diverse nations have every right to construct new conceptions of democracy, which respond to their religious, economic, and social needs.[117]

For those in this school of thought, the principles of democracy are not universal but subjective depending on the realities of the social, economic, cultural, and religious environment of the people; thus, democracy as currently practiced in Africa can neither be sustained, nor can it solve the bulk of the crises facing the continent. The apologists of this school are sympathetic to an indigenous democratic system, which for them is more natural to African culture. Some of the prominent representatives of this school

of thought are Wambia dia Wamba, Marie P. Eboh, Kwasi Wiredu, Francis Offor, Ikechukwu Ogugua, etc. Wambia dia Wamba, in his distinction between democracy in Africa and democracy for Africa posits that, Western multiparty system is unsuitable for the African situation. He argued against imposing the Western democratic system on the African situation from the top. On the contrary, he advocates for a democracy from below. For him, democracy in Africa must not be seen primarily as a mode of politics; rather, it must be viewed as a process of emancipation, self-determination and the meeting of the needs of the people. As a way forward, he charged Africans to reflect on the possibility of attaining African democracy and sums it up thus:

> Democratisation has to be considered as a process of struggle to win, defend and protect rights of people and individuals against one sidedness - including the right of self organization for autonomy and not necessarily right of participation in the state process.[118]

Also, Eboh posits that the Western style of democracy is not an authentic expression of contemporary African political culture, which must address so many peculiar issues.[119] Thus, Eboh in his *Democracy with an African Flair* insists that the solution to the problem of governance in Africa lies in tackling the African socio-economic and political realities, thereby giving democracy an African flair.[120] More so, Kwasi Wiredu is of the view that Africa's political salvation cannot come from the presently known model of majoritarian democracy, which African states are currently practicing. Majoritarian democracy involves a multi-party system of politics, in which the party that wins the most seats at the election forms the government. In such a political set-up, the losing party or parties become the opposition, singly or jointly. In this system, the minority representatives' votes are overridden by the votes of the majority. Thereby trifling the right of the minority representatives and their constituencies to meaningfully participate in the actual making of decisions. In many contemporary African states,

certain ethnic groups and political parties have found themselves perpetually in the minority, consistently staged outside the corridor of power. Not only this, their fundamental human rights of decisional representation are permanently denied with impunity.[121] This violation of the right to be well represented, Wiredu argues, is one of the most persistent causes of political instability in Africa.

More so, Wiredu explores the resonance of a non-party and consensual democracy in forestalling many of the socio-political ills in Africa. For him:

> A non-party and consensual democratic system is one in which parties are not the basis of power. People can form political associations to propagate their political ideas and help to elect representatives to parliament. But an association having the most elected members will not therefore be the governing group. Every representative will be of the government in his personal, rather than associational capacity.[122]

The basis of Wiredu's argument is the need to consider the individual's personal views, before all important decisions are made on the principle of consensus. This process of deliberation on issues rather than resorting to popular vote, is according to Wiredu, capable of promoting mutual tolerance, thereby contributing to demarginalization in a polity.[123] Meanwhile different reasons have been adduced for why democracy seems not to be working in Africa. For Offor (*Democracy as an Issue in African Philosophy*)[124], why democracy seems not to be working in Africa is our refusal to accept that democracy varies from one society to another, and that by reason of this elasticity, democracy need not be practiced in strict adherence to those attributes that define it in its Western conception. He reiterates that the problem with democratic practice in Africa therefore stems from a fundamental misconception that democracy as a form of government can be imported wholesale from one society to another, regardless of cultural differences. He advances the thesis that democracy is desirable

and can be made to work in Africa only if the indigenous continent's democratic heritage is explored, and those ideas that define good governance are brought to bear in evolving a kind of democracy best suited for resolving Africa's peculiar problems. Ogugua sums up that, a continuous aping of the ideals of Western democracy "will continue to leave us in continuous fruitful attempts, stumbles and wobbles and we still only continue to deteriorate."[125] Thus, he posits "community democracy as the ideology for Nigeria and other African States (nations)."[126] According to him:

> Community Democracy is a system of governance based on the metaphysical principle of relation, and African understanding of family which intones belongingness, and solidarity will make more realistic the conception of rule of the people, by the people and for the people, which Western idea of democracy could not do. It is (only) through this system will an orderly, peaceful, balanced and affluent society emerge.[127]

Invariably, the shouts of "Nigerian Democracy", "home grown Democracy", "our nascent Democracy", "Community Democracy", etc is alarming. In this regards, Olusegun Obasanjo asserts in his edited work *Elements of Democracy* that:

> Democracy as conceived in the West may not suit our peculiar circumstances and needs. As such, our conceptualization of democracy must take due cognizance of our lived reality and whatever structures and institutions that would sustain democratic practice must also reflect the peculiarities of our (Nigerian) environment. [128]

Such ideas seem to have influenced Obasanjo's desire for a third term tenure when he eventually became a democratically elected president of Nigeria, since in Africa, 'the king rules till death'. In a corroboration, Akpanobong affirms that, "there is a growing conviction that the future development of the new states should be based upon their traditional or indigenous political systems."[129]

Etuk readily responds that:

> A democracy is a democracy, wherever it is grown-like a plant, it may be more luxuriant where the soils is very fertile than where it is not – if the concerns are about justice and the rule of law, governance by popular participation and the sovereignty of the will of the people, free and fair elections, and orderly change and succession in government, moral probity and accountability on the part of those who are govern, then we must maintain that these are universal values; and as principles for the smooth ordering of a polity they are unexceptionable.[130]

Therefore, one begins to wonder what really the peculiar needs and circumstances in Nigeria are. Are the needs of Nigerians (Africans) different from the needs of humanity which are; freedom, equality, security and social justice? Are we less humans that the universal principles of democracy are not applicable to us? Is Nigeria not good enough for liberal democracy? Meanwhile, a look at the *1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria*. Chapter 2, Sections 14-18 provides that Nigeria shall be administered on such fundamental objectives and principles that will ensure democracy, social justice, security and welfare of all Nigerians.[131] Despite the reaffirmation by the constitution of laws - which ensures the governing of people as if they matter, one ponders on why the government overlooks and not pursue the provisions of the constitution? Why poverty in midst of affluence? Why strife when peace and harmony can easily be achieved? Why the destruction of nationhood and the embrace of disintegration? Why is decadence and violence at its apex? Why trade patriotism and nationalism for ethnicity? Etuk readily asserts that, "part of the problem with democracy in African countries is the low level of political education and awareness; which is a factor of under-development."[132] This really is an irony, since power in the democratic system resides in the hands of the masses, yet, ignorance has created an overwhelming lacuna in the system.[133] Thus, the people must come together and answer the question, how can we so organize political institutions that bad or

incompetent rulers can be prevented from doing too much damage?, while abolishing the old and unproductive question, who should rule? Invariably, Karl Popper's democratic ideals which anchors on the possibility of bringing about reform of institutions without using violence, guaranteeing the fundamental human rights of the citizens, liberty, equality and peoples' sovereignty is suitable to create the much needed enabling environment for the actualization of Nigerians potentials and development.

ENDNOTES

1. J. Obi. Oguejiofor, "Preface" *Philosophy and the African Predicament*, (Ibadan: Hope Publications, 2001), p. 124.

2. Walter Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, (London: Bogle-L'ouverture Publications, 1972), pp. 52-82.

3. O. A. Falaiye, "Democracy in African: Problems and Prospects" *Journal for the Advancement of Blacks in the Diaspora.* (1997), p.35.

4. Udo Etuk, "Poverty, Injustice and Social Disorder" *Sapientia: Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 3, December, (2010), p.176.

5. Elijah John, *Man and the State: Issues in Social Political Philosophy*, (Lagos: Omega Books, 2016), p.27.

6. Francis Offor, "Civil Disobedience, Moral Autonomy and the Quest for Sustainable Democratic Culture in Africa" *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa.* Vol. 9, No. 1, (2007), pp. 139-140.

7. O.J.B. Ojo, "Democracy in Nigeria: Past, Present and Future" *Journal of Community Education and Social Science Research*, Vol. 1, No. 1, (2002), p.38.

8. K. B. C. Onwubiko, *History of West Africa: 1800-Present Day*, (Lagos: Africana Educational Publishers Company, 1972), p.338.

9. K. Ajayi, "Problems of Democracy and Electoral Politics in Nigeria" kolawole, D. (ed.), *Issues in Nigeria Government and Politics*, (Ibadan: Dekaal Publishers, 1998), p. 37.

10. A. Azzez, "Democracy and Legitimacy Crisis" Hassan A.S. et al (eds.) *Democracy and Development in Nigeria,* Vol.1, *Conceptual Issues and Democratic Practice.* (Lagos: Concept Publications Limited, 2006), p. 216.

11. Eme O. Awa, *Emancipation of Africa*, (Lagos: Emancipation Consults and Publishers Ltd, 1996), p. 6.

12. Major Chukwuma Kaduna Nzeogwu announcing Nigeria's first military Coup on Radio Nigeria, Kaduna on January 15, 1966. Retrieved on 20th June, 2015 from Nigerian History Channel at *https://maxsiollun.wordpress,com.*

13. Leo Dare, "On Leadership and Military Rule in Nigeria" *ODU: A Journal of West African Studies.* No. 16, July, (1999), p.73.

14. James Ojiako O., *13 Years of Military Rule: 1966-79*, (Lagos: Daily Times Publications, 1980), p.86.

15. Richard Akinnola, *Fellow Countrymen…: The Story of Coup D'etats in Nigeria*, (Lagos: Rich Konsult, 2000), p.65.

16. Ibid; p.77.

17. Bauchi Opene, Et al. "Depoliticizing the Military," *Times International*, July 20, 1987, p.1.

18. Claude Ake, "The Case for Democracy," *The Carter Center: African Governance in the 1990s: Objectives, Reserves and Constraints*. Atlantic: The Carter Center of Emory University, (1990), p. 2.

19. P. A. Nyongo, "Popular Struggle for Democracy in Africa" Caron, B. et al. (eds) *Democratic Transition in Africa*. Ibadan: Credu, 1992, p. 360.

20. Elijah John, Op; cit. p. 358.

21. Ibim Sementari, "Expensive Government, Dashed Hopes," *Tell*, No. 51, December 23, 2002, p.43.

22. C. Nnamdi, "Why our Nationalists Abandoned the Struggle," *The News*. September 3, 2001, p.65.

23. John G. Ikubaje, *Corruption and Anti-Corruption in Nigeria: Revenue Transparency in the Nigerian Oil Sector*, (Lagos: Pub-Taolab and Co., 2006), p.52.

24. Chinua Achebe, *The Trouble with Nigeria,* (Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co.Ltd., 1983), pp. 2-3.

25. John G. Ikubaje, "Democracy and Anti-Corruption Policies in Africa" *The Uganda Journal of Management and Public Studies*, Vol 6, (2006), p. 40.

26. J. Obi Oguejiofor, Op; Cit. 2001, p. 36.

27. D. E. Agbiboa, "The Corruption-underdevelopment Nexus in Africa: Which way Nigeria?" *Journal of Social Political and Economic Studies,* (2010), *34*(5), 474–509.

28. E. Maduagwu, *Problems of socialism: The Nigerian challenge*, (London: Zed books, 1982), p.1.

29. M. M. Munyae & Lesetedi, G. N. "Interrogating Our Past: Colonialism and Corruption in Sub-Sahara Africa" *African Journal of Political Science*, (1998), *Vol.3 No.2,* pp. 15-28.

30. Bedford Umez, *Nigeria's Real Problems, Real Solutions*, (Kearney, USA: Morris Publishers, 2000), pp. 29-30.

31. D. Kew, *Nigeria*, (New York: Freedom House, 2006), p. 55.

32. M. M. Ogbeidi, "Political Leadership and Corruption in Nigeria Since 1960: A Socioeconomic Analysis" *Journal of Nigeria Studies*, (2012), 1,(2) : pp. 1- 25.

33. Wash Post, "Corruption flourished in Abacha's regime". Accessed Feb 29, 2016, from *http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpsrv/inatl/longterm/nigeria/stories/corrupt060998.htm.*

34. Wole Soyinka, *The Open Sore of a Continent: A Personal narrative of the Nigerian Crisis*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p.9.

35. *Save Nigeria Group*, 2012

36. Transparency International Reports on Corruption 1996 – 2012. Global Corruption Barometer. Assessed January 22, 2012, from *www.transparency.org.*

37. A. Adebajo, "Hegemony on a Shoestring: Nigeria's Post-Cold War Foreign policy," A. Adebajo & A. R. Mustapha (eds.), *Gulliver's Troubles: Nigeria's Foreign Policy after the Cold war* (pp. 1–37). Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal, (2008), p.5.

38. A. Agbaje, Akande, A., & Ojo, J., "Nigeria's Ruling Party: A Complex Web of Power and Money," *South African Journal of International Affairs, 14*, 1, (2007), P. 93 (79–93).

39. H. J. Cohen, "Fooling People Some of the Time," *International Herald Tribune*. February 15, 2007, p.6.

40. S. Odunfa, "Time to move on" *BBC Focus on Africa, 18*, 2, (2007), p. 24.

41. The achievement of President Umaru Yar'Adua. Retrieved on January 22, 2012:*https://www.naija.ng/821110-5-major-achievements-late-president-umaru-musa-yaradua.html#821110*

42. Elijah John, Op; Cit. p.404.

43. Mayewa Oyinbola, "PDP is Evil," *Daily Sun*, January 12, 2016.

44. O. Adeyemi, "10 Biggest Corruption Cases that Shook Nigeria in 2015" *Green News Publication*, Nigeria, 2016.

45. FG to Reveal Ex-Gov's 30 bank accounts in court. *Pulse Nigeria News Publication*. September, 2016.

46. Vanguard 28th September, 2017, p. 14.

47. Felix Machi Njoku, "Nigeria at 40: Putting Africa's Giant Back on its Feet." *Pan African News Agency*, Sept. 30, 2000. Available at WESTLAW, Africa News Library (quoting President Obasanjo).

48. Jola Sotubo, "Senators make N15M monthly, Reps 10M,' Ex-president says." *Pulse Nigeria News Publication*, 2016.

49. Ibid; p.11.

50. The Chairman of the Presidential Advisory Committee Against Corruption (PACAC), Prof. Itse Sagay(Sagay flays N'Assembly over hostility to anti-corruption war By Sheriff Adaji-Ogbu September 6, 2017 *https://www.today.ng/news/nigeria/11343/sagay-flays-nassembly-hostility-anti-corruption-war*

51. Elijah John, Op; Cit. p. 404.

52. Ibid; p. 404.

53. Transparency International. Op; Cit., p.54.

54. Prof. Akin Oyebole on Corruption. *Vanguard*. September 28, 2017.

55. P. Bond, "Dodging World Bank Schizophrenia- the looting on Africa continues?" *Pambazuka News*, September 06, 2010.

56. Ibid; p. 14.

57. L. Cockcroft, "Corruption in Africa: The role of the North" Aderinwale, Ayodele (ed.).*Corruption,* Democracy *and Human Rights in Southern Africa.* African Leadership Forum, Abeokuta/Accra, (1995), p.88.

58. Ibid; p. 90.

59. Makinda and Okume, 2007, p. 22.

60. Person, A. R. B. & Teorell, J., *The Failure of Anti-Corruption Policies: A Theoretical Mischaracterization of the Problem.* (Goteborg: The QOG Institute, 2010), p. 111.

61. Arthur Nwankwo, *Nigeria – My People, My Vision*. (Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd., 1979), p. 47.

62. Ibid; p. 3

63. Hyginus Okibe, *Political Evolution and Constitutional Development in Nigeria: 1861-1999*, (Enugu: Marydan Publishers, 2000), p. 148.

64. Basil Onuoha, *Nigeria Transition to Democracy*, (Uyo: Minder International Publishers, 2004), p. 9.

65. J. Obi Oguejiofor, Op; Cit. p. 34.

66. Hyginus Okibe, Op; Cit. pp. 152-153.

67. J. S. Coleman, *Nigeria Background to Nationalism*, (Berkley: University of California Presss, 1971), p.330.

68. C. B. Okolo, *Democracy: Squandermania Mentality: Reflections on Nigerian Culture*, Nsukka: Uuniversity Trust Publishers, 1994, pp. 82-83.

69. Chinua Achebe, Op; Cit. p. 1.

70. Ali A. Mazrui, *Africans International Relations: The Diplomacy of Dependency and Change*, (Colorado: West View Press, 1979), p. 106.

71. Panter Bricks, *Nigerian Politics and Military Rule: Prelude to The Civil War*, (London: University of London Press, 1970), p. 102.

72. Ibid; p. 103.

73. Ibid; p. 107.

74. Hyginus Okibe, Op; Cit. p. 145.

75. Remi Anifowose, *Violence and Politics in Nigeria: The Tiv and Yoruba Experience*, (Enugu: NOK publishers, 1982), p.62.

76. Hyginus Okibe, Op; cit. p. 145.

77. Godwin Okaneme, "Poverty and Poor Leadership: Twin Evils of Nigeria's Democracy" in *Politics and Development, Essence: Interdisciplinary- International Journal of Philosophy. Philosophy, Science & Society*. Vol. 9 No.1, (2012), pp. 36-48.

78. Herbert Wilson. "Democratic Leadership in A Multi-Ethnic Environment: Challenges, Prospects and Options for Nigeria" *A Paper Presented at Ibrahim Mantu's Birth Forum* Abuja, 2005, p. 18.

79. Bola Tinubu. "Jonathan has failed Nigerians" *Daily Trust*, Tuesday, December 25,2012,

80. I. N. Obasi, *"Political Leadership and Followership Mobilisation in Nigeria Public Administrative System,"* in *The Social Sciences. Issues and Perspectives.* Nsukka: Fulladu Publishing Company, 2000, p. 141.

81. Wole Soyinka, Op Cit; p.59.

82. J. A. A. Ayoade, "Nigeria: Positive Pessimism and Negative Optimism", *A Valedictory lecture* delivered on September 17, 2010, Faculty of the Social Sciences, University of Ibadan. pp. 55, 56.

83. Bamidele Ademola-Olateju, "Nigeria's Crisis of Followership" *Premium Times*. May 19, 2015.

84. Francis Offor, Op; cit. p.142.

85. Chinua Achebe, Op; Cit. 1983, p. 11

86. Uche Chukwumereje, "Nigeria's Political Parties: The need for Ideology" *A lecture presented at the 26th memorial anniversary of Malam Aminu Kano* held at Sa'adu Zungur Auditorium, Mambayya House on April 17, 2009.

87. Karl Marx, "Preface" to "A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy" *Selected Works*, vol. 1. (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977), pp. 181-182.

88. Dipo Irele, *In the Tracks of African Predicament: Philosophy and Contemporary Socio- Economic and Political Problems of Africa*, (Ibadan: Options Book and Information Services, 1993), pp. 22-23.

89. Ibid; pp. 23-24.

90. Ibid; p.24.

91. H. N. Nwosu, *Laying the Foundation for Nigeria's Democracy: My Account of the June 12, 1993 Presidential Election and its Annulment*, (Lagos: Macmillian Publishers, 2008), p.41.

92. Uche Chukwumerije Op; cit. p. 9.

93. Ibid; p.10.

94. Ibid; p.12.

95. Nwala Uzodinma, "The Poverty of Ideology in Nigerian Development" Okwudiba Nnoli (ed.) *Path to Nigerian Development.* (Dakar: CODESRIA Book Series, 1981), p. 153.

96. Chinua Achebe, Op; Cit. p.11.

97. Ibid; p.11

98. Ibid; p.11

99. Ikechukwu Ogugua, "Ideology, Civil Society and Development" Ike Odimegwu, et al (ed) *Philosophy, Democracy and Conflicts in Africa*, (2007), p. 193.

100. Arthur Nwankwor, *The Igbo Leadership and the Future of Nigeria*, (Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers), 1985, p. 55.

101. Viktor Kalu, *Leadership Question, Power and Poverty in Nigeria*, (Lagos: Hilly's Press Nig. Ltd., 1994), p.51.

102. Adeola Aderounmu *Re: Nigeria, Revolution is our last option* http://aderinola.wordpress.com/2011/12/28/re-nigeria-revolution-is-ourlast-option.html. Accessed 28/02/12).

103. Ibid; p.6.

104. BenNwabueze,*"TheImperativeofaBloodyRevolutioninNigeria"*http://nigeriaandafricarenaissanceinitiative.blogspot.com/2072/02/html.Accessed14/10/15.

105. Ngugi Wa Thiongo, *Home Coming: Essays on African and Caribbean Literature, Culture and Politics*, (London: Heinemann, 1997), p.8.

106. Ikechukwu Ogugua, Op; Cit. p. 193.

107. F. U. Okafor, "Law, Democracy and Public Affairs: The Nigerian Case" *Africa: Philosophy and Public Affairs*. Oguejiofor J. O. (ed.) (Enugu: Bigard Memorial Seminary, 1997), p.72.

108. Moses Aderibigbe, and Onyibor, Marcel. "Philosophy, Democracy and the Rule of Law in Nigeria: An Evaluative Analysis" In Ike Odimegwu, et al (ed.) *Philosophy, Democracy and Conflicts in Africa*. (2007), p. 21.

109. The "Preamble" to *The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999*(as amended).

110. *The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999.)Section 14 sub-sections 1 and 2*(as amended).

111. Ibid; pp.1-7.

112. Eme O. Awa, Op; Cit. p. 7.

113. Martin Asiegbu, "A Philosophical Reflection on Africans' Stalling Attitudes toward the Culture of Democracy" Ike Odimegwu, et al (ed.) *Philosophy, Democracy and Conflicts in Africa*. (2007), p. 61.

114. C. Nnamani, "Why Our Nationalists Abandoned the Struggle" *The News*. September 3, 2001.

115. Oliver Agundu, "Politics of Bitterness: Scanning the Nigerian Democratic Experience," Ike Odimegwu, et al (ed.) *Philosophy, Democracy and Conflicts in Africa*. (2007), p. 257.

116. Ibid; p. 257.

117. Ademola Kazeem Fayemi, "Towards an African Theory of Democracy" *Thought and Practice: A Journal of the Philosophical Association of Kenya (PAK)*. Premier Issue, Vol.1 No.1, June (2009), pp. 107-109

118. Ernest Wambia dia Wamba, "Democracy in Africa and Democracy for Africa," Kimmerle, Heinz and Fraz M. Wimmer eds. *Philosophy and Democracy in Intercultural Perspective.* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1990), p.129.

119. Marie P. Eboh, "Is Western Democracy the Answer to the African Problem?" Heinz, Kimmerle and Fraz M. Wimmer eds. *Philosophy and Democracy in Intercultural Perspective.* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1990), p. 167.

120. Marie P. Eboh, "Democracy with an African Flair". *Quest: Philosophical Discussions*, Vol.7, No.1. (1993), P.98.

121. K. Wiredu, *Cultural Universals and Particulars*, (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1996), p. 175.

122. Loc; Cit.

123. K. Wiredu, "Tradition, Democracy and Political Legitimacy in Contemporary Africa". Kurimoto, E. (ed.), *Rewriting Africa: Toward Renaissance or Collapse?* (Osaka: The Japan Center for Area Studies, 2001), p.143.

124. Francis Offor, "Democracy as an Issue in African Philosophy" Oladipo, Olusegun ed. *Core Issues in African Philosophy*, (Ibadan: Hope Publications, 2006), p.121.

125. Ikechukwu Ogugua, Op; Cit. p.196.

126. Ibid; p. 197.

127. Ibid; 197.

128. Obasanjo Olusegun, (ed.). *Elements of Democracy*, (Abeokuta: African Leadership Forum, 1992), p.1.

129. Emmanuel Akapnobong, *Democracy in Small Doses*, (Uyo: Afahaide Publishing Co., 1997), pp. 104-105.

130. Etuk, U. "Democracy as a Pragmatic Political Ideology". *Uyo Journal of Humanities, vol.7,* Dec. 2002, p.15.

131. *The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999*(as ammended) op cit.

132. Udo Etuk, Op; Cit, p.5.

133. Uwemedimo Akpan-Umoh, "Humanism and Politics: An Assessment of Udo Etuk's Democratic Ideals and National Reconstruction" In Uduma, U. and Etim, F. (ed.) *Humanism and Globalization and the Relevance of Philosophy: A Festschrift in honour of Professor Udo Akpan Etuk*. Eket: Inbonet Resources, 2016, p.352.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE IMPLICATIONS OF POPPER'S LIBERALISM AND NON-VIOLENT REVOLUTION FOR NIGERIA

5.1   A Critique of Popper's Political Thought

There is no gain reiterating that Popper's political thought generally as captured in his theory of critical rationalism – nonviolent approach, and incremental reformism – piecemeal social engineering is deeply rooted in his asymmetry of verification and falsification. In fact, the interface of Popper's basic ideals in both the natural sciences and the social sciences is the reason behind many scholars ascribing his contributions to political thought as birthed and nourished by his account of scientific method. For instance, central to Popper's thought, "is the idea that reason is a vital component of the open society, reason being understood as "critical rationalism", arrived at by generalizing Popper's falsificationist conception of scientific method."[1] It follows that for him, both scientific method, and rationality, need to be understood in social terms. Thus, while Brian Magee maintains that, "Popper's political philosophy is seamlessly interwoven with popper's philosophy of science"[2], David Harper corroborates that, "Popper's political thought is closely connected with his explanation of science."[3] However, despite the similarities of Popper's thought in both the natural and social sciences, there are distinctive features of it in these apparently different fields. For instance, John Gray insists that, "Popper appears to commend revolution in science while favouring incremental reformism in political life"[4] Thus, while Alan Ryan contends that:

> Popper's account of scientific rationality is itself in a broad sense political, and that what sustains his commitment to some awkward epistemological views is his liberalism. That is, it is not so much that his philosophy of science supports his liberalism as that it expresses it.[5]

Gray sums up that, those who postulate;

> A relation of dependency between his political philosophy and his epistemology are not mistaken, but that the claim that there is any inconsistency between these two parts of popper's thought rests upon a demonstrably defective understanding of both of them and so fails to conceive correctly the nature of the relation between them.[6]

Also, Shearmur, seems to be contending that in *The Open Society*, Popper paid insufficient attention to the means that might be necessary to achieve laudable ends. He considers Popper's views on 'piecemeal social engineering' to be problematic. For him:

> Is of us as being engaged in a process of social engineering, in which we, armed with knowledge from the social sciences, try to impress our knowledge is fallible, and as our actions will generate unintended consequences, he sees us as involved in a process of learning by trial and error. I will argue, in this volume, that such an approach is defective.[7]

He continues that:

> [Popper] does not take sufficiently seriously . . . the character of the material upon which such "social engineering" is working . . . [which] consists in part of structural arrangements which, while they are in place, impose constrains upon what else we can accomplish. . . . These points are of significance, [since] they impose limitations concerning what, as a matter of fact, can be accomplished by means of "social engineering" - especially a social engineering that, as Popper would wish, takes the freedom of the individual seriously.[8]

His summary thus, is that, in calling for "social engineering," Popper was engaging in an unrealistic neglect of factors that might, or that should, stand in the way of the goal of using the state to mitigate human suffering. Opposing this position, Colin Simkin argues that "Popper advocates social engineering as the practical aim of social science, the shaping or creation of social institutions in order to achieve or promote desired improvements to social conditions."[9] For Katrina Forrester, Popper is to be viewed as changing from liberal to neo-liberal in his outlook, from the liberal who advocated piecemeal social reform to a neo-liberal advocating limited government intervention

both in free market relations and in the freedom of individuals to think independently and to act in any non-criminal way. Here, the implication would appear that the piecemeal social engineering Popper described in *The Poverty of Historicism* and emphasised in *The Open Society and Its Enemies* has suffered abandonment. Piecemeal social engineering seems incompatible with a system such as neo-liberalism that is associated with "extreme risk and massive reward, but also social inequality and potential market failure."[10] It appears that Forrester derives support for her position from a letter that Popper wrote in 1956 in response to Henry Hazlitt, the American journalist who was a defender of classical liberal economic ideas and a founding member of the Mont Pe'lerin Society.[11] Significantly, Shearmur in a response, published a rejoinder to Forrester in the *London Review of Books*. Shearmur's letter states:

> Katrina Forrester reads Popper as if he was a proponent of market liberalism, or 'neoliberalism' (LRB, 26 April). But this isn't the case. Popper certainly valued liberty and markets; but within the broad commitments of the 'open society' he was willing to accept considerably more government involvement than neoliberals – or any conservative, for that matter – would. Any account of Popper's views is complicated by the fact that he found admirers on the left as well as on the right. But today there is no reason to think that support for liberty and (well-regulated) markets alone entails any particular position on the liberal spectrum. Part of the interest of After 'The Open Society', the collection of Popper's writings that Forrester reviews, which I co-edited, is that it shows the extent to which Popper never fully joined with Hayek and other neoliberals. For example, late in his career he proposed that the state take a 51 per cent share in all public companies (but not an active role in management). His attention to the problem of overpopulation and his (curmudgeonly) worry about the effects of mass market television, also tell against a neoliberal interpretation of his views, especially when a more consistent social democratic interpretation is available. Popper was explicitly critical of 'free market ideology'. But the main contribution of his political philosophy was towards the defence of the widely shared liberal commitments of the 'open society', within which more specific policy prescriptions may be worked out through trial and error.[12]

More so, for Eidlin, "Popper's attitude towards the training of leaders and administrators and the political education of the citizenry is somewhat problematic."[13] He criticises Popper for appearing not to have reflected much on the qualities of good leadership; on how to recognize, recruit, and train good leaders; or on how to lead effectively, humanely, and democratically. He accuses Popper of appearing to argue against any kind of search for good leaders and against training for leadership. He maintains that, some of what Popper writes about leadership does not, in fact, square with the practice of existing liberal democracies, all of which pay considerable attention to the selection and training of leaders and to citizenship indoctrination.[14] Eidlin reiterates that, "like the Marxists, he continued to focus on demands for a better world, without showing much interest in the nuts and bolts of how it might be brought about."[15]

Obviously, it seems that most of the criticism against Popper's democratic ideals is rather a product of misunderstanding and misinterpretation of his ideas. Thus, an elucidation of Popper's democratic ideals in chapter three aims at clarifying and rectifying this misnomer. Accordingly, Harper opines that:

> Popper developed an approach to knowledge and to politics which was free of authoritarian assumptions. As for his theory of knowledge, Popper argues that we learn from our mistakes, by trial and the elimination of error. He applied this simple idea to science and to politics. According to Popper, all our beliefs are guesses about the world, mere conjectures. What is distinctive about science is that we seek systematically to make our theories open to interpersonal criticism and empirical testing, with a view to discovering our mistakes as soon as possible.[16]

Corroborating, Ryan insists that:

> The scientific community, when living up to its own best ideals was, moreover, a paradigm of an 'open society'. The search for scientific truth was a disciplined, and, in a manner of speaking, a constitutionally controlled search for an informed and intelligent consensus on the mechanisms underlying and explaining the way the world works.[17]

Indeed, there exist a connection between Popper's philosophy of science, theory of knowledge and political Philosophy. Popper sought to combat the anti - democratic propaganda of totalitarian regimes and their sympathizers by criticizing the philosophical doctrines from which they derived intellectual support. He intended his work as "a defense of freedom against totalitarian and authoritarian ideas, and a warning against the dangers of historicist superstitions."[18] His target was the claims of totalitarians that their beliefs were true and certain. Marxists, for example, claimed that the theory guiding their political action was backed by the authority of science. Popper saw it as his obligation to use what he had learned about the status of knowledge claims in the advanced natural sciences to expose Marxism as pseudo-science.

Significantly, Popper distinguishes two kinds of social planning or intervention, which he calls Utopian and piecemeal social engineering. Utopian social engineering seeks to attain an ideal social order, such as socialism, by bringing about holistic changes in society; such an approach is, Popper argues, doomed to failure. Piecemeal social engineering, by contrast, searches for and fights against "the greatest and most urgent evils of society": this is the approach that Popper advocates.[19] This Popperian distinction has informed the recent debate on planning theory, that revolved around a related distinction between comprehensive and incremental planning and which was

resolved by the so called mixed-scanning approach."[20] According to Popper, while the

utopian approach flows from an insistence on determining one's ultimate political goal,

one's ideal state, before taking any practical action[21], the piecemeal approach on the

other hand, flows from the insistence on attempting to locate and eradicate the greatest

and most urgent social evils.[22] More so, Utopian social engineering Popper, claimed,

requires the centralized rule of a few, the suppression of dissent and ultimately, the use

of violence instead of reasons to settle the disputes that arise in the pursuit of the

ultimate goals of the engineers, while piecemeal social engineering, he argues, allows

for democratic action, the tolerance of dissent and the use of reason and compromise to

settle political disputes.[23] Subsequently, Popper points out that piecemeal social

engineering can take the form either of state intervention, or of the creation of legal,

institutional checks on freedom of action. The latter is to be preferred, Popper argues,

as the former carries with it the danger of increasing the power of the state.[24] For

Popper, the piecemeal approach to socio-political engineering is "methodologically

sound."[25] Thus, while this approach may or may not be based on a blueprint of society,

nor it may or may not be based on hope that mankind will one day realize an ideal state,

and achieve happiness and perfection on earth, it will be based on an awareness that:

> Perfection, if at all attainable is far distant and that every
> generation of men, and therefore also the living, have a
> claim, perhaps not so much a claim to be made happy, for
> there are no institutional means of making a man happy
> but a claim not to be made unhappy, where it can be
> avoided.[26]

Outstandingly, the argument that Popper is against any kind of search for good leaders and against training for leadership is flawed. Popper, is rather against indoctrination. According to Popper:

> A certain amount of state control in education, for instance, is necessary, if the young are to be protected from a neglect which would make them unable to defend their freedom, and the state should see that all educational facilities are available to everybody. But too much state control in educational matter matters is a fatal danger to freedom, since it must lead to indoctrination.[27]

He proposes that, "the way to improve the political life of the city was to educate the citizens to self-criticism."[28] This can however, not be achieved through indoctrination, which is "liable to produce dogmatic self-satisfaction and massive intellectual complacency, instead of critical dissatisfaction and eagerness for improvement."[29] For him, freedom to criticize, individual responsibility, and tolerance are among the values typically instilled by the educational systems of liberal-democratic regimes. Thus, Popper develops an argument for the 'rational unity of mankind', according to which we are all considered to be of value, and to be equal in our rationality, because of our role as sources of possible criticism. Criticism is the most effective agent of desirable change. Moreover, school children, citizens, new immigrants, and civil servants are taught that the state is a servant of its citizens, rather than citizens being servants of the state. Thus, he makes a case for liberal democracy. His case for liberal democracy does not rest on argument, but rather on the actual practice of existing liberal democratic regimes. Popper proposes the alternative aim of striving to limit the damage that bad rulers can do which is mostly manifested in such institutions as the separation of powers, checks and balances, free and fair elections, and limited terms of office. It is worthy of note that, governance and politics in liberal democracies take place within constitutional frameworks designed to limit the abuse of power. As such, the questions

of who should govern are constantly a matter of concern. However, a more demanding need is how the state could be so constituted that bad leaders can be gotten rid of without bloodshed and violence. In all, Popper acknowledges the powerful motivating and constraining forces of markets, and the "awful problem" of the bureaucratisation of human lives that may result from government intervention, but, he insisted on the possibility and necessity of purposeful use of government.

Thus, Popper states clearly that:

> The view of the state which I have sketched here may be called 'protectionism'. The term 'protectionism' has often been used to describe tendencies which are opposed to freedom. Thus the economist by protectionism the policy of protecting certain industrial interests against competition; and the moralist means by it the demand that officers of the state shall establish a moral tutelage over the population. Although the political theory which I call protectionism is not connected with any of these tendencies, and although it is fundamentally a liberal theory, I think that the name may be used to indicate that, though liberal, it has nothing to do with the policy of strict non-intervention (often, but not quite correctly, called 'laissez-faire'). Liberalism and state-interference are not opposed to each other. On the contrary, any kind of freedom is clearly impossible unless it is guarantee by the state.[30]

Popper's strong conviction of the necessity of state – intervention years after the publishing of *The Open Society* is reflected in his discussion with Adam six weeks before his death in 1994. According to Chmielewski, Popper reiterates that, "one has to have a free market, but I also believe that to make a godhead out of the principle of the free market is nonsense."[31] Popper remained a principled, though realistic optimist. "My works are always," he writes, "attempts to formulate intractable problems as precisely as possible and then to solve them"[32]

Thus, the question of the mistakes and shortcomings of government arises and Popper readily responds that:

> It should be mentioned that, from the protectionist point of view, the existing democratic states, though far from perfect, represent a very considerably achievement in social engineering of the right kind.[33]

It could then be summed up that, mistakes are inevitable, since all human knowledge and all human institutions are fallible. Conversely, governments actually do need to learn from their mistakes since living entails searching for a better world.

The paradox of democracy in Popper, is not in the voting in of leaders but in preventing damage brought about by bad leaders/rulers in the polity by peaceful changes. While Popper settles for suffrage as the institutional framework for achieving this goal, the challenge of enduring a failed regime for years pending periodical elections is of grave consequence. Although there are provisions for recalling of representatives in the constitution of Nigeria, the process is tedious, which is a pointer to why the recall process in Nigeria seems futile. And of course, the critical rationalism comes into focus and gives room for Civil disobedience – the conscientious refusal to obey unfair laws and governmental policies with the aim of bringing about a change. Thus, the citizens must not only criticise unfair governmental laws and policies, but they must conscientiously reject such laws and policies. However, it must be a non – violent civil disobedience. In all, Popper's democratic ideals characterised by critical rationalism - non-violence, piecemeal social engineering and liberalism, and modifies with civil disobedience appears to be the most suitable panacea for the dwindling Nigeria's fortunes.

5.2   Wither Reforms (Non-Violent) or Violent Revolution in Nigeria

Can the desired democratic atmosphere be achieved through reforms (non-violence) or a violence revolution? Can Popper's democratic ideals with the necessary modifications ameliorate the dwindling Nigeria's fortunes and usher in the needed sustainable development in the country in particular and Africa at large? It is an established fact that governance in Nigeria is charcterised by tribalism, corruption, authoritarianism, among others. Also, the agencies of the state; the legislature, judiciary and executives are inconsistent in their activities, invariably fueling social disorder within the polity. Not left out is, abuse of suffrage, poverty of ideology by both the leaders and the followers, lack of the will to implement lofty policies by leaders, and in all, failed leadership and irresponsible followership. These and other variables are reasons for a continuous clamor for a violent social and political revolution by some Nigerians at any given opportunity. Commenting on this, Alahji Isa Kaita maintains that:

> By 1965 it was clear to the southern politicians that there was no way that they could achieve political power by way of ballot box, hence they sought to achieve their ambitions through the bullet. The coup was meant to offer a military solution to their political ambition.[34]

Oly Stokke corroborates that:

> In Nothern Nigeria, the unitary decree was regarded as an instrument to lay the North wide open to Ibo dominance. This led the traditional elites in the North to inspire demonstration against the decree in the major main Northern towns. These demonstrations escalated into riots that led to the killings of Ibos and the looting of Ibo property.[35]

Invariably, the chronology of violence in Nigeria is evidenced from the Tiv riots of 1960, Western regional crisis of 1962, the census crisis of 1962/63, the federal election crisis of 1964 and the Western election crisis of 1965, series of coups, the 1967 to 1970 civil war, and of recent, the country is plagued with seemingly unending eruptions of

religious violence and mayhem against other ethnic groups for little or no provocation; unwarranted destruction of lives and properties by Fulani herdsmen and cattle rustlers, the Boko Haram insurgency, the Shites revolts against constituted authorities, revolutionary movement such as Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB), the Movement for the Actualization of the Sovereign State of Biafra (MASSOB), the Niger Delta Avengers (NDA), and the multiplicity of ethnic militias.

At this juncture, it becomes pertinent to ask, why violence in the post-independence Nigeria, and what solution has violence brought? Available facts has shown that violence has an approach to change is not the typical African way of approaching issues. For instance, in the traditional African society, leaders who lost the confidence of the followers, voluntarily abdicated the throne and embarked on exile without violence or bloodshed. Also, Nigeria's independence was not achieved through a violence approach, as the nationalists, rather embraced non-violence strategies that brought about the desired result. Thus, there appears to be a disconnection between the leaders and followers in post-independence Nigeria which has led to a total loss of confidence in successive Nigerian government, and to a reasonable extent, substantiates the desire for violent revolution by majority of its citizens. However, Wilson Idahosa Aiwuyor observes that radical approach to change has not worked in Nigeria and the workability of it today is not assured. According to him:

> …if history remains a good teacher, there is no certainty that any bloody revolution would solve Nigeria's problems. All the retrogressive military coups that have taken place in Nigeria as well as the country's three years civil war (1967 – 1970) were executed in the name of bringing about revolutionary change yet, none could solve the country's problems.[36]

What option is left for Nigerians in her quest for socio-political change? In his submission, Aiwuyor posits thus:

> If the necessary preconditions are fulfilled, Nigeria's impending revolution could be through the ballot boxes at a crossroad… where there would be a convergence between divine force majeure and the determined efforts by Nigerians to break with politics as usual.[37]

Significantly, the non-violence approach remains a viable alternative that will not only ensure peaceful co-existence among Nigerians, but has the prospect of bringing about sustainable development in the African continent as a whole, as it is difficult to achieve any tangible development in times of violence.

Therefore, the application of Popper's non-violence approach characterised by piecemeal social engineering, tolerance, dialogue and critical rationalism in Nigeria as against a violent revolution needs to be explore. Popper's political thought is his mistrust of large-scale planning. As such, he introduces an antithetical idea: the idea of piecemeal social engineering. Popper terms 'piecemeal engineering' the redressing of agreed social problems by a trial-and-error, bits-and-pieces approach. According to Popper:

> The characteristic approach of the piecemeal engineer is this. Even though he may perhaps cherish some ideals which concern society 'as a whole'… he does not believe in the method of redesigning it as a whole. Whatever his ends, he tries to achieve them by small adjustments and readjustments which can be continually improved upon … The piecemeal engineer knows, like Socrates, how little he knows. He knows that we can learn from our mistakes. Accordingly, he will make his way, step by step, carefully comparing the results achieved, and always on the lookout for the unavoidable unwanted consequences of any reform; and he will avoid undertaking reforms of a complexity and scope which make it impossible for him to disentangle causes and effects, and to know what he is really doing.[38]

187

Thus, the specific end of a piecemeal approach must be to ameliorate a condition that reasonable people agree is a problem. The means to that end must be tentative: the social engineer must be fallibilist concerning any aspect of the approach that is taken. Popper envisages that from epistemic modesty of this kind will also flow a disposition to respect individual rights and to protect against any injustice. Also, the piecemeal social engineering does not imply solely 'one-piece-at-a-time', but 'many-pieces-at-once', and seeks to avoid undertaking reforms of too great a complexity in order to know the effect of the changes we have introduced in social reform. This is precisely what Nigeria needs at this critical point in her existence as a nation as against the clamors for an uprising, a revolt, and even a bloody revolution by some Nigerians. This approach to changes and development involves small scale intervention to deal with social issues, and to see whether they are producing their intended effects, and to find ways of mitigating any unintended consequences. It is therefore a trial-and-error approach to learning that seeks to refine interventions based on that learning. Invariably, with the piecemeal approach, Nigerian leaders would "begin to look out for their own mistakes instead of trying to explain them away and to prove that they have always been right."[39] Moreover, piecemeal social engineering is a method in which everyone in a liberal democracy--from individual citizen to head of state—who is thinking about how to bring about change is engaged. However, most Nigerians are desperate for an overnight turnaround of the precarious state of the nation; a political miracle, as such, they strongly have faith in a violence revolution, rather than changing their ways and manner of doing things in order to bring about the necessary and expected reforms. To this class of Nigerians, Popper asked, "are we to believe that

politics, or the framework of legal institutions, are intrinsically impotent to remedy such a situation, and that only a complete social revolution, a complete change of the 'social system', can help? He cautions thus:

> Accordingly, it is not reasonable to assume that a complete reconstruction of our world would lead to a workable system. Rather we should expect that, owing to lack of experience, many mistakes would be made which could be eliminated only by a long and laborious process of small adjustments; in other words, by that rational method of piecemeal engineering whose application we advocate. But those who dislike this method as insufficiently radical would have again to wipe out their freshly constructed society, in order to start anew with a clean canvas; and since the new start, for the same reasons, would not lead to perfection either, they would have to repeat this process without ever getting anywhere. Those who admit this and are prepared to adopt our more modest method of piecemeal improvements, but only after the first radical canvas-cleaning, can hardly escape the criticism that their first sweeping and violent measures were quite unnecessary.[40]

Popper reiterates the need to design a 'legal framework' of protecting institutions, thus, institutions must be designed to prevent even bad rulers of doing too much damage. Obviously, the reason behind the perils of Nigeria 59years after independence, with 29years of military rule and 30years of elected government characterised by abject leadership incompetence and passive followership, the assassination of two government leaders, six successful coups and four failed ones is not far-fetched. It is simply the case of not being able to subject leaders to scrutiny as a result of weak and ineffective institutions. Rather than build strong institutions, the nation has produced strong leaders who one way or the other have contributed grossly to the unenviable state of Nigeria. For instance, the legitimacy and independence of the nation's judiciary is being

threatened by the growing culture of lobbying, favouritism and godfatherism."[41] Thus, the judiciary that was the last hope of the common man is now dispensing justice to the highest bidder, and according to the dictate and caprices of the godfathers. Also, competence has since becomes a secondary consideration for appointment and elevation in the Nigeria's judiciary. The legislature in Nigeria is not left out in the usurping of powers and abuse of office. The National Assembly and various State House of Assembly rather than focusing on making and amending laws that will be meaningful to the masses are either busy aiding and abating the executives in squandering and looting the commonwealth of all, which is feasible in their swift approval of obnoxious annual budgets presented by the executives, unnecessarily delaying the approval of annual budgets in order to arm twist the executives into rubbing their palm or in a fiasco and ruffles within the chambers(which often leads to exchange of words and blows), and with other organs of government. Invariably, the legislature have made the process of recalling unsatisfactory representatives by their constituents near-impossible. Obviously, while the members of the 8th National Assembly seems to be at daggers drawn with other organs and institutions of government, especially the executives, there are calculated moves by them to interfere and undermine the powers confer on those institutions. An example, is the selfish attempt by the 8th NASS to interfere in the exercise of the discretionary power of Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) to organize, undertake and supervise the elections which has hitherto been interpreted by the Supreme Court to

include the power to fix the dates for the general elections or determine the sequence of the elections as provided for in the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (as amended). The State Houses of Assembly on the other hand have moved from being rubber-stamped to iron-sealed, and as puppets to State Governors. What can be said of a House of Assembly that members voted against their own financial autonomy? Is it the proposal for Local Government Autonomy and abrogation of the State-Local Government Joint Account which allows state Governors to continuously interfere with statutory funds allocated to the 774 local government areas from the Federation Account, independent candidature that would be approved by them? The executives are not left out in the crisis of governance in Nigeria since the power of implementation is their utmost responsibility. There are instances of gross abuse of due process and office, incompetency, infringement of human rights, disobedience to rule of law by all the organs of government, which has further weakened the institutions of the state. The press; the fourth estate of the realm have in no mean measure misinterpreted and misinformed the teeming populace, which has further bolded the disintegration lines of the various ethnic enclaves that makes up the Nigerian state. The panacea is the strengthening of institutions as proposed by Karl Popper. Since the non-violence approach allows for self-criticism, tactfulness, self-realisation, and improvements. The prospects of adopting this approach would not only ensure sustainable development in Nigeria, but it would equally restore the damaged image of Nigerians globally and ensure the place of Nigeria in the comity of nations. On the

other hand, the method of incremental reformism in Nigeria appears bleak without a conscientious and proactive followership, since the leaders rather than re-engineer the system are feeding fat on it. Thus, it becomes pertinent to question the place of the citizens, the followers, the populace in ensuring and sustaining peaceful reforms rather than violence revolution in Nigeria?

5.3   Followership Imperative and Governance in Nigeria

There is no gain reiterating that Nigerian leaders have plunged the nation into mediocrity and retrogression. There is general insecurity, herdsmen menace, kidnapping and cultism, educational decline, total and paralysing absence of national identity, and the questioning of the unity of Nigeria. Without doubt, the unpardonable failures of the political leadership class managing the affairs and wealth of the country have inevitably brought severe misery to many voiceless and helpless Nigerians. It must also be mentioned here that Nigeria's post-independence political bureaucratic and military elites have terribly pillaged the nation's common wealth and national patrimony with impunity, thereby denying Nigerians access to economic prosperity and quality living condition. While the 'followers' are quick in pointing fingers at the 'leaders' as being responsible for the precarious and unenviable status of the Nigerian state, the fact, remains that, the 'leaders' would not have achieved such unenviable feat without the 'followers' aiding and abating them. In fact, the leaders rode to stardom of destroying the country on the back of the followers. Thus, Popper insists that, "it is

quite wrong to blame democracy for the political shortcomings of a democratic state. We should rather blame ourselves, the citizen of the democratic state."[42] It follows that the place of conscientious and proactive followership which is the bedrock of good governance is deficit in Nigeria. Throughout the ages in every society that has evolved successfully, social reform and change is initiated by followership and not necessarily the leadership. Thus, Aderounmu dissatisfied at the resilient attitude of most Nigerians, posits that, "the greatest crime ordinary Nigerians are committing against themselves is their collective passivity and their continuous hope even in the face of outright hopelessness"[43] How do one explain a situation that people are groaning but they are not acting or getting involved in what goes around in their environs? Most Nigerians are disinterested and aloof about the political activities in the polity, but are quick to complain bitterly when basic health, employment and social services are not available where they should be easily accessible by either them or their relatives. What justification does a disinterested citizen who has shown no interest in the political process and played no role in ensuring that the process is free, fair and credible have to complain when the treasury is looted, hospitals ill-equipped, roads left unmaintained, education underfunded, and incompetent people appointed or elected to man institutions of the state? What about citizens that do not obey the laws nor follow the rules? When Nigerians participates in electoral malpractices that produce politicians who are not fit to be head of households to high offices, who should be blame? Obviously, those who did nothing and those who sold their votes for pittance of

stomach infrastructure; that is, food, drinks and a few thousand of naira to the candidates during electioneering campaigns are of the same category. Though, those who got their hands soiled by tokens from politician did more disservice to the entire polity. The irony on the other hand, is that, the politicians who dished out little or nothing will recoup in multiple folds by amassing the commonwealth of his constituents, since the gullible followers have already traded the development of their constituents for peanuts. As such, is it justifiable for those who sold their votes to question or claim that politicians are corrupt when corruption actually started from those of them who took their own kickback upfront and ahead of delivering their votes to politicians? Is it not scandalous to vote time and again for representatives who have failed because they keep inducing us with peanuts during re-elections?

Yet again, Popper's democratic ideals if adopted are prospective to the reawakening of Nigerians from their political slumber. Popper cautions that as followers:

> We must realize that the control of physical power and of physical exploitation remains the central political problem. In order to achieve this control, we must establish 'merely formal freedom'. Once we have achieved this, and have learned how to use it for the control of political power, everything rests with us….once we have achieved formal freedom, we can control vote-buying in every form. There are laws to limit the expenditure on electioneering, and it rests entirely with us to see that much more stringent laws of this kind are introduced. The legal system can be made a powerful instrument for its own protection. In addition, we can influence public opinion, and insist upon a much more rigid moral code in political matters. All this we can do; but we must first realize that social engineering of this kind is our own task, that it is in our power, and that we must not wait for economic earthquakes miraculously to produce a new economic world for us, so that all we shall have to do will be to unveil it, remove the old political cloak.[44]

It follows logically that the future of Nigeria is in the hands of Nigerians, especially the hands of the followers. Commenting on the necessity of proactive followership in Nigeria, Fawehinmi Gani notes that:

> The problem with Nigerians is that they worship authority too much; they worship official-dom too much; they worship people in power too much and that is why the people in power cheat them and that is why they lord things over them… Those who are in position of power should be made to be servants of the people, and if they don't serve, people should be on the streets to chase them out, through mass demonstrations… I mean we should begin the culture of resistance against the misuse of power.[45]

Obviously, Popper's democratic ideals does not allow for the citizens to be either nonchalant or onlookers in governance, since a government devoid of citizen control is a potential failure. Thus, change will definitely not be dropped on the laps of the masses who are nonchalant and passive; rather, such followers will remain victims of their own smugness. However, a serious impediment to a united, focused and proactive followership in Nigeria is tribalism. While the ruling elites are united for the common purpose of staying perpetually in power and amassing as much wealth as possible, they in turn, deceive the followers by pulling clannish strings since it appears to be the cheapest way of rallying their kith and kin for personal gains. Corroborating, Raila Odinga notes that, "tribalism is a disease of the elite; they are the ones who in competition for the resources of the country invoke ethnicity as a tool against each other."[46] This clearly explains why the incessant calls for and a threat of secession in Nigeria is ethnic based. As such, Nigeria as a sociopolitical entity is largely divided on ethno-religious lines which has made practically impossible the realization of national

integration; an integration that is critical in doing away with the united elites. History

has shown that, only in the event of united masses with a common agenda can the elites

be challenged. In this light, Adujie cautions that, instead of becoming tools in the hands

of inept politicians who are liable to fan embers of ethnic, religious and regional

violence, Nigerians across the spectrum should realize that we have abject poverty in

common, we have unemployment in common; we have concerns for safety and security

in common.[47] Corroborating, Arhuidese posits that:

> Nigeria is a conglomerate of numerous cultural groups
> that differ from one another marginally and evolving a
> common cultural policy both in formulation and
> implementation requires just marginal changes,
> modifications or additions to the desired policy results.
> The pluralism of Nigerian culture is inimical to evolving
> a Nigerian nation and hence incremental changes and
> additions to existing cultures of the various people a
> suitable remedial course for ameliorating the said effect
> of diverse cultural groups in a common territorial
> boundary. Mere additions to one's culture by Nigerians
> who hold their culture tenaciously is easier to accept by
> their target groups than a wholesale call to do away with
> one's traditions. This is the tune with the incremental
> theory and since the theory also advocates give and take
> and mutual consent among numerous participants it is
> most suitable as the base for our cultural policy.[48]

Invariably, the critical rationalism and tolerance will further ameliorate the multi-

cultural challenges of proactive followership in Nigeria. According to Popper, "if

things cannot be improved by the use of reason, then it would be indeed an historical or

political miracle if the irrational powers of history by themselves were to produce a

better and more rational world."[49] This is a clarion call to Nigerians who are intolerance

of each other, who at the slightest provocation either call for violence or partake in

violence against each other, especially other tribes to embrace the critical rationalism which is a civilized and better approach to issues. Popper maintains that:

> We could then say that rationalism is an attitude of readiness to listen to critical arguments and to learn from experience. It is fundamentally an attitude of admitting that 'I may be wrong and you may be right, and by effort, we may get the nearer to the truth'. It is an attitude which does not lightly give up hope that by such means as arguments and careful observation, people may reach some kind of agreement on many problems of importance, and that, even where their demands and their interests clash, it is often possible to argue about the various demands and proposals, and to reach - perhaps by arbitration – a compromise which, because of its equity, is acceptable to most, if not to all. In short, the rationalist attitude, or, as I may perhaps label it, the 'attitude of reasonableness', is very similar to the scientific attitude, to the belief that in the search for truth we need co-operation, and that, with the help of argument, we can in time attain something like objectivity….The fact that the rationalist attitude considers the argument rather than the person arguing is of far-reaching importance. It leads to the view that we must recognize everybody with whom we communicate as a potential source of argument and of reasonable information; it thus establishes what may be described as the 'rational unity of mankind'.[50]

He sums up that:

> Toleration is the necessary consequence of realizing our human fallibility: to err is human, and we do it all the time. So let us pardon each other's follies. This is the first principle of natural right….If we concede to intolerance the right to be tolerated, then we destroy tolerance, and the constitutional state.[51]

Thus, it is only when such admonition is heeded by ordinary Nigerians that they can overcome the things that divide them and can collectively seek to alter the status-quo.

Moreover, critical rationalism is not limited to sitting in an armchair to criticise unfair and anti-people's governmental laws and policies, but when formal institutional mechanisms for checks and balances are very weak, inappropriate or absent we must resort to the basic universal methods found in every society. That is the exercise of

basic attitudes and behaviors that clearly demonstrate intolerance for graft, ineptitude and other forms of leadership failure. In addition to civil disobedience we must also stimulate social consciousness through behaviors that answers some basic but fundamental questions. For instance is it appropriate to applauds and reward 'thieves ' with honorary degrees, religious and traditional titles? Are the monies collected in the church or mosques for the personal and discretionary use of the pastor or imams or should it be disbursed with a consensus? Should strategic and national resources such as oil blocs be criminally assigned to individuals? Should competence be traded for nepotism? Etc.

Significantly, it is obvious that the Nigeria's ruling class may not hurriedly effect necessary reforms that will ameliorate the living condition of the followers if the followers do not rise to the occasion, and so demand for their rights. Thus, proactive and conscientious followership is the only needed resource for political transformation and taming the elite menace perpetuated through godfatherism. On the other hand, uneducated and illiterate followers lack the knowledge of what constitute their rights and obligations to and from the state. Thus, the elites take advantage of their plights and further oppressed and subdue them to a life of fear. In this regards, Popper recommends state controlled education as the panacea for the elite's deceit. Accordingly, the state controlled education would ensure that educational facilities are available to all and sundry in order to protect the citizens, especially the young ones from the neglect which would make them unable to defend themselves, freedom and rights. Though, he cautioned against indoctrination. The place of education in shaping the mind of the citizens need not be overemphasised as it is a prerequisite for self-realization and critical rationalism, tolerance, liberalism, among others according to Popper. Thus, the questions that beg for answers are; what form or system of

government would ensure the application of nonviolence reforms rather than violent revolution? What form of government would place the masses in their rightful place as against what is obtainable in the Nigerian polity? What form of government would restore the lost glory of Nigeria, unites her citizens, and ensure sustainable development?

5.4   The Liberalist Option

According to Popper:

> We may distinguish two main types of government. The first type consists of governments of which we can get rid without bloodshed-for example, by way of general elections; that is to say, the social institutions provide means by which the rulers may be dismissed by the ruled, and the social traditions ensure that these institutions will not easily be destroyed by those who are in power. The second type consists of governments which the ruled cannot get rid of except by way of a successful revolution-that is to say, in most cases, not at all. I suggest the term 'democracy' as a short hand label for a government of the first type, and the term 'tyranny' or 'dictatorship' for the second…. If we make use of the two labels as suggested, then we can now describe, as the principle of democratic policy, the proposal to create, develop, and protect, political institutions for the avoidance of tyranny.[52]

He continues that:

> The theory of democracy is not based not based upon the principle that the majority should rule; rather, the various equalitarian methods of democratic control, such as general elections and representative government, are to be considered as no more than well-tried and, in the presence of a widespread traditional distrust of tyranny, reasonably effective institutional safeguards against tyranny, always open to improvement, and even providing methods for their own improvement…. Democracy provides the institutional framework for the reform of political institutions. It makes possible the reform of institutions without using violence, and thereby the use of reason in the designing of new institutions and the adjusting of old ones.[53]

Popper raised as a matter of concern, the mistaken view that has held sway in political philosophy from the classical period that the fundamental problem of politics is: "Who should rule?" Popper proposes the alternative aim of striving to limit the damage that bad or incompetent rulers can do. Again, this aim reflects the actual practice of liberal-democratic regimes. It is manifested in such institutions as the separation of powers, checks and balances, free and fair elections, and limited terms of office. He refers to modern Western liberal democracies as open societies and defended them as "the best of all political worlds of whose existence we have any historical knowledge." [54] For him, their value resided principally in the individual freedom that they permitted and their ability to self-correct peacefully over time. The fact that they were democratic and generated great prosperity was merely an added benefit. Governance and politics in liberal democracies take place within constitutional frameworks designed to limit the abuse of power. Popper's argument is premised on the fact that, "political rulers are not always sufficiently 'good' or 'wise' , and that it is not all easy to get a government on whose goodness and wisdom one can implicitly rely."[55] Invariably, what Popper proposes is being proactive as followers, preparing for the worst leaders, while hoping for the best. Thus, it is a pragmatic and liberalist approach to life, as it takes into cognizance, not just existence but essence.

More so, he maintains that:

> Those who believe that the older question is fundamental, tacitly assume that political power is 'essentially' unchecked. They assume that someone has the power-either an individual or a collective body, such as a class. And they assume that he who has the power can, very nearly, do what he wills, and especially that he can strengthen his power, and thereby approximate it further to an unlimited or unchecked power.[56]

Invariably, the dilemma created by attempting to answer the question 'who should rule?' has been the bane of development in Nigeria; a heterogeneous and multi-cultural state, and the primary cause of disaffection, disintegration and insistence calls for violent revolution and secession by various ethnic enclaves making up the nation. Not left out, is the genuine calls for a restructuring of the nation which is long overdue, as the ethnic lines keep getting bolder by the day, 59years after independence.

The early Nationalists who struggled for the independence of Nigeria believed and embraced democracy with all the institutional paraphernalia of liberalism such as political parties, open elections, recognized opposition, rule of law, checks and balances, independent of the judiciary, human rights, etc. With this mindset, they fought for and successfully convinced the British colonial masters on why Nigeria should be independent. At the point of this struggle for self-rule and liberation, there seems to be unity of purpose amongst the elites and the masses, as the enemy of all were the colonial masters. Ironically, self-rule came with the challenges of national unity of the many ethnic groups with different languages, cultures, customs and traditions brought together by the British to form Nigeria, and till date, this threat to national integration rather than being extinct or decreasing is blossoming. The moment each of this tribes embraced and attempted to answer the question, "Who should rule?" peace, justice and development eluded the giant of Africa- Nigeria. From political parties to the institution of the state, all played the ethnic card; each carrying out their activities simultaneously with their tribal ideologies. This birthed mistrust by the ethnic elements, inter-tribal rivalry for political power, public offices and the distribution of public wealth. The consequences being the undermining of the institutions of the state on one hand, and the abuse of suffrage on the other hand; that is, elections no longer serve the important purpose of empowering the people with the opportunity of electing their representatives on the basis of competency of the

contestant but on tribal and religious grounds. This further deteriorated to disintegration of the country and a resort to violent methods of agitating and effecting change in government notwithstanding its concomitant effects. Thus, from the Westminister Parliamentary model of the First Republic to the Presidential system of government originally modelled towards the American democratic system, the tale of Nigeria has been that of authoritarianism, nepotism and violence. Invariably, while it is not out of place to assert that the values that go with a democratic society is yet to be adequately internalised in the Nigerian's way of life, there is yet another shaky notion among African leaders that the principles of democracy is subjective and not universal; that is, what is practicable for the Western world may not necessarily be practicable to Africa in general and Nigeria in particular. As such one can easily hear shouts of "Nigerian Democracy", "home grown Democracy", "our nascent Democracy", etc.

For instance, traditionalism, a school of thought in the discourse on the state of democracy in Africa is sympathetic to an indigenous democratic system. However, the fundamental problem with the traditionalist's position is basically in their wrong assumption that democratic ideals are culturally specific, whereas, what actually differs are democratic practices in different cultural and political societies. In all, democratic ideals such as equality, liberty, people's sovereignty are universal. Also, the traditionalists from Wamba to Wiredu argues that multi-party system is unsuitable for the African situation. Thus, while Wamba holds that:

> Democratisation has to be considered as a process of struggle to win, defend and protect rights of people and individuals against one-sidedness- including the right of self organisation for autonomy and not necessarily right of participation in the state process.[57]

Kwasi Wiredu rejects the multi-party majoritarian democratic model which allows the party that wins the most seats at the election to form the government, while the party

that wins the least becomes the opposition. The implication for him is that the right of the minority representatives and their constituencies to meaningfully participate in the actual making of decisions is rendered nugatory. Invariably, Wiredu opt for a non-party and consensual democracy as a panacea for the socio-political ills in Africa. According to him:

> A non-party and consensual democratic system is one in which parties are not the basis of power. People can form political associations to propagate their political ideas and help to elect representatives to parliament. But an association having the most elected members will not therefore be the governing group. Every representative will be of the government in his personal, rather than associational capacity.[58]

Ironically, adopting Wiredu's position would encourage the creation of strong men rather than strong institutions which is already one of the variables mitigating against development in Africa. On the other hand, eclecticists subscribe to the adoption of certain democratic values and principles in traditional African cultures and a mix of democratic ideas and practices of other culture. As such, Owolabi holds that, "there is nothing forbidding us from developing a new culture of sustainable democracy from the amalgam of ideas from both our culture and that of other societies."[59] Meanwhile, the eclecticism position is that, "diverse nations have every right to consent new conceptions of democracy, which respond to their religious, economic, and social needs" would definitely end up watering down the nitty-gritty of democracy as witnessed in successive regimes in Nigeria and Africa. For instance, President Obasanjo's attempt to distort the Nigerian Constitution in order to run for a third-term or even as many terms as possible as observed by the sit-tight syndrome of most African leaders. More so, the attempt to adjust or construct new conceptions of democracy is evidenced in the political party structure in Nigeria which allows for the representatives to decamp from one party to another while occupying a seat, without

losing the seat. This is very unlike the practice in South Africa and the Western world which as of recent led to the former President of South Africa Jacob Zuma resigning as the leader of the African National Congress (ANC) the ruling party and as such relinquishing the office of the President of South Africa to Cyril Ramaphosa, the newly elected leader of party.

Thus, while I agree with Ademola Fayemi that though:

> Local cultures and traditions impact upon the way democratic values and systems are built and supported, it is fallacious to think that certain cultures are inherently inhospitable to democratic values and institutions… democratic governance appeals to and grows out of the universal human values of dignity and freedom. Where democratic governance has failed, it has done so more due to imperfect institutions rather than to the 'unripeness' of a given country.[60]

However, I disagree with Ademola Fayemi's opinion that, the adoption of liberal democracy by African states, "can be seen as an imperialist attempt at inventing a new scramble for Africa" and "an integral part of the cordiality package of neocolonialism."[61] What then is the essence of knowledge and globalization? The sustenance of Fayemi's position implies that from Western education to Christianity as a religion, and from technology/ICT to Western dressing that we have since adopted among others are mere packages of neocolonialism that should be discarded despite its enormous benefits to the Africans.

Invariably, the fact remains that, liberal democracy as an ideology is not cast in iron. Thus, Popper would no doubt fall back on the argument that sound institutions are, somehow, actually created and improved in existing liberal democracies. He would have no difficulty responding to the argument that institutions created in liberal-democratic polities have often been flawed. Human fallibility creates an imperfect system in its practice, and no one can fully foresee all of the consequences that will

follow from their actions. So flawed institutions will always arise, under any kind of regime. Even market-based theories and proposals for public policy are fallible, and may lead to flawed institutions and undesirable consequences. The saving virtue of liberal democracy is not that it guarantees the avoidance of mistakes; rather, it facilitates their identification and elimination. As such, Popper reiterates that:

> Democracy, the right of the people to judge and to dismiss their government, is the only known device by which we can try to protect ourselves against the misuse of political power; it is the control of the rulers by the ruled. And since political power can control economic power, political democracy is also the only means for the control of economic power for the purposes very different from the protection of the freedom of its citizens.[62]

Thus, liberal democracy has an intrinsic human development value since it places the people in the center, thus creating opportunities for their common good. Invariably, those variables that facilitated the workability of democratic ideas, principles and institutions in the West would definitely as a matter of passage of time, work in Nigeria. Corroborating, Jane posits that:

> Liberal democracy has the inherent potentiality of guaranteeing development in Africa. He asserts that the reason why it seems to be failing is that many African states are in haste in struggling to consolidate their democracies and impatient in achieving the developmental pace of the West. He pointed out that older democracies in the West tended to have in their favor some conditions that facilitated their societal development and consequently, consolidation of democracy. These are economic prosperity and equality (enhanced by early industrialization); a modern and diversified social structure in which a middle class plays a primary role; a national culture that tolerates diversity and prefers accommodation, and a long time span of practicing democracy. Today, however, the preconditions of the older democracies do not prevail in Africa, yet many African states are struggling to consolidate their democracies, eager to ape the development pace of the West.[63]

This is a clear call for a piecemeal process which would bring about reforms that will ensure the sustainability of democracy and its enormous benefits to Nigerians in particular and Africans as a whole. Meanwhile, Popper makes a case for state interventionism as against unrestrained freedom. Thus, he maintains that:

> Freedom, we have seen, defeats itself, if it is unlimited. Unlimited freedom means that a strong man is free to bully one who is weak and to rob him of his freedom. This is why we demand that the state should limit freedom to a certain extent, so that everyone's freedom is protected by law. Nobody should be at the mercy of others, but all should have a right to be protected by the state…. Even if the state protects its citizens from being bullied by physical violence, it may defeat our ends by its failure to protect them from the misuse of economic power. In such a state, the economically strong is still free to bully one who is economically weak, and to rob him of his freedom. Under these circumstances, unlimited economic freedom can be just as self-defeating as unlimited physical freedom, and economic power may be nearly as dangerous as physical violence. And assuming that the state limits its activities to the suppression of violence (and to the protection of property), a minority which is economically strong may in this way exploit the majority of those who are economically weak.[64]

The near unlimited freedom expressed by herdsmen and other criminal elements in Nigeria is in the increase, and an embarrassment to the Nigerian state. From the North to the South, and from the East to the West, the cannibalistic tendency of the herdsmen and other criminal elements has further derailed every sense of tolerance and oneness in the polity. In fact, since most of the herdsmen are Fulani, and coincidentally, President Buhari and other Northern elites currently occupying offices of authorities are equally Fulani, there is a perceived correlation between the nefarious acts of the herdsmen and authority. There is definitely a conspiracy and compromise, for how, in the presence of the Nigerian Military, Directorate of State Services, Nigerian Police, and other para military bodies can miscreants be unleashing calculated terror on others unabated? What is the source of the sophisticated ammunitions in the hands of these miscreants?

How can the State government be so helpless, that without the direct interference of the Presidency, there is no security of the lives and properties of her citizens? What is the essence of the security votes accrued to State Governors monthly, if they cannot stand up for the State? Should we bother adumbrating the deprivation and exploitation by capitalist in Nigeria? Obviously, something is definitely wrong with either the mindset of Nigerians or the practice of democracy in Nigeria. On the way out of this misnomer, Popper, thus admonishes that:

> It must be a political remedy-a remedy similar to the one which we use against physical violence. We must construct social institutions, enforced by the power of the state, for the protection of the economically weak from the economically strong. The state must see to it that nobody need enter into an inequitable arrangement out of fear of starvation, or economic ruin. This, of course means that the principle of non-intervention, of an unrestrained economic system, has to be given up; if we wish freedom to be safeguarded, then we must demand that the policy of unlimited economic freedom be replaced by the planned economic intervention of the state. We must demand that unrestrained capitalism give way to an economic interventionism.[65]

The damage of unrestrained capitalism is feasible in the phenomenon of deregulation and the present practice of privatisation in Nigeria, which is exclusive, as it does not guarantee a future for the workers. It is immoral, since it consistently concentrates the wealth of the state in few hands. Also, that there is little or no government control in terms of pricing and administration which have led to unprecedented exploitation of the masses. An example is the Nigeria's power sector regionally controlled by private investors, and the cries of inflated and outrageous estimated billing even without the availability of power to the masses. Also, is the exploitation of the masses by the Digital Satellite Television (DSTV) owners, etc.

On how to bring about a remedy to the exploitation and alienation of the masses,

Popper proposes that:

> We can, for instance, develop a rational political programme for the protection of the economically weak. We can make laws to limit exploitation. We can limit the working day; but we can do much more. By law, we can insure the workers (or better still, all citizens) against disability, unemployment, and old age. In this way we can impossible such forms of exploitation as are based upon the helpless economic position of a worker who must yield to anything in order not to starve. And when we are able by law to guarantee a livelihood to everybody willing to work, and there is no reason why we should not achieve that, then the protection of the freedom of citizen from economic fear and economic intimidation will approach completeness.[66]

This is a clarion call on the legislature, judiciary and executives in Nigeria to be more responsible. Events in the Nigeria polity portrays institutions of government that lacks independence and is ill-conceived. It portrays representatives that are either naïve, and not adequately informed on their obligations to their constituency and the nation as a whole or myopic, self-centered, hypocritical, and unpatriotic, who have refused to make, interpret or administer laws that will uphold the sanctity of human lives, give the citizens a sense of belonging, and bring about sustainable development of the country. Thus, that Nigeria is practicing representative democracy is not an invitation to the tyranny of the representatives. The representatives cannot continue making important decisions without adequately consulting their constituency. Time has come and now is the time when Nigerians should begin to decide how their representative's vote on National issues raised in the National and State houses of Assembly. The leadership of the Legislature must come to the realisation that legislation is a serious business that can make or mar the development of Nigeria. Invariably, popular vote and the principle of consensus should be abolished, while individual representatives should be

allow to vote in every decision in the legislative plenary. It appears to be a waste of resources to have installed an electronic voting device in the chambers of the National and State houses of Assembly that is rarely put to use for fear of losing the choking grip some persons have over a house of elected representatives of Nigeria. This will go a long way in curbing the marginalisation of the representatives by a few other representatives in decision making, which is equally the marginalisation of their constituency.

Significantly, Popper reminds the citizens that:

> Political power is the key to economic protection. Political power and its control is everything. Economic power must not be permitted to dominate political power; if necessary, it must be fought and brought under control by political power.[67]

Thus, Nigerians must desist from being passive over their rights and welfare. The level of voter's apathy is discouraging, and this is not one of the hallmarks of good followership. Nigerians must subject their leaders to scrutiny, as such, they must consciously move away from electing provincials, ascetics, and religionists into offices. There is need to restructure through piecemeal engineering in order to revitalize competition and drive for production by the federating units, rather than waiting every month for proceeds from oil generated revenue to be shared by the Federal Government. There is also need for a converging of a nationwide conversation of all ethnic nationalities that makes up the Nigerian state so as to come up with a consensus proposal of a constitution. On the other hand, the National Assembly should reflect as

much of the ethnic nationalities as possible. Our ideology has to change for us to survive as a country. Corroborating, Nwodo John Nnia posits that:

> A model based on sharing of Government revenue must give way to a new structure that will challenge and drive productivity in different regions across the country. This new model must take into account that the factors driving productivity in today's world are no longer driven by fossil oil but rather the proliferation of a knowledge-based economy. The restructuring of Nigeria into smaller and independent federations units and the devolution of powers to these federating units to control exclusively their human capital development, mineral resources, agriculture, and power(albeit with an obligation to contribute to the federal government) is the only way to salvage our fledging economy. Restructuring will devote attention to the new wealth areas, promote competition and productivity as the new federating units struggle to survive. It will drastically reduce corruption as the large federal parastatals which gulp Government revenue for little or no impact dissolve and give way to smaller and viable organs in the new federating units."[68]

Also, the Federal Government should concentrate on external defence, customs, immigration, foreign relations and a Federal legislature and judiciary to make and interpret laws. These should be the components of the exclusive list. Invariably, the state should control a percentage of revenue accruing from their areas and contribute an agreed percentage to the federal government. However, it is unfortunate that the legislature have failed to conscientiously carry out their obligations of making good laws despite incessant calls by their constituents for restructuring of Nigeria. The alarming earnings of the National Assembly members is milking the nation dry, and it calls for a review of not only their earnings, but the ideology behind a bi-cameral legislature. It is becoming glaring that the cost of running a bi-cameral legislature is overwhelming. Why should Nigeria keeps spending more to service a bi-cameral legislature, when we can spend less on a unicameral system and get a better result?

210

Aside from the high cost of servicing the system, a bi-cameral legislature allows for nominalism; duplication of duties. What is the essence of an individual representing 10 – 12 Local Government Areas?

Furthermore, Popper also argues that two-party systems, such as found in the United States and Great Britain, are superior to proportional representation systems; his position is premised on the fact that in a two-party system voters are more easily able to assign failure or credit to a particular political party, that is, the one in power at the time of an election. This in turn fosters self-criticism in the defeated party: "Under such a system … parties are from time to time forced to learn from their mistakes"[69] For these reasons, government in a two-party system encourages a vibrant and robust opposition. Unlike the Nigerian situation with proliferation of political parties which has become a vehicle of political utility and convenience, bereft of ideology, and deficit in both ideas and principle. Political parties that brands themselves 'opposition' are merely seeking a regional control of power or mere replacement of the ruling political party without deepening the ingredients of quality policy debate and checkmate vital to democratisation. The so-called opposition parties are further deepening an already protracted pluralistic burden on the country; most fan the embers of ethnicity, romancing an antithetical stance of the 'ought to be' role of political parties as agent of unification and nation-building. And for those who argue that, the pluralistic understanding of democracy is imperative, especially in the light of the heterogeneous, multi-ethnic, religious, ideological, linguistic, regional and cultural cleavages of Nigeria does not hold water. Thus, the extent of Nigeria's failure is brought into sharp relief when we juxtapose the country with Indonesia, another huge, populous, ethnically diverse and oil-rich nation. Both countries have suffered military rule and, at times, massive bloodshed. At independence, both countries were nations of subsistence

farmers. Both struck oil and were deluged with petrodollars. But here the parallels cease. Indonesia has not exactly been a model of good governance, but average incomes rose nonetheless, from under $200 in 1974 to $680 in 2001, despite the Asian financial crash of 1997. In 2002, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) reported that Nigerians are more than twice as likely as Indonesians to be illiterate or to die before the age of 40.[70]. Invariably, Popper reiterates the need for tolerance by all citizens thus:

> Implicit in this attitude is the realization that we shall always have to live in an imperfect society. This is so not only because even very good people are very imperfect; nor is it because, obviously, we often make mistakes because we do not know enough. Even more important than either of these reasons is the fact that there always exist irresolvable clashes of values: there are many moral problems which are insoluble because moral principles may conflict.[71]

He continues that:

> There can be no human society without conflict: such a society would not be a society of friends but of ants. Even if it were attainable, there are human values of the greatest importance which would be destroyed by its attainment, and which therefore should prevent us from attempting to bring it about. On the other hand, we certainly ought to bring about a reduction of conflict. So already we have here an example of a clash of values or principles. This example also shows that clashes of values and principles may be valuable, and indeed essential for an open society.[72]

Thus, since in any functioning liberal-democratic regime there will be countless individuals, groups, and institutions that play the role of piecemeal social engineer whenever they criticize existing policies or make proposals for new ones, it is necessary for Nigerians to take due advantage of their heterogeneous society, converts love of ones tribe to love for the nation and be united in ensuring the sustainability of institutions that will ensure that incompetent leaders are prevented from doing too

much damage. While the misconceptions and inadequacies inherent in liberal democratic theory could be expunged. Popper reiterates that, democracy can work only if the main parties adhere to view of its functions which may be summarized in some rules such as these:

1. Democracy cannot be fully characterized as the rule of the majority, although the institution of general elections is most important. For a majorly might rule in a tyrannical way. (The majority of those who are less than 6ft. high may decide that the minority who of those over 6ft. shall pay all taxes.) In a democracy, the powers of the rulers must be limited; and the criterion of a democracy is this: In a democracy, the rulers- that is to say, the government- can be dismissed by the ruled without bloodshed. Thus if the men in power do not safeguard those institutions which secure to the possibility of working for a peaceful change, then their rule is tyranny.

2. We need only distinguish between two forms of government, viz, such as possess institutions of this kind, and all others; i.e. democracies and tyrannies.

3. A consistent democratic constitution should exclude only one type of change in the legal system, namely a change which would endanger its democratic character.

4. In a democracy, the full protection of the minorities should not extend to those who incite others to the violent overthrow of the democracy.

5. A policy of framing institutions to safeguard democracy must always proceed on the assumption that there may be anti-democratic tendencies latent among the ruled as well as among the rulers.

6. If democracy is destroyed, all rights are destroyed. Even if certain economic advantages enjoyed by the ruled should persist, they would persist only on suffrage.

7. Democracy provides an invaluable battle-ground for any reasonable reform, since it permits reform without violence. But if the preservation of democracy is not made the first consideration in any particular battle fought out on this battle-ground, then

the latent anti-democratic tendencies which are always present may bring about a breakdown of democracy. If an understanding of these principles is not yet developed, its development must be fought for. The opposite policy may prove fatal; it may bring about the loss of the most important battle, the battle for democracy.[73]

Popper's democratic ideals has the tendencies of promoting shared material and non-material benefits, mutual trust, citizen participation in decision making, and the accountability of representatives to Nigerians. As such, it is either we adopt Popper's democratic ideals with the necessary modifications or dwell with the perils of a failed state.

CONCLUSION

From our hermeneutics of democratisation in Nigeria thus far, it is evident that the problem with Nigerian democracy is not just authoritarianism, wide spread corruption, tribalism, mass poverty, decayed infrastructures, wanton insecurity of lives and properties, nepotism, absolute disregard for due process and the rule of law, but leadership deficiency, failed followership and a utopian, bleak and confusing ideology.

The tragic principles of this ideology is summarised by Nwala thus:

1. That in politics, money is everything. Without money you cannot achieve political power,

2. That it does not matter how you acquire this money. What matters is having it and using it to achieve your pre-eminence among the people,

3. That the man who holds political power in Nigeria is invincible and so exercises so much unlimited authority and control over all our material resources,

4. That the masses generally have short memory. As a result, nothing you do now would matter especially if you succeed in making money and achieving political power,

5. The belief that the masses are ignorant and do not appreciate the fine points of political deceit and betrayal.[74]

While we cannot deny the impediment of illiteracy, poverty and tribalism to conscientious and proactive followership in Nigeria which has resulted in most of the masses being gullible, as such, they are indifferent on how to curb the excesses of the ruling elites. Notwithstanding, others have settled for a violent revolution to bring to an end to the exploitation by the ruling elites. Thus, there has been a great yearning for revolution in Nigeria at any given opportunity, which is evidenced in series of coup, civil war, and unending eruptions of religious violence and inter-ethnic mayhem for little or no provocation, and proliferation of ethnic militias. Failed governance accompanied with systemic corruption has attained an unimaginable height and is currently assuming a pandemic proportion in Nigeria. Invariably, there is no gain reiterating that there really was never a golden age of great leadership in the history of Nigeria. Democracy and its tenets have been abused and distorted. The lack of competent, responsible leaders with integrity, vision, high moral values and conscientious and proactive followers has been the bane of development in the country. It is simply embarrassing that Nigeria, a country blessed with natural resources and manpower is now doomed with uncertainty where abject poverty, high unemployment rate, unresolved assassinations, looting and squandering of public funds, and series of unresolved development challenges, all as a consequence of failed governance.

No doubt, while corrupt practices among the political leadership class with the followers as accomplices have resulted in undermining the growth and stability of the nation's trading and financial system, damaging of economic development and reforms, and hindering the growth of democratic institutions, the resort to violent revolution has

not yielded any tangible result, rather, it has bolded the ethnic lines and nourished intolerance in the polity.

Although the situation looks very bad, it is not beyond remedy. Invariably, democracy becomes rigid, corrupt and unresponsive in the absence of periodic reform and renewal. But where there is a well-articulated democratic theory, the possibility of success in its practical manifestation is higher than where there is none. It is in this light that the research seeks to meet the urgent and necessary need of re-awakening the consciousness of Nigerians to the unequivocal benefits of peaceful reforms by proposing Popper's democratic ideals with its liberalism and non-violent tendencies (critical rationalism and piecemeal social engineering), and the necessary modifications as an ideology that will more than any other ideology ameliorate the governance menace in Nigeria in particular, and Africa as a whole. Popper calls for the abolishing of the question, 'who should rule' which has been the bane of distrust, unhealthy competition within and between the ethnic enclaves, and proposes the adoption of the new question, 'how can we so organise political institutions such that bad leaders can be prevented from doing too much damage' which is a call for unity of purpose by the followers. Nigeria simply has been lacking in the fundamental things that every nation, big or small, needs to achieve greatness – credible, responsible and people-oriented leadership and conscientious, proactive followership and a clear-cut ideology to guide all her citizens. After decades of failed attempts to produce credible leaders, it is imperative now for the political leadership class to turn a new leave by rejecting old habits of authoritarianism, tribalism, corruption and a bleak ideology which has hitherto hindered Nigeria from becoming a modern, great, and developed nation. This is not in any way to undermine the need for strong institutions. Nevertheless, no country can develop strong institutions without the benefits of good leadership and proactive

followership. Leaders who will create the conditions necessary for building strong institutions and followers that will ensure the sustenance of strong institutions. This is a clarion call for a positive change in the attitudes of the Nigerian leadership and followership class, as this is all that is needed to end governance failures in Nigeria and for the nation and its people to experience sustainable socio-economic development, because no matter how perfect or excellent the constitution or other instruments for ensuring accountability and checking corruption in the country might be, all will come to naught unless the political leadership class show the political will to abide by and enforce them on one hand, while the followers on the other hand must insist that the right thing be done, nothing more, nothing less. The followers must arise and reclaim their place as the central figure in democracy, since the concept of political democracy is on one hand a social contract, which gives the people the option of governing themselves by choosing their leaders, and taking responsibility there from, constituting a court for leadership by observing, advising, cautioning, compelling, checkmating and even confronting; and on the other hand, gives the leadership its legitimacy by determining and agreeing that it is rightfully constituted and therefore worthy of obedience. There is a need to build a culture of honesty and establish a tradition of selflessness and patriotism in public service; an attitude reminiscent of J. F. Kennedy's remark, "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."[75]

RECOMMENDATIONS

I strongly believe that Nigerians can provide a regular and non-violent way to get rid of incompetent, corrupt or authoritarian leaders, and invariably get it right in governance and the practice of democracy. Popper's democratic ideals which entails liberalism,

critical rationalism and piecemeal social engineering, and modified with civil disobedience is an imperative ideology adopted as a panacea that will bring about a paradigm shift in the practice of democracy and governance in Nigeria, and will ensure the amelioration of the unenviable state of affairs in Nigeria, which is characterised by series of developmental challenges. In light of this and in order to ensure a people oriented democracy, where; the dignity of persons is given top priority, there is an unconditional protection of citizens' lives and properties, and the welfare of the governed constitute the soul justification of government. In this light, I thus propose;

-       A unicameral National legislative system with at least 1(one) member representing 2(two) Local Government Areas. While each Local Government Area should have a minimum of 1(one) representative in the State Houses of Assembly unlike what is currently practiced in Nigeria. Not left out, is the need for a law mandating Chairmen of Local Government Areas and their councilors to reside permanently in their respective Local Government Areas and wards while occupying elective offices. There is no going back on the necessity of granting financial autonomy to the Local Government from the monopoly of the State Government despite the present set back by majority of the State Houses of Assembly, thus, the citizens must consistently demand the amendment of the constitution to accommodate their needs. This will ensure accountability, affinity between the representatives and their constituents, as well as effective monitoring of representatives by the constituents, and a turnaround development.

-       Mixed economy rather than unrestrained capitalism in order to breach the monopoly and exploitation of the masses by few individuals.

- Restructuring of the educational system to meet the necessary needs of Nigerians, such that encourages productivity, creativity, and an enlightened democratic education of the citizens towards the commitment to participatory democracy.

- The independence of the anti-graft agencies from the influence of political elites and government in order for the agencies to perform efficiently and effectively, and to clear the perception that anti-graft agencies are witch-hunting mechanism of the government of the day. Also, the ant-graft agencies should be adequately equipped technologically with the data base information of Nigerians which can always be updated in order to encourage accountability.

- The agents of socialisation; family, religious organisations, schools, and the society at large should frown at and be more proactive towards discouraging individuals from participating in corrupt practices.

- The government should lead by example and be ready to take bold steps to serve as a guide to the led, by practicing good governance, transparency and accountability in all of its dealings in order to gain the confidence of the citizenry. Bureaucracies should be reduced to its barest minimum; there should be no duplications of offices.

- There should be sincerity by government in the sharing of political offices, revenue and developmental projects across the States and Local Governments Areas.

- Respect for the rule of law and checks and balances should be the order of the day. This will ensure the independence and strengthening of institutions, and that corrupt individuals are adequately prosecuted irrespective of their position in the society, party affiliation, ethnic enclave or religious affiliation.

- Our laws should be constantly reviewed through the piecemeal approach in order to meet upcoming challenges. Also, more stringent punishment should be meted out on convicts of corrupt acts in our law courts. A cue from what is obtainable in the Asian countries such as China and others should be adopted, as it would definitely deter Nigerians from sharp practices and corruption. This is urgent as the 2017 Transparency International corruption perception index portrays that corruption is getting worse in Nigeria

- Honesty, transparency and productivity should be constantly and publicly rewarded in order to inculcate good moral values in the polity.

- Proactive and conscientious followership who would readily embrace the critical rationalism, tolerance, piecemeal social engineering, civil disobedience, but holistically rejects violent revolution in the Nigerian polity remains a better option that will ensure peace and justice, and equally pave way for sustainable democracy and development in Nigeria.

ENDNOTES

1. Maxwell Nicholas, "Karl Raimund Popper (28 July 1902 – 17 September 1994)," *British Philosophers, 1800-2000*, Dematteis, P. Fosl and L. McHenry (ed.) (Columbia: Bruccoli Clark Layman, 2002), p.177.

2. Brian Magee (ed.), *The Great Philosophers: An introduction to Western Philosophy,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 79-80.

3. David A. Harper, "The Political Thought of Karl Popper by Jeremy Shearmur*" Review of Austrian Economy*. 12, (1999), p. 95.

4. John Gray, *"The Liberalism of Karl Popper" Philosophical Notes*, No. 9 London: Libertarian Alliance, (1976), p. 2.

5. A. Ryan, "Popper and Liberalism," G. Currie and A. Musgrave (eds.), *Popper and the Human Sciences*, (1985), p. 89.

6. John Gray, Op; cit. p. 2.

7. Jeremy Shearmur, *The Political Thought of Karl Popper*, (New York: Routledge, 1996), p.8

8. Loc; Cit.

9. Colin Simkin, *Popper's views on Natural and Social Science*, (New York: Orbis, 1993), p.132.

10. Katrina Forrester, "Tocqueville Anticipated Me" *London Review of Books*. (2012), p. 42.

11. Jeremy Shearmur and Piers Norris Turner (eds.), *Karl Popper: After The Open Society, Selected Social and Political Writings*, (London and New York: Routledge, 2008b), p. 196.

12. Jeremy Shearmur, et al (eds.), *London Review of Books*, (2012), p. 311.

13. Fred Eidlin, "Popper's Social Democratic Politics and Free Market Liberalism" *Critical Review*. August (2011), p.208.

14. Loc; Cit.

15. Ibid; p. 216.

16. David Harper, "The Political Thought of Karl Popper by Jeremy Shearmur" *A Review of Austrian Economy*. 12, (1999), p. 95.

17. A. Ryan, "The Achievement of Karl Popper" *Times Literary Supplement*. October 7, (1994), p.19.

18. Karl Popper, "The Logic of the Social Science." Theodor, W.Adorns, et al. (La Salle, 111: Open Court. 1976), p. 115

19. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2013), p. 148.

20. A. Faludi (ed), *A Reader in Planning Theory*, (Oxford and New York: Pergamon Press, 1973), p. 6.

21. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies. Vol. 1. The spell of Plato.* (London: Routledge; 1999), p. 157.

22. Ibid; p. 158.

23. Ibid; p. 159.

24. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, vol. 2, *The High Tide of Prophecy: Hegel, Marx and the Aftermath* (5th edition), (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1966b), pp. 129-133.

25. Ibid; p. 158.

26. Loc; Cit.

27. Karl Popper, Op; Cit. 2013, p.106

28. Ibid; p. 122.

29. Loc; Cit.

30. Ibid; p. 106.

31. Adam Chmielewski and Karl R. Popper, "The Future is Open: A Conversation with Karl Popper." Ian Jarvie and Sandra Pralong, ed., *Popper's Open Society after Fifty Years: The Continuing Relevance of Karl Popper*. (1999), p. 36.

32. Karl Popper, "Against Big Words (a letter not originally intended for publication)." *In Search of a Better World*.1984, p.83.

33. Ibid; pp. 107-108.

34. Alahji Isa Kaita, in Mathew Hassan Kukah, Religion, *Politics and Power in Northern Nigeria*, (Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd., 1993), p. 417.

35. Olv Stokke, *Nigeria – An Introduction to the Politics, Economy and Social Setting of Modern Nigeria*, (Sweeden: Soderstrom and Finn, Uppsala, 1970), p.49.

36. Wilson Idahosa Aiwuyor, *"The Impending Democratic Revolution in Nigeria"* in Louis Achi's "Again, Drumbeats of Revolution". *Leadership* Sunday, November 18, 2012, p. 21.

37. Loc; Cit.

38. Karl Popper, *The Poverty of Historicism*, London and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1960, p.152.

39. Karl Popper, *Op; Cit.* 2013, p. 152.

40. Ibid; p. 157.

41. Justice Aloma Mukhtar, "How lobbying, favouritism is killing Judiciary". *The Nation News*, 5th march, 2018.

42. Karl Popper, Op; Cit. 2013, p.120.

43. Adeola Aderounmu *Re: Nigeria, Revolution is our last option"* http://aderinola.wordpress.com/2011/12/28/re-nigeria-revolution-is-ourlast-option.html. Accessed 28/02/12. p. 5.

44. Karl Popper, Op; Cit., 2013, p. 337.

45. Gani Fawehimi, "Gov's Wives Are not Excellencies", in an interview with Esther Omame, in *The Monitor on Sunday*. Lagos: Aug. 11, 2002, p. 16.

46. Odinga Raila, *Guardian Newspaper*. Friday, March 23, 2013.

47. *Paul Adujie "Is Revolution Impossible inNigeria?"http://saharareporters.com/article/revolutin-impossible-nigeria.*(Accessed 14/10/12.p.1)

48. J. E. Arhuidese, "An Analysis of Nigerian Cultural Policy". *Nigerian Heritage: Journal of the Nigerian Commission for Museums and Monuments*. 2, (1993), pp. 99-108.

49. Karl Popper, Op; Cit. 2013, p. 352.

50. Ibid; pp. 431-432.

51. Karl Popper, In Search of a Better World, 1998, p. 190.

52. Karl Popper, Op; Cit. 2013, p. 118.

53. Ibid; p. 119.

54. Karl Popper, All Life is Problem Solving, p. 90.

55. Karl Popper, Op; Cit. 2013, p. 115.

56. Loc; Cit.

57. Wamba Ernest Wamba, *Democracy in Africa and Democracy for Africa*, 1990, p. 129.

58. K. Wiredu, *Cultural Universals and Particulars*, (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1996), p. 177.

59. K. A. Owolabi, "Can the Past Salvage the Future? Indigenous Democracy and the Quest for Sustainable Democratic Governance in Africa" in Oguejiofor, J. O. (ed.) (2003), p.443.

60. Ademola Kazeem Fayemi, "Towards an African Theory of Democracy" *Thought and Practice: A Journal of the Philosophical Association of Kenya (PAK)* Premier Issue, New Series, Vol. 1. No. 1, June, (2009), p.110(101-126)

61. Ibid; pp. 109-110.

62. Karl Popper, Op. Cit. 2013, p. 335.

63. Jane Sophine, *Liberal Democracy and the Requisites of Development and Political Legitimacy in Africa*, (Port Harcourt: Bakis Publishers, 2002), p.19.

64. Karl Popper, Op; Cit. 2013, p. 333.

65. Ibid; p. 332.

66. Ibid; p. 333.

67. Ibid; p. 335.

68. John Nnia Nwodo, Restructuring Nigeria: Decentralization for National Cohesion" Ohaneze PG's paper at Chatham House, London, sept, 27, 2017.

69. Karl Popper, Op; Cit. *All Life is Problem Solving*, p. 97.

70. United Nations Development Programme(UNDP). 2002. p. 151 *Deepening Democracy in a Fragmented World*. New York: Oxford University Press.

71. Karl Popper, Op; Cit. Unended Quest. p. 116.

72. Loc; Cit.

73. Karl Popper, Op; Cit. 2013, pp. 368-369.

74. T. U. Nwala, Nigeria: Path to Unity and Stability. Nsukka: Niger Books and Publishing Co. Ltd., 1997, pp. 227-228.

75. J. F. Kennedy, The 35th US President, Inaugural Address, January 20, 1961.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Achebe, Chinua, *The Trouble with Nigeria.* Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co.Ltd., 1983.

Ademola Azez, "Democray and Legitimacy Crisis" in Hassan A.S. et al (eds.), *Democracy and Development in Nigeria*, vol. 1, Conceptual Issues and Democratic Practice. Lagos: Concept Pub. Ltd., 2006.

Aderibigbe, Moses and Onyibor, Marcel. "Philosophy, Democracy and the Rule of Law in Nigeria: An Evaluative Analysis" In Ike Odimegwu, et al (eds.) *Philosophy, Democracy and Conflicts in Africa*. Awka: Fab Education Book, 2007.

Agundu, Oliver. "Politics of Bitterness: Scanning the Nigerian Democratic Experience" Ike Odimegwu, et al (eds.) *Philosophy, Democracy and Conflicts in Africa*. Awka: Fab Education Book, 2007.

Ajayi, K. "Problems of Democracy and Electoral Politics in Nigeria" kolawole, D. (ed.), *Issues in Nigeria Government and Politics*. Ibadan: Dekaal Publishers, 1998.

Akinnola, Richard, *Fellow Countrymen…: The Story of Coup D'etats in Nigeria*. Lagos: Rich Konsult, 2000.

Akpanobong, Emmanuel, *Democracy in Small Doses*. Uyo: Afahaide Publishing Co., 1997.

Akpan-Umoh, Uwemedimo, "Humanism and Politics: An Assessment of Udo Etuk's Democratic Ideals and National Reconstruction" in Uduma, U. and Etim, F. (ed.) *Humanism and Globalization and the Relevance of Philosophy: A Festschrift in honour of Professor Udo Akpan Etuk*. Eket: Inbonet Resources, 2016.

Alahji Isa Kaita, in Mathew Hassan Kukah, *Religion, Politics and power in Northern Nigeria*. Ibadan: Spectrum books ltd., 1993.

Allan, Ryan, "Popper's Politics: Science and Democracy" in P. Catton & G. Macdonald (eds.), *Karl Popper: Critical Appraisals,* London: Routledge, 2004, pp. 174-188.

Anifowose, Remi, *Violence and Politics in Nigeria: The Tiv and Yoruba Experience*. Enugu: NOK publishers, 1982.

Appadorai, A., *The substance of Politics*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2003,3[rd] edition.

Arendt, Hannah, *Crises of the Republic,* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972.

Asiegbu, Martin. "A Philosophical Reflection on Africans' Stalling Attitudes toward the Culture of Democracy" Ike Odimegwu, et al (eds.) *Philosophy, Democracy and Conflicts in Africa*. Awka: Fab Education Book 2007.

Augustine Oburota, "The Philosophy of Conflict and the Problem of Democracy in Africa" in Ike Odimegwu et al (eds.), *Philosophy and Africa.* Vol. 1, Awka: Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, 2006.

Awa, Eme O., *Emancipation of Africa*. Lagos: Emancipation Consults and Publishers Ltd, 1996.

Azzez, A., "Democracy and Legitimacy Crisis" Hassan A.S. et al (eds.) *Democracy and Development in Nigeria,* Vol.1, Conceptual Issues and Democratic Practice. Lagos: Concept Publications Limited, 2006.

Bedau, Adam Hugo, (ed), *Civil Disobedience in Focus,* London: Routledge, 1991.

Bedau, Hugo Adam, (ed), "Civil Disobedience and Personal Responsibility for Justice" *Civil Disobedience In Focus,* London: Routledge, 1991.

Benedict Michael, "Democratization and Conflict in an Emerging Civil Society" in Ike Odimegwu (ed.), *Philosophy and Africa.* Vol. 1, (Awka: Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, 2006.

Bricks, Panter, *Nigerian Politics and Military Rule: Prelude to The Civil War*. London: University of London Press, 1970.

Catton, P. & G. Macdonald, "Introduction," in P. Catton & G. Macdonald (eds.), *Karl Popper: Critical Appraisals,* London: Routledge, 2004.

Coleman, J.S., *Nigeria Background to Nationalism*. Berkley: University of California Presss, 1971.

Corvi, Roberta, *An Introduction to the Thought of Karl Popper*, London: Routledge, 1997.

Eboh, Marie P., "Is Western Democracy the Answer to the African Problem?" Heinz, Kimmerle and Fraz M. Wimmer eds. *Philosophy and Democracy in Intercultural Perspective*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1990.

Eric C. Omazu, "Crisis and Corrption in Africa; Is Democracy the Solution" in Ike Odimegwu et al (eds.), *Philosophy and Africa.* Vol. 2., Awka: Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, 2007.

Esikot, Idoreyin, *Socio-Political Philosophy: The Basics and the Issues*, Uyo: Minders International Publishers, 2002.

Etim, Francis, *Metaphysics for Authentic Nigerianism: The Heideggerian Option*. Uyo: Inela Publishers Ltd., 2008.

Etuk, Udo, *The Riches of Philosophy*. Uyo: Scholars Press, 2000.

Faludi, A., (ed). *A Reader in Planning Theory*. Oxford and New York: Pergamon Press, 1973.

Fung, Archong and Erik Wright, *Deepening Democracy: Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*, London: Verso, 2003.

Gonzalez, J. W., "The Many Faces of Popper's Methodological Approach to Prediction," in P. Catton & G. Macdonald eds.), *Karl Popper: Critical Appraisals,* London: Routledge, 2004.

Habermas, Jurgen, "Discourse Ethics: Notes on Philosophical Justification" *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action.* Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1990.

Habermas, Jurgen, *Between Facts and Norms*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1996.

Hacohen, Malachi, *Karl Popper- The formative Years, 1902-1945. 2001: Politics and Philosophy in Interwar Vienna*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Harper, David, *The Political Thought of Karl Popper by Jeremy Shearmur*, London: Routledge, 1996.

Idike, Emmanuel, *Introduction to Social and Political Philosophy*, Nsukka: Goodseed Publishers, 2000.

Ikechukwu N. Ogugua, "Ideology, Civil Society and Development" in Ike Odimegwu et al (eds.), *Philosophy and Africa.* Vol. 2, Awka: Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, 2007.

Ikubaje, John G., *Corruption and Anti-Corruption in Nigeria: Revenue Transparency in the Nigerian Oil Sector*. Lagos: Pub-Taolab and Co., 2006.

Irele, Dipo, *In the Tracks of African Predicament: Philosophy and Contemporary Socio- Economic and Political Problems of Africa*. Ibadan: Options Book and Information Services, 1993.

Iwuchukwu, Oliver, "Democracy and Regional Ontologies" in Obi Oguejiofor (ed.) *Africa: Philosophy and Public Affairs*. Enugu: Delta Publications Nigeria Ltd, 1998.

John, Elijah, *Man and the State: Issues in Social Political Philosophy*. Lagos: Omega Books, 2016.

Kalu, Viktor, *Leadership Question, Power and Poverty in Nigeria*. Lagos: Hilly's Press Nig. Ltd., 1994.

Kant, Immanuel, *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals (1785).* Trans. James Wesley Ellington, Cambridge, M.A.: Hackett Publishing, 1993.

Kayemi Kazeem, "The Tragedy of Psuedo-Democracy and Social Disorder in Contemporary Africa: Any Philosophical Rescue?" in Ike Odimegwu (ed.), *Philosophy and Africa.* Vol. 1., Awka: Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, 2006.

Magee, Bryan, "What Use is Popper to a Politician?" in Anthony O'Hear (ed), *Karl Popper: Philosophy and Problems*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Magee, Bryan, *Confessions of a Philosopher*, London: Phonenix, 2003.

Marx, Karl, "Preface" to "A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy" *Selected Works*, vol. 1. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977.

Maxwell, Nicholas, "Karl Raimund Popper (28 July 1902 - 17 September 1994),"in *British Philosophers, 1800-2000,* P. Dematteis, P. Fosl and L. McHenry(eds), Columbia: Bruccoli Clark Layman, 2002.

Mazrui, Ali A., *Africans International Relations: The Diplomacy of Dependency and Change*. Colorado: West View Press, 1979.

Michael Walzer, *Obligations: Essays on Disobedience, War, and Citizenship*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Mulhall, Stephen, and Swift Adam, *Liberals and Communitarians*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

Ngugi, Wa Thiongo, *Home Coming: Essays on African and Caribbean Literature, Culture and Politics*. London: Heinemann, 1997.

Nwala, T.U., *Nigeria: Path to Unity and Stability*, Nsukka: Niger Books and Publishing Co. Ltd., 1997.

Nwala, T.U., Nigeria: *Path to Unity and Stability*, Nsukka: Niger Books and Publishing Co. Ltd., 1997.

Nwankwo, Arthur, *Nigeria – My People, My Vision*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd., 1979.

Nwankwor, Authur, *The Igbo Leadership and the Future of Nigeria*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers, 1985.

Nwosu, H.N., *Laying the Foundation for Nigeria's Democracy: My Account of the June 12, 1993 Presidential Election and its annulment*. Lagos: Macmillian Publishers, 2008.

Nyongo, P. A., "Popular Struggle for Democracy in Africa" Caron, B. et al. eds. *Democratic Transition in Africa*. Ibadan: Credu, 1992.

O'Hear, Anthony, "Popperian Individualism Today," in Zusanna ParusniKova and R.S. Cohen (eds.), *Rethinking Popper*, Dordrecht: Springer, 2009.

O'Hear, Anthony, "The Open Society Revisited," in P. Catton & G. Macdonald (eds.), *Karl Popper: Critical Appraisals,* London: Routledge, 2004.

O'Hear, Anthony, *Karl Popper: Philosophy and Problems*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Obasi. I.N. *"Political Leadership and Followership Mobilisation in Nigeria Public Administrative System"*. In *The Social Sciences. Issues and Perspectives.* Nsukka: Fulladu Publishing Company, 2000.

Obi Oguejiofor, J. Obi, Philosophy and the African Predicament, Ibadan: Hope Publications, 2016.

Offor, Francis, "Democracy as an Issue in African Philosophy" Oladipo, Olusegun ed. *Core Issues in African Philosophy*. Ibadan: Hope Publications, 2006.

Oguejiofor, J. Obi, "Preface" *Philosophy and the African Predicament*, Ibadan: Hope Publications, 2001.

Ogugua, Ikechukwu, "Ideology, Civil Society and Development" in Ike Odimemegwu, et al (ed.) *Philosophy, Democracy and Conflicts in Africa*. Vol. 2 Awka: Fab Educational Book, 2007.

Ojiako, James O., *13 Years of Military Rule: 1966-79*. Lagos: Daily Times Publications, 1980.

Okafor, F.U., "Law, Democracy and Public Affairs: The Nigerian Case" *Africa: Philosophy and Public Affairs*. Oguejiofor J. O. (ed.) Enugu: Bigard Memorial Seminary, 1997.

Okibe, Hyginus, *Political Evolution and Constitutional Development in Nigeria: 1861-1999*. Enugu: Marydan Publishers, 2000.

Okolo, C.B., Democracy: *Squandermania Mentality: Reflections on Nigerian Culture*. Nsukka: University Trust Publishers, 1994.

Okon Uya, "Democracy and the requirements of Good Governance: A Welcome Address", in Okon Uya (ed.) *Civil Society and the Consolidation of Democracy of Democracy in Nigeria*. Calabar: CATS Publishers, 2008.

Olusegun Oladipo (ed.), "Modernization and the search for Community in Africa: Crisis and Conditions of Change" in *Remarking Africa: Challenges of the Twenty-First Century*, 1998.

Olusegun, Obasanjo (ed.), *Elements of Democracy*. Abeokuta: African Leadership Forum. 1992.

Olv Stokke, *Nigeria – An Introduction to the Politics, Economy and Social Setting of Modern Nigeria*. Sweeden: Soderstrom and Finn, Uppsala, 1970.

Onimode, Bade, *"Class Struggle as a Reality of Nigerian Development,"* in Okwudiba Nnoli, (ed) *Path to Nigerian Development*, Dakar: CODESRIA Book Series, 1981.

Onuoha, Basil, Nigeria Transition to Democracy. Uyo: Minder International Publishers, 2004.

Onwubiko, K.B.C., *History of West Africa: 1800-Present Day*. Lagos: Africana Educational Publishers Company, 1972.

Owolabi, K. A. "Can the Past Salvage the Future? Indigenous Democracy and the Quest for Sustainable Democratic Governance in Africa" In Oguejiofor, J. O. (ed.) Enugu: Bigard Memorial Seminary 2003.

Person, A. R. B. & Teorell, J., *The Failure of Anti-Corruption Policies: A Theoretical Mischaracterization of the Problem.* Goteborg: The QOG Institute, 2010.

Plato, *The Last Days of Socrates*, trans. H. Tredennick. London: Penguin Books, 1969.

Plato, *The Republic*. Trans. by Desmond Lee. London: Penguin Books, 1987.

Popper, Karl, "Against Big Words (a letter not originally intended for publication)." *In Search of a Better World*.1984.

Popper, Karl, "Popper on Democracy: The Open Society and its Enemies Revisited". *The Economist.* April 23, 2008.

Popper, Karl, "The Logic of the Social Science." Theodor, W.Adorns, et al. La Salle, 111: Open Court. 1976.

Popper, Karl, *All Life is Problem Solving*, London: Routledge, 2001.

Popper, Karl, *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*. Cambridge: Routledge, 1989.

Popper, Karl, *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*, New York: Basic Books, 1962; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.

Popper, Karl, *In Search of a Better World: Lectures and Essays from Thirty Years*, London: Routledge, 1994.

Popper, Karl, *Objective Knowledge: An Evolutionary Approach*, Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Popper, Karl, *The Logic of Scientific* Discovery, London and New York: Routledge, 2002.

Popper, Karl, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery,* London: Routledge, 1972.

Popper, Karl, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2013.

Popper, Karl, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, vol. 2, *The High Tide of Prophecy: Hegel, Marx and the Aftermath* (5th edition). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1966b.

Popper, Karl, *The Poverty of Historicism*, London and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd. 1979.

Popper, Karl, *The Poverty of Historicism*, London and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1960.

Popper, Karl, *Unended Quest: An Intellectual Autobiography*, London: Routledge, 1976.

Popper, Karl. *The Open Society and its Enemies. Vol. 1. The spell of Plato.* London: Routledge; 1999.

Putnam, H., "The Corroboration of Theories," in Schlipp, P.A. (ed.), *The Philosophy of Karl Popper, Book I.* Open Court, La Salle, Illinois, 1974.

Rawls, John, *A Theory of Justice,* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Raz, Joseph, *The Authority of Law: Essays on Law and Morality,* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1979.

Ryan, Alan, "Popper's Politics: Science and Democracy," *Karl Popper: Critical Appraisals*. Eds. Philip Catton and Graham MacDonald. London, New York: Routledge. 2004.

Sassower, Raphael, "Popper's Legacy: Rethinking Politics" *Economics and Science*, Stockfield: Acumen, 2006.

Shearmur, Jeremy and Piers Norris Turner (eds.), *Karl Popper: After The Open Society, Selected Social and Political Writings*. London and New York: Routledge, 2008.

Shearmur, Jeremy, et al (eds.) *London Review of Books*. 2012.

Shearmur, Jeremy, *The Political Thought of Karl Popper*. New York: Routledge, 1996.

Simkin, Colin, *Popper's views on Natural and Social Science*. New York: Orbis, 1993.

Sophine, Jane, *Liberal Democracy and the Requisites of Development and Political Legitimacy in Africa*. Port Harcourt: Bakis Publishers, 2002.

Soyinka, Wole, *The Open Sore of a Continent: A Personal narrative of the Nigerian Crisis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Swift, Adam, *Political Philosophy: A Beginners' Guide for Students and Politicians,* 2nd edition. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006.

Udokang, Cosmos and Awofeso Olu. *Political Ideas: An Introduction*, Lagos: MacGrace Academic Resource Publishers, 2002.

Uduigwomen, Andrew, "Karl Popper's Evaluation of the Humean Problem" in Ozumba, G.O. (ed.) *The Great Philosophers.* Vol. 11. Aba: Vitalis Books, 1997.

Umez, Bedford, *Nigeria's Real Problems, Real Solutions*. Kearney, USA: Morris Publishers, 2000.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), *Deepening Democracy in a Fragmented World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Uzodinma, Nwala *"The Poverty of Ideology in Nigerian Development"* Okwudiba Nnoli (ed.) *Path to Nigerian Development.* Dakar: CODESRIA Book Series, 1981.

Walter, Rodney. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle-L'ouverture Publications, 1972.

Wamba Ernest Wamba, Democracy in Africa and Democracy for Africa. 1990.

Wiredu, K. "Tradition, Democracy and Political Legitimacy in Contemporary Africa". Kurimoto, E. ed. *Rewriting Africa: Toward Renaissance or Collapse?* Osaka: The Japan Center for Area Studies, 2001.

Wiredu, K. *Cultural Universals and Particulars*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1996.

Journal Articles:

Adebajo, A., "Hegemony on a shoestring: Nigeria's post-Cold War foreign policy" A. Adebajo & A. R. Mustapha (Eds.), *Gulliver's Troubles: Nigeria's Foreign Policy after the Cold war* (pp. 1–37). Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal, 2008, p.5.

Afisi, Oseni Taiwo, "On Karl Popper's Liberal Principle of Freedom: The Individual and Social Aspects," in *GSTF Journal of General Philosophy (JPhilo)*. 1(1), March, (2014), pp. 1-14.

Agashi, Nnaemeka, "Evaluation of Karl Popper's Democratic Theory: An Imperative for Nigerian Democracy," in *Journal of Advances in Social Science-Humanities*. 2(5) (2016), pp. 01-05.

Agbaje, A., Akande, A., & Ojo, J. "Nigeria's Ruling Party: A Complex Web of Power and Money" South African Journal of International Affairs, 14(1), 2007, Pp. 79–93.

Agbiboa, D. E., "The Corruption-underdevelopment Nexus in Africa: Which way Nigeria?" *Journal of Social Political and Economic Studies*, (2010), 34(5), 474–509.

Agu, S. N., "The Challenge of Democratisation, An Expository Analysis of Nigeria's Claim to Democracy," in *Uche Journal of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy, University of Nigeria, Nsukka*. 11, 2005.

Arhuidese, J. E. "An Analysis of Nigerian Cultural Policy". *Nigerian Heritage: Journal of the Nigerian Commission for Museums and Monuments*. 2, 1993, 99-108.

Boyer, Alain, "Is an Open Society a Just Society? Popper and Rawls" in *Learning for Democracy*. 1(2), (2005), pp. 1-30.

Buchanan, Allen, "Political Legitimacy and Democracy," *Ethics*. 112, (2002), pp. 689-719.

Chmielewski, Adam and Karl Popper, "The Future is Open: A Conversation with Karl Popper." Ian Jarvie and Sandra Pralong, ed., *Popper's Open Society after Fifty Years: The Continuing Relevance of Karl Popper*. 1999.

Dare, Leo. "On Leadership and Military Rule in Nigeria" *ODU: A Journal of West African Studies*. No. 16, July, 199, p.73.

Eboh, Marie P., "Democracy with an African Flair". *Quest: Philosophical Discussions*, Vol.7, No.1. 1993.

Eidlin, Fred, "Karl Popper, 1902-1994: Radical Fallibilism, Political Theory, and Democracy," in *Critical Review* 10(1), (1996), pp. 135-153.

Eidlin, Fred, "Popper's Social Democratic Politics and Free Market Liberalism" *Critical Review*. August 2011.

Etuk, Udo, "Democracy as a Pragmatic Political Ideology," *Uyo Journal of Humanities, vol.7,* (Dec. 2002), pp. 1-19.

Etuk, Udo, "Poverty, Injustice and Social Disorder" *Sapientia: Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 3, December, 2010.

Etuk, Udo, "Humanities, Humanism and this our Nation," in *Uyo Journal of Humanities. 7,* January, (2004), pp. 1-15.

Falaiye, O. A. "Democracy in African: Problems and Prospects" *Journal for the Advancement of Blacks in the Diaspora*. 1997.

Fayemi, Ademola Kazeem. "Towards an African Theory of Democracy" *Thought and Practice: A Journal of the Philosophical Association of Kenya (PAK)*. Premier Issue, Vol.1 No.1, June 2009.

Forrester, Katrina. "Tocqueville Anticipated Me" *London Review of Books*. 2012, p. 42.

Gattei, Stefano, "The Ethical Nature of Karl Popper's Solution to the Problem of Rationality," in *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*. 32(2), (2002), pp. 240-266.

Gray, John *"The Liberalism of Karl Popper" Philosophical Notes*, No. 9 London: Libertarian Alliance, 1976.

Habermas, Jurgen, "Civil Disobedience: Litmus Test for the Democratic Constitutional State" *Berkley Journal of Sociology. 30,* 1985.

Harper, David, "The Political Thought of Karl Popper by Jeremy Shearmur" *A Review of Austrian Economy*. 12, 1999.

Haworth, Allan, "The Open Society Revisited," in *Philosophy Now*. 38, (2002), pp. 35-37.

Helfenbein, Kevin G. and Rob DeSalle, "Falsifications and Corroboration: Karl Popper's Influence on Systematics" in *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*. 35, (2005), pp. 271-280.

Ikubaje, John G., "Democracy and Anti-Corruption Policies in Africa" *The Uganda Journal of Management and Public Studies*, Vol 6, 2006.

Jarvie, I. C., *The Republic of Science: The Emergence of Popper's Social View of Science 1935-1945* reviewed John Wettersten 73(1), (2006), pp. 108-121.

Kapeller, Jakob, and Stephan Puhringer, "Democracy in Liberalism and NeoLiberalism: The Case of Popper and Hayek," in *ICAE working Paper Series*. 10, November, (2012), pp. 1-21.

Malik, Jozsef Zoltan, "Thinking about Karl Popper and Open Society," in *Jogelmeleti Szemle (Journal of Legal Theory)*. 15(4), (2014), pp. 58-66.

Marney, Milton and Paul Schmidt, "Evolution of Scientific Method," in Jantsch Erich, Waddington, C. H. (eds.) *Evolution and Consciousness: Human Systems In Transition*, (1976), pp. 191, 185-197.

Munyae M. M. & Lesetedi, G. N., "Interrogating Our Past: Colonialism and Corruption in Sub-Sahara Africa" *African Journal of Political Science*. 1998, *Vol.3 No.2,* pp. 15-28.

Nedelsky, Jennifer, "The Puzzle and Demands of Modern Constitutionalism," *Ethics*. 104, (1994), pp. 505-515

Offor, Francis, "Civil Disobedience, Moral Autonomy and the Quest for Sustainable Democratic Culture in Africa" Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa. Vol. 9, No. 1, (2007), pp. 139-140.

Ogbeidi, M. M., "Political Leadership and Corruption in Nigeria Since 1960: A Socioeconomic Analysis" *Journal of Nigeria Studies*, 2012, 1,(2) : pp. 1- 25.

Ojo, O.J.B. "Democracy in Nigeria: Past, Present and Future" *Journal of Community Education and Social Science Research*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 2002.

Okaneme, Godwin, "Poverty and Poor Leadership: Twin Evils of Nigeria's Democracy" In *Politics and Development, Essence: Interdisciplinary-International Journal of Philosophy. Philosophy, Science & Society*. Vol. 9 No.1, 2012, pp. 36-48.

Ryan, A., "Popper and Liberalism." G. Currie and A. Musgrave (eds.), *Popper and the Human Sciences*, 1985.

Sylvain, Cibangu, "Karl Popper and the Social Sciences," in *Social Sciences and Cultural Studies- Issues of Language, Public Opinion, Education and Welfare*. University of Washington, Seattle. (2004), pp. 1-22.

Thompson, Dennis, "Democratic Theory and Global Society," *Journal of Political Philosophy*. (1999), pp. 111-125.

Ukana Ikpe, "The Delimma of Democratic Theory and Political Participation in the Era of Globalization" in International Journal of Social Sciences, Vol.4, No.1 (June 2005), pp. 244-264.

Newspapers:

Ademola-Olateju, Bamidele. "Nigeria's Crisis of Followership" *Premium Times*. May 19, 2015.

Aiwuyor, Wilson Idahosa, *"The Impending Democratic Revolution in Nigeria"* in Louis Achi's "Again, Drumbeats of Revolution". Leadership Sunday, November 18, 2012.

Bola Tinubu. "Jonathan has failed Nigerians" *Daily Trust*, Tuesday, December 25, 2012.

Bond, P. "Dodging World Bank Schizophrenia- the looting on Africa continues?" *Pambazuka News*, September 06, 2010.

Justice Aloma Mukhtar "How lobbying, favouritism is killing Judiciary". *The Nation News*, 5th march, 2018.

Mayewa Oyinbola, "PDP is Evil" *Daily Sun*. January 12, 2016.

Prof. Akin Oyebole on Corruption. *Vanguard*. September 28, 2017.

Raila, Odinga. *Guardian Newspaper*. Friday, March 23, 2013.

Internet Sources:

"Crowd Psychology" *http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title =crowdpsychology &oldid=524513588*" Accessed, January 15, 2017.

"Karl Popper" *www.wikipedia.com* Retrieved 3rd July, 2016.

"Stephen Thoronton, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy" *Plato.stanford.edu*. Retrieved 21st June, 2016.

Adeola Aderounmu *"Re: Nigeria, Revolution is our last option"* http://aderinola.wordpress.com/2011/12/28/re-nigeria-revolution-is-ourlast-option.html. Accessed 28/02/12.

Nwabueze,Ben.*"TheImperativeofaBloodyRevolutioninNigeria"*http://nigeriaandafricare naissanceinitiative.blogspot.com/2072/02/html.Accessed14/10/15.

Radio Broadcast by Major Chukwuma Kaduna Nzeogwu announcing Nigeria's first military Coup on Radio Nigeria, Kaduna on January 15, 1966. Retrieved on 20th June, 2015 from Nigerian History Channel at *https://maxsiollun.wordpress,com.*

The achievement of President Umaru Yar'Adua. Retrieved on January 22, 2012:*https://www.naija.ng/821110-5-major-achievements-late-president-umaru-musa-yaradua.html#821110*.

The Chairman of the Presidential Advisory Committee Against Corruption (PACAC), Prof. Itse Sagay(Sagay flays N'Assembly over hostility to anti-corruption war By Sheriff Adaji-Ogbu September 6, 2017 *https://www.today.ng/news/nigeria/11343/sagay-flays-nassembly-hostility-anti-corruption-war.*

Transparency International Reports on Corruption 1996 – 2012. Global Corruption Barometer. Assessed January 22, 2012, from *www.transparency.org.*

Wash Post "Corruption flourished in Abacha's regime". Accessed Feb 29, 2016, from *http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpsrv/inatl/longterm/nigeria/stories/ corrupt060998.htm.*

Magazine:

"Sir Karl Popper is Dead at 92 – Philosopher of Open Society," *New York Times*, 18th September, 1994.

Adeyemi O., "10 Biggest Corruption Cases that Shook Nigeria in 2015" *Green News Publication*, Nigeria, 2016.

Ake, Claude. "The Case for Democracy". *The Carter Center: African Governance in the 1990s: Objectives, Reserves and Constraints*. Atlantic: The Carter Center of Emory University, 1990.

Cockcroft, L. "Corruption in Africa: The role of the North" Aderinwale, Ayodele (Ed.).*Corruption,* Democracy *and Human Rights in Southern Africa.* African Leadership Forum, Abeokuta/Accra, 1995.

Cohen, H. J. "Fooling People some of the Time" *International Herald Tribune.* February 15, 2007.

FG to reveal ex-Gov's 30 bank accounts in court. *Pulse Nigeria News Publication.* September, 2016.

Gani Fawehimi "Gov's Wives Are not Excellencies", in an interview with Esther Omame, in *The Monitor on Sunday.* Lagos: Aug. 11, 2002.

Njoku, Felix Machi, "Nigeria at 40: Putting Africa's Giant Back on its Feet." Pan African News Agency, Sept. 30, 2000. Available at WESTLAW, Africa News Library (quoting President Obasanjo).

Nnamani, C. "Why Our Nationalists Abandoned the Struggle" *The News*. September 3, 2001.

Odunfa, S., "Time to move on" BBC Focus on Africa, 18(2), 2007.

Opene, Bauchi, Et al, "Depoliticizing the Military" *Times International*. July 20, 1987.

Ryan, A., "The Achievement of Karl Popper" *Times Literary Supplement*. October 7, 1994.

Save Nigeria Group, 2012.

Sementari, Ibim. "Expensive Government, Dashed Hopes" *Tell*. No. 51, December 23, 2002.

Sotubo, Jola. "Senators make N15M monthly, Reps 10M,' Ex-president says." *Pulse Nigeria News Publication*, 2016.

Unpublished Sources:

Ayoade, J. A. A. "Nigeria: Positive Pessimism and Negative Optimism", *A Valedictory lecture* delivered on September 17, 2010, Faculty of the Social Sciences, University of Ibadan.

Chukwumereje, Uche. "Nigeria's Political Parties: The need for Ideology" *A lecture presented at the 26th memorial anniversary of Malam Aminu Kano* held at Sa'adu Zungur Auditorium, Mambayya House on April 17, 2009.

Herbert, Wilson, *"Democratic Leadership in A Multi-Ethnic Environment: Challenges, Prospects and Options for Nigeria" A Paper Presented at Ibrahim Mantu's Birth Forum* Abuja, 2005.

Nwodo, John Nnia, Restructuring Nigeria: Decentralization for National Cohesion" *Ohaneze PG's paper* at Chatham House, London, Sept, 27, 2017.

Other Sources:

Blackburn, Simon, *Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005, 2nd edition.

The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999(as ammended).