

**MACHIAVELLIANISM IN NIGERIAN
POLITICS: A PHILOSOPHICAL APPRAISAL**

BY

**OGONNAYA, CHIDI KENECHUKWU
NAU//PG/PhD/2012087002P**

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
FACULTY OF ARTS
NNAMDI AZIKIWE UNIVERSITY, AWKA**

MARCH, 2016.

**MACHIAVELLIANISM IN NIGERIAN
POLITICS: A PHILOSOPHICAL APPRAISAL**

BY

**OGONNAYA, CHIDI KENECHUKWU
NAU/PG/PhD/2012087002P**

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
FACULTY OF ARTS
NNAMDI AZIKIWE UNIVERSITY, AWKA**

**A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE DEPARTMENT
OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE FACULTY OF ARTS
NNAMDI AZIKIWE UNIVERSITY, AWKA, IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF
PHILOSOPHY**

**SUPERVISOR:
A/PROF. PAUL OGUGUA**

MARCH, 2016.

APPROVAL

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT
OF PHILOSOPHY, NNAMDI AZIKIWE UNIVERSITY, AWKA.

By

.....
Dr. Paul Ogugua
(Supervisor)

.....
Date

.....
Rev.Fr. Prof. Bona Umeogu
(Head of the Department)

.....
Date

.....
Dr. Chinedu Uchechukwu
(Faculty PG Sub-Dean)

.....
Date

.....
Rev. Fr. Prof. B.A.C Obiefuna
(Dean of the Faculty of Arts)

.....
Date

.....
Prof. Ike Odimegwu
(Dean,SPGS)

.....
Date

.....
Prof. C.B. NZE
(External Examiner)

.....
Date

CERTIFICATION

Chidi Kenechukwu Ogonnaya with Registration No: 2012087002P, a student of the Department of Philosophy, in the Faculty of Arts of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, has satisfactorily completed the requirements for course and research works for the degree of Doctor in Philosophy.

.....
A/Prof. Paul Ogugua
Supervisor

.....
Rev. Fr. Prof. Bona Umeogu
Head, Department of Philosophy

MARCH, 2016.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I thank the Almighty God for sustaining me all these years of my Doctoral Programme at Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. I most sincerely express my heartfelt appreciation to my erudite supervisor, Dr. Paul Ogugua, for painstakingly moderating this work. All his constructive criticisms and suggestions were second to none.

I also appreciate my erudite professors and lecturers who taught and moulded me academically and intellectually; Professors Bonachristus Umeogu, J. Obi Oguejiofor, Maduabuchi Dukor, Ike Harris Odimegwu, Rev. Fr. Dr. Mbaegbu and Dr. Paul Ogugua. You people are indeed one in a million. I am also indebted to my friend Prof. Alex Asigbo, the former Dean of Faculty of Arts, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka, for his encouragement and support.

My thanks go to my parents, Nnaoma. and Ezinne, Moses Ogonnaya and my siblings, Chika, Chinwendu, Ogechi and Amarachi for their encouragements and support. I also extend my appreciation to all who have in one way or the other contributed to the completion of this work.

Finally, I appreciate my wife, Njide and children, Adanna, Ugochukwu and Chiagoziem for their care and love.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to God Almighty, who is the author and finisher of everything that is good.

Abstract

Since Nigeria's Political independence till date, she has not fared very well as a country in terms of political leadership. Instead the struggle for power and its sustenance has progressively dominated the political landscape of Nigeria. Lack of patriotism and the passion for service delivery has gone under. Many reasons have been adduced for this unfortunate development. This work posits that Machiavellianism which champions the cause of political expediency above morality and the use of deceit or manipulation in statecraft is at the centre of the problem. The state exists for the preservation of the common good of her citizens, and government is the concrete system through which the objective of the state (the common good) is realised. But over the years, the glorification of deception, craft and shrewdness as essential tools in the governance of a state have had a direct negative bearing on the Nigerian state thereby making the virtuous pursuit of the common good unrealisable. A combination of analytical and comparative methods were employed to expose Machiavellianism as a school of thought in political philosophy, which Nigerian politicians had accepted hook, line and sinker. It was discovered in this work that due to the excessive craze for political power and its retention at all costs, Nigerian politician stops at nothing including engaging in all kinds of impunity to see this desired goal realised. This has made decent leadership in Nigeria very elusive while the triumph of desperation is the order of the day. This work condemned Machiavellianism as a brand of politics for it negates the hallmarks of an ideal state which are justice and good moral standard. This work concludes that since philosophy seeks the ideal always, politics in Nigeria should be seen as that which provides the best of ends and not as a "do or die" affair and a means of exploitation of the common wealth. It therefore recommends the strengthening of the spread of the philosophic life, deepening of Nigeria's civic education curriculum, sensitisation of the people and moral regeneration as panaceas for the growth of democratic values and good governance in Nigeria.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	
Presentation	i
Approval	ii
Certification	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Dedication	v
Table of Contents	vi
Abstract	ix
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background of Study	1
1.2 Statement of Problem	6
1.3 Purpose of Study	8
1.4 Scope of Study	9
1.5 Significance of Study	9
1.6 Methodology of Study	10
1.7 Explication of Key Concepts	11
Endnotes	20
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Literature Review	22
Endnotes	43
CHAPTER THREE: MACHIAVELLIANISM AS A POLITICAL IDEOLOGY	
3.1 General Meaning and Notion of Politics	46
3.2 The Birth of Machiavellian Politics	50
3.2.1 The Means and the End	54
3.2.2 Does the End Really Justify the Means?	56
3.2.3 Implications of the End Justifies the Means	60

3.3	Machiavelli's View of Man and Politics	62
3.3.1	Exposition of Machiavelli's Political Thought	63
3.4	The Doctrine of Power in Machiavelli	66
3.4.1	The Acquisition and Application of Power	69
3.4.2	Retention of Power	72
3.4.3	The Loss of Power	76
3.4.4	Power and Morality	77
3.5	The State in Machiavelli	81
3.5.1	His Concept of the Ruler	84
3.5.2	His concept of Followership	89
3.5.3	Machiavelli and Other Political Philosophers	91
3.6	The Mechanism of Government in Machiavelli	99
	Endnotes	105

CHAPTER FOUR: MACHIAVELLIANISM IN NIGERIAN POLITICS

4.1	A Reflection on the Constitution of Federal Republic of Nigeria	109
4.1.1	The Purpose of a Political Constitution	113
4.1.2	The Derailment of Common Good Politics	116
4.2	Political Thuggery and Rigging of Elections	120
4.3	The Role of Deceit and Brutality	122
4.4	The Exclusion of Objective Morality	125
4.5	Autocratic Governance	128
4.5.1	Ibrahim Babangida's Regime	130
4.5.2	Sani Abacha's Regime	131
4.5.3	Olusegun Obasanjo's Regime	133
4.6	The Non-Relevance of the citizenry	135
	Endnotes	138

CHAPTER FIVE: THE SEARCH FOR A SUSTAINABLE NIGERIAN POLITY

5.1	The Rule and Supremacy of the Law	142
5.2	Respect for Fundamental Human Dignity and Rights	144
5.3	The Development of moral Character	146
5.3.1	Patriotism	147
5.3.2	Constitutionalism	149

5.4	Free and Fair Elections	150
5.4.1	Separation of Power	152
5.5	Recovering the Nigerian Political Track	153
	Endnotes	158
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS		
6.1	Evaluation	159
6.2	Recommendations	163
6.2.1	The Need to Intensify the Socio-Philosophic Life	164
6.2.2	The Imperative Need for Civic Education and Re-branding of Nigerian Political System	168
6.3	Conclusion	174
	Endnotes	177
	Bibliography	178

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of Study

In recent years, practicing politics is seen by many as the most lucrative ways or means of making quick money. Thus, politics is highly glorified today as being synonymous with wealth and affluence. Lending credence to this, Asouzu says:

“One of the most lucrative and greatest investments now in our country is that made towards ascension to political post. Occupying political positions is nothing other than recouping of investments and interest thereof”.¹ The political society has always existed to satisfy the numerous needs of her members, among which the common good is the most basic. In line with this philosophy, most states have practiced politics with the sole aim of actualising the common good of man by upholding justice and good moral standard at all times. But in states like Nigeria, the reverse is the case.

According to Aristotle, ... he who is unable to live in society or who has no need because he is sufficient for himself, must be either a beast or a god².

From the above, we can distill the impossibility of man living outside the human community or more precisely the society, in “strict sense” political society. An individual being insufficient by nature needs the society in the course of realising his destiny and

satisfying his numerous needs. The demands he makes on the society and those the society makes on him are all justified; as they all tend towards the actualisation of the common good. Man as a social animal is disposed to interact and relate with others in the political society. He is a political animal. Every society or state that has a focus needs instituted leadership, a kind of control. In the bid to achieve this, tussles for supremacy arise. The fundamental question of political philosophy is “who should rule?” Plato in Book II of his book *The Republic* states:

The state exists in order to serve the wants of men. Men are not independent of one another, but need the aid and cooperation of other in the production of the necessaries of life ... they gather associates and helpers into one dwelling place and give this joint dwelling the name of a city³.

The attainment of the common good for the generality of the people becomes imperative for the rulers of the state to achieve. Little wonder, history is filled with the unending search for the best and most acceptable way to govern the state to ensure the common good for all. This has led to various theories of government. While some of these theories have worked in most places, it has failed in others. Nigeria is no exception. The

fundamental question that readily comes to mind here is, are the systems bad in themselves or do Nigerians make them look bad?

To state the obvious, the hallmarks of an ideal state are justice and good moral standard. Machiavellian politics is one that is devoid of morality. He deviated from the standards set by his predecessors, and gave politics an undertone which has nothing to do with the divine. His method was so realistic that it negated the method of philosophy that seeks the ideal, what ought to be and concentrated in the empirical, concrete events, influenced so much by the experience in Italy of his day. He exaggerated the wickedness and inhumanity of man which led him to divorce morality from politics.

It is not out of place to say that Nigerian rulers have swallowed hook, line and sinker the dictates of Machiavelli and in turn removed morality from the political system of the Nation. Today, different facets of our noble nation have been battered and in disarray.

According to St. Augustine, in a state where justice does not exist, such a state is, "... a kingdom of gangs of criminal on a large scale."⁴ To this end, any system of government that is completely lacking in morality is a serious threat to the state in question. This is because the state would definitely be a replica of state of nature in Thomas Hobbes "... where the life of man is solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short."⁵ This is a state where

might is right and where in the words of a sophist, Thrasymachus "laws are made by the ruling party for its own interest"⁶ Imagine a situation where one man's interest and inordinate ambition is considered supreme, or when he is a dictator who uses dishonesty, lies and deceit to cover up his evil motives.

Nigeria as a nation is not completely free from such political scenario depicted above. Ever since her independence in 1960, something seems to be wrong with Nigeria.

Commenting on the experience of the Nigerian nation, the renowned novelist Chinua Achebe insisted that the root cause of the Nigerian predicament should be laid squarely at the foot of bad leadership. "The trouble with Nigeria", Achebe argues:

Is simply and squarely a failure of leadership... The Nigerian problem is the unwillingness or inability of its leaders to rise to their responsibility, to the challenge of personal example which is the hallmark of true leadership.⁷

Going down memory lane, the problem of leadership in Nigeria cannot be overemphasised as previous regimes including the present one have all recorded set backs in Nigerian political administration. Every regime that came in made a promise of sanitising the body polity, but on the contrary litany of broken promises, disappointments and fragile peace have been recorded.

During the military era, series of coup d'état, counter coup, dictatorship and politics of deceit were common.

There was a total separation of morality from politics, which under normal circumstances are one and the same. To say the least, one cannot perfectly function without the other. Omoregbe sums it up thus, "... it is impossible to separate morality from politics as it is to separate it from law."⁸

Nowadays, civilian regimes which supposed to promote democracy have turned dictatorial. It seems that so much notoriety has gathered around the Machiavellian principle that crafts a perspective that aligns politics with warfare, and justifies the deployment of force, the exercise of cruelties; the practice of deceit that consider the end of actions and not the means. This will to a large extent negate the principle of democracy and retard its growth.

Democracy is cherished a lot for its space of freedom, equality, justice and fairness. And for any democratic institution to flourish, all traces of Machiavellianism should be strictly avoided. This work will go a long way to appraise how the Machiavellian principle is in play in the Nigerian politics with its multiple effects of impunity and lawlessness of the political class. The work also proffers some useful recommendations that would help to move Nigeria forward in power politics.

1.2 Statement of Problem

Power politics, all over the world is played with some degree of decorum and the key actors abiding by the rules of the game. Aristotle in his Nicomachean Ethics at 1099b30 said, "The end or goal of politics is the best of ends; and the main concern of politics is to engender a certain character in the citizens and to make them good and disposed to perform noble actions."⁹ Politics in Nigeria is not seen as that which provides the best of ends for her citizens. Instead it is seen as a "do or die" affair and a means of exploitation of the common wealth. The rules of good politics have been abandoned and its practice assumed a dangerous dimension.

In recent years, politics has been characterised by thuggery, arson, murder, kidnapping, maiming and torturing of political opponents, falsehood, rigging of elections, buying of votes with money, intimidation of voters, to mention but a few. Politicians and seekers of political offices in the country adopt these unwholesome methods to get and retain power at all cost. They remain unruffled as they adopt these measures whether fair or foul as they see them as nothing but politics. The basic question is, can our present democratic government as practiced today be admired for moulding man's moral, social, religious and political life?

Morality has been an issue of concern for many political thinkers and philosophers alike. The problem of morality constitutes a major part in Machiavelli's political philosophy. From the ancient times, philosophers had always associated politics with morality. The case of Machiavelli was that of a radical departure from tradition. He posited that, "... straight forward efforts to master and apply the tenets of traditional rules will not produce an effective rule,"¹⁰ Human actions, for Socrates, are associated with morality. Thus he opines, "... to know the good is to do the good, knowledge is virtue."¹¹ He equated knowledge with virtue and maintained that to have the knowledge of virtue is to have virtue. Lending credence to this, Plato in his moral philosophy states, "... virtue means knowledge, a true knowledge of the true consequences of all acts."¹² Plato followed Socrates in maintaining that the goal of human life is happiness and the only road that leads to it is through a virtuous life.

The basic problem in Machiavellian principle is the outright rejection of morality. There is no place for fair play, justice, peace and fairness. Machiavelli's popular maxim that the end justifies the means is a scathing attack on moral principles. Where would morality be if we always rejoiced in the end that was made possible through unfair and foul means? If this should be the case, then on which ground shall immoral acts perpetrated by people be condemned? What about some political leaders who

ascend the mantle of leadership through questionable means and yet succeed in improving the standard of living of the people. Jerry Rawlings of Ghana is a typical example of who assassinated the past leaders in order to bring sanity into the political arena of Ghana. This strange action is morally bad and should be condemned in its entirety.

1.3 Purpose of Study

Due to the long years of military rule in Nigeria, which have had some devastating consequences of infiltrating the psyche of the Nigerian politicians and its citizens alike. The struggle and quest for power have since then assumed a dangerous dimension. Thus, power in Nigeria today has become a "do or die" affair issue as politicians now go to any length to seek, acquire, and retain power at all cost, irrespective of the means used.

This work will examine and philosophically appraise the intricacies of power politics, its acquisition, execution and retention. The political intrigues that play out in the scheming for political offices in Nigeria shall also be evaluated. This work will go a long way in appraising the Machiavellian principle which is at play in Nigerian politics with its multiple effects of impunity and lawlessness of the political class with a view to seeking ways of de-emphasising the obsession with power and strictly upholding the inseparability of politics and morality at all times.

1.4 Scope of Study

It is a truism that government is the concrete system through which the objective of the state: the common good is realised. Over the years, in Nigeria, the successive governments from pre-independence era to the present era have been struggling to live up to the ideals of good governance with regard to the attainment of the common good for its citizens. In effect, the past and present governments in Nigeria have not really measured up to the conventional standard of morality in politics. Instead, they have variously been engaged in all kinds of vices, impunities, electoral fraud and so on in their quest for political power and positions. The practice of politics has deviated from the traditional classical conception of philosophers. Hence, politics was separated from morality by the Nigerian politicians. And the Nigerian society today has not been better for it. This work therefore covers the Nigerian Political landscape from the period of her independence as a nation till date.

1.5 Significance of Study

This work is not a mere speculative venture. It is geared towards reawakening the conscience of the people especially the political rulers on how to curb the ills in politics especially in Nigeria. This study also presents us with the intricacies of politics devoid of morality as well as proffering recommendations towards the way forward. It seeks ways of de-emphasising the obsession

with power, fame and wealth, thus restoring the value of man as a moral and intelligent being who should take responsibility for every of his actions. The work will also help the larger society to recognise that impunity in governance do more harm than good. Hence, the imperative need to avoid all forms of impunities and sharp practices in the quest for the acquisition and retention of political offices and positions.

1.6 Methodology of Study

With the complete deviation of Machiavelli from tradition by giving politics an independent status, the researcher became interested in applying various methods to be able to achieve the significance and objective of the work. In this work, a combination of analytical and comparative methods were employed and geared towards exposing Machiavelli's politics devoid of morality and its application in the acquisition, execution and retention of power at all cost in the Nigerian polity. This work is presented in six chapters with each chapter dealing with a fundamental aspect of the work. Chapter one is the general introduction while chapter two is on review of literature. Chapter three deals with Machiavellianism as a political ideology while chapter four is on Machiavellianism in Nigerian politics. Chapter five deals with the search for a sustainable Nigerian polity while chapter six takes on evaluation, recommendations and conclusion.

1.7 Explication of Key Concepts

Some of the key concepts used in this work were considered and explained. They are: Machiavellianism, power, politics, state, impunity, morality, Republic and Principality.

a. Machiavellianism

According to the Oxford English Dictionary, Machiavellianism is the employment of cunning and duplicity in statecraft or general conduct. Simply put, it is putting political expediency above morality and the use of deceit or manipulation in statecraft.

The first fundamental tenet of Machiavellianism is political power and deception. This political tenet holds that power in politics acquired through force and deceit were political ideals which a politician who aspire to be successful should apply. Omoregbe commenting on this writes: the essential thing in politics, that is, ultimate goal of politics, according to Machiavelli is to grab political power and retain it. Any means fair or good, moral or immoral can be used to achieve this goal¹³.

Hence, this political tenet glorified the application of deception, craft and shrewdness as essential tenets in the running of a state. Another prominent tenet of Machiavellianism is that he advocates that moral principles should be eschewed in politics and even warned rulers not to encourage what he called "Christian virtues". These "Christian virtues" include: patience, meekness, mercy, humility, self-denial, compassion and forgiveness". In line

with this he writes,... it will be found that some things that seem like virtue will lead you to ruin if you follow them; while others that apparently are vices, will if followed result in your safety and well being¹⁴. Machiavellianism teaches rulers not to be humane in their political activities. It rather holds that rulers should be fierce and cunning in their political conduct. Hence, he used his analogy of the lion and the fox. The former is brutal and the latter is crafty and as such a ruler that should emulate it ought to guard himself with political diplomacy as to make himself unpredictable. Machiavelli arrived at this when he said that: A prince, therefore, being compelled knowingly to adopt the beast, ought to choose the fox and the lion, because the lion cannot defend himself against the wolves¹⁵.

Therefore, a ruler can keep the state calm if he is able to make a conscious blend of brutality and deception. Machiavellian principle exhorts that, while rulers pursue their ambition, they should not bother about the means through which the aim will be achieved. It rather advocates that the main thing that actually counts is success and not the means through which it is acquired. Therefore, the "end justifies the means" is now a common principle that is being applied in most contemporary endeavours.

b. Morality

According to the *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 'morality' is the quality attributed to human action by reason of its conformity or

lack of conformity to standard or rules according to which it should be regulated¹⁶. This supposes that on the one hand, human actions are free and on the other, there are standards and rules by which human conduct should be measured. Furthermore, the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* sees morality as: "Principles concerning right and wrong or good and bad behaviours¹⁷.

c. Power

The definition of 'power' and distinction of 'power' into active and passive are most clearly given by Aristotle. Later writers as Hobbes and Locke, have done little more than repeat Aristotle in this respect. Power is the ability of one person to cause another to do what he wishes, by whatever means. However, because it is so difficult to measure precisely how and when power is exercised; there are disputes within political science about how much power various groups have. The concept of power is much emphasised in its usage. Power may be exercised as coercion, persuasion, and conviction of another to comply with a wish. The style and usage of power is corrupt when it is used excessively and in bad faith. The meanings of 'power', 'influence', 'control' and 'domination' are uncertain, shifting and overlapping. In some sense, the interchange of these words would not matter so much, for instance, to substitute 'power' for 'influence' would not matter much in the sentence, "Nigeria has

very great influence in African politics." People like H. Lasswell, C.J. Friedrich, P.H. Patridge, would see 'power as a relation,¹⁸ yet we talk about the distribution of "power", about the power of speech, about seeking "power as means to future enjoyment"¹⁹. Also as in Hobbes and Rousseau who talk about power as "the production of intended effects"²⁰. Whatever way people may see power, the power as used in this work, is concerned with having the will or having the power over men in a state or a nation, being in charge and having others subjugated under one, who is the ruler, head and sovereign. Hence, the term power politics which is the political action characterised by the exercise or pursuit of power as a means of coercion.

Power in politics is the ability to shape and control the political behaviour of others and to lead and guide their behaviour in the direction desired by the person, group or institution wielding the political power. It is also the capacity to influence, condition, mould and control human behaviour for the accomplishment of political objectives.

In this sense, power could be defined as successfully achieving an intended result, politically, by making one do that which one would not have done but for the power wishing him to do so. On this concept, however, people have varied opinions and views on how power is to be used and in whom it should be vested.

d. Politics

On hearing the word politics, what usually comes to mind are images of government, politicians and their policies or more negatively the idea of corruption and dirty trick.

The word politics comes from the Greek word "polis", meaning the state or community as a whole. The concept of the "polis" was an ideal state and came from the writings of great political thinkers such as Plato and Aristotle. In his book "The Republic", Plato describes the ideal state and the means to achieve it. Hence, the word politics originally has connotations in the ways in which to create the ideal society. An ideal society is in practice a rather difficult aim and even an impossible aim to achieve. Politics implies measures which could and should, in the views of their devisor, be implemented in the hope to create a better society, than that which is already present. The very fact that Plato and Aristotle saw imperfections in the societies, in which they lived, prompted them to write their political philosophies. These philosophies provided the first written recognition of politics. In his writings "The Politics", Aristotle states that "Man is by nature a political animal" (The Politics, 1), it lies deep within the instinct of man. It is almost primal. Due to his nature man should consider and realise his role within the "polis". So according to Aristotle, Politics is not a dreamt up concept, but rather an inherent feature of mankind.

The basic premise that underpins the notion of politics should be considered in order to arrive at a fair definition. Man is self-preserving by nature. He thinks and acts, whether as an individual or as a group who share interests, with foremost regard to his own interest. Self-preservation is the number one rule. He therefore possesses his own interests, ideas and preferences, which may differ from those of his contemporaries. In the "Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Thought", Miller supports this premise thus: "Politics presupposes a diversity of views, if not about ultimate aims, at least the best ways of achieving them".²¹

Politics implies power. Dahl, in *Modern Political Analysis*, states that: "a political system as any persistent pattern of human relationships that involves, to a significant extent, control, influence, power or authority".²² Finally, the ultimate power is found in government. Miller continues to name the state as "the chief arena of politics, in the modern world".²³

e. State

The state is made up of both community and association. The distinctive characteristic of the modern state is sovereignty. The state can be said to exist where there is a territory, people, and government; it may lack the feeling of nationality, or oneness among people, and yet remain a state. According to Aristotle: "*The state is the highest form of community and it aims at good in a greater degree than any other, and at the highest good*"²⁴

With the above definition, the state which aims at the highest good is also a way of regulating human conduct in the society.²⁵ Thus, Appadorai defines the state: "A territorial society divided into government and subjects claiming, within its allotted physical area, a supremacy over all other institutions".²⁶ Therefore, a state can be said to be the political organisation exercising authority over a defined territory. As a political community, it is included in the most comprehensive and highest society, mankind which has its specific "international law", common good, and its historically variable form or organisation. Although, each state claims sovereignty and independence from other societies, states are inter dependent and bound to recognise the mutual respect among nations (comity of nations) and its public international law, and of course the natural law, which is ultimately the foundation of the state and critical norm for all man made positive law.

f. Principality

According to the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, a principality is defined as "a country that is ruled by a prince."²⁷ In the principality the prince administers tyrannically and must subjugate the people because they lack virtue and cannot govern themselves. Machiavelli proposes two major types of principalities; hereditary and new principalities.²⁸

g. Republic

This is a country that is governed by a president and politicians, elected by the people and where there is no king or queen. It is also a form of government in which the people, or some significant portion of them, have supreme control over the government and where officers of state are elected.

h. Impunity

The word 'impunity' derives from the Latin word 'impunitas' which means everyone doing as he/she likes in blatant disregard of the law and state institutions however, without punishment. Impunity therefore, means "without punishment". That is no sanction for bad behaviour, no punishment for misdeeds. Impunity can thus be likened to an unmitigated and an uncontrolled emancipation, freewill and free choice. It is the attitude encouraged by an unlawful liberty from retribution or recrimination among citizens and government of a country. It is anti-social behaviour that disregards punishment or sanction.

States bedeviled with impunity are characterised by infrastructural decay, debt burden, poor welfare and inefficient public institutions. Impunity is therefore, a significant determinant of the socio-economic and political development outcomes of any state. It constitutes the fundamental root of most of the misdeeds, in both public and private spheres of a nation. Impunity explains why government officials, groups and individuals act

contrary to the expectations of the law of the state. In effect, impunity leads to bad governance with the attendant mass poverty, high rate of crime, corruption, unemployment, insecurity, etc.

In Nigeria, years of military dominance in governance created and entrenched the culture of impunity. The military ruled with absolute disregard of the rule of law and so created national psyche of 'militarisation'. This has persisted till date, despite more than a decade of steady democratic governance, where it is expected that public conscience and accountability would drive development. But the reverse is the case. Impunity has acquired its unique Nigerian meaning. In the Nigerian parlance, impunity can be regarded as the consciousness and belief of 'nothing go happen', 'nothing dey', 'nothing go sele', 'na today', 'only in my country' and so on. These acts of impunity have resulted in a low level of public trust and confidence in state machineries. In other words, impunity could be considered as the bane of Nigeria's development challenges.

Endnotes

1. I. Asouzu, *Effective Leadership and the Ambivalence of Human Interest. The Nigerian Paradox in the Complementary Perspective* (Calabar: University of Calabar Press, 2003), p.15.
2. F. Copleston, *A History of Philosophy*. (New York: Image Books Vol. 1. Part II, 1962), P.93
3. B. Jowett, *The Republic – Plato* Trans Joweth, B (New York: Airmont Publication Company Inc, 1968), p. 76
4. St. Augustine, *City of God Bk 4*, (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1967), p.261
5. Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan Part 1*, (Middlesex: England, Penguin Classics 1985), p. 186
6. S. Stumpf, *Philosophy: History and Problem*, (New York: McGraw Hill Inc, 5th Edition, 1994), p. 41
7. C. Achebe, *The Trouble with Nigeria*, (Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers, 1983), p. 1
8. J. Omoregbe *Ethics, A Systematic and Historical Study*, (Lagos: Joja Educational Research and Publishers, 1989). p.186
9. Aristotle *Nicomachean Ethics* Translated and Edited by Terry Irwin. (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing 1999).
10. A. Crafton *Introduction to the Prince in N. Machiavelli*, (New York: Trans By G. Bull, Penguin Books, 1961), p. 22
11. S. Stumpf, Op. Cit; p.41.
12. - - - - - Ibid; p.70
13. J. Omoregbe, *History of Western Philosophy*, (Lagos : Joja Press Ltd, 1991), p. 188.
14. N. Machiavelli, *The Prince* (trans) George Bull, (London: Penguin Books Ltd, 1961), Ch. 15

15. - - - - - *The Prince* (trans) George Bull,
(London: Penguin Books Ltd, 1961), Ch. 25
16. T. J. Higgins, *Morality*, "New Catholic Encyclopedia"
Vol. 9, (New York: McGraw Hill Books, 1967).
17. A. S. Hornby et al, *Oxford Advanced Learners
Dictionary, 6th Edition*, Ed. Sally Wehmeier,
(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p.761.
18. H. D. Lasswell and A. Keplan, *Power and Society, A
Framework for Political Inquiry*, (New Haven:
Yale University Press,1950), p. 26
19. C. J. Friedrich, *Man and His Government*, (New York:
Routes Co. 1963), p. 31.
20. T. Hobbes, *Leviathan*, M. Oakeshot (ed) (London:
Oxford University Press 1946), p.2
21. Miller, D, *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political
Thought*. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987), P.390.
22. Dahl, R, *Modern Political Analysis*. New Jersey:
(Prentice Hall, 1984), P.9-10.
23. Miller, D, Op Cit. P.391
24. Aristotle, *Politics*, Trans., Benjamin Jowett, (New
Modern Library Classics, 2001), P.1127.
25. Appadorai, *The Substance of Politics*, (New York: Oxford
University Press 1975), p. 13
26. Ibid.
27. S. Wehmeier, *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*,
6th Ed.(Oxford University Press : New York
2000), p. 925
28. Appadorai, Op cit., P.12.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the history of philosophy, scholars have always subscribed to the classical standard of morality needed to be maintained by the state. However, politics made a dramatic break with previous political doctrines anchored in moral and religious systems of thought. Unlike his classical predecessors, who took their political bearings from divinely sanctioned conceptions of justice, Machiavelli oriented himself to the "effectual truth" of politics; how the world actually "is" rather than how it "ought" to be. To say the least, Machiavelli's realistic political stance seems to have contravened all previous and socially respectable forms of political reflection. Contrary to the traditional political theories, Machiavelli insists that the nature of political sovereignty gives priority to practicality over morality. Politics is the primary concern of Machiavelli and power plays a central role in politics. Little wonder, he stressed the need to be realistic in confronting political affairs. He insists that a leader more than being ethical, must be cunning, deceitful and very flexible. It is not that the leader must be evil in order to rule. It is simply that the leader must know the need of the moment. Machiavelli sees politics as a political battle field with the ruler as the Military General who knows the most appropriate strategies and best techniques to be applied in any particular circumstances. Machiavelli was infact a

man of astonishing and striking contrasts. For him, anyone who ignores reality in order to live up to an idea will discover that he has been taught how to destroy himself.

No doubt, Machiavelli was a great Political Philosopher who lived in Italy during the height of the Renaissance. Today, he is widely known for the controversial political views found in his masterpiece, the Prince. As a diplomat, his travels made him realise that both political power and stability were possible if the right formulas were followed. Little wonder, his views on politics set him apart from any other political philosopher before him as he probed deep into the conflict between politics and ethics. For him, politics and matters of the state, were always of utmost importance. He sees the state as the primary good. It is the state that provides security and freedom for its citizens; therefore, everything must be done in order to maintain it. More than anything else, this belief has placed political leaders above ethical standards. In the words of Machiavelli, "the end justifies the means". Leaders must do everything they can to support the state, even if their actions at times seem unethical. Machiavelli believed in strong secularism, as he insists that citizens should place nothing (not even God) above the state. The state and the state alone exists to provide citizens with security. It is worthy to note that Machiavelli's call for secularism still reflects in modern governments of today through the separation of church and state.

It is a common knowledge that political leaders mask their true intentions, avoid inconsistency and frequently acts against mercy, faith, humanity, frankness, religion, in order to preserve the state.

Many scholars widely consider him as the father of modern political theory. He fashioned a radical treatise that separated morality and politics. No doubt, the ingenuity and profundity of his ideas have set the stage for modern discussions on political philosophy. Be that as it may, a review of some scholars' views on the end of the state with reference to the Machiavellian political thought will be useful to the understanding of this work. The main source of dispute is Machiavelli's attitude towards conventional moral and religious standards of human conduct. For many scholars, his teaching adopts the stance of immoralism or, at least amoralism.

Ocholor Chinenye and Metuonu Iheanacho see the Machiavellian principle of "the end justifies the means" as the philosophical basis of wealth acquisition by political leaders in Nigeria.¹ As a direct offshoot of Machiavellianism, the end is made a justification of any means to the end in question. The corrupt practices that Machiavellian philosophy initiated, have reached a point where Nigerian leaders now accept corrupt practices as a way of life. It has affected such Nigerians so adversely that they now think of morality as a concept that cannot be found in

politics, business, religion and socio-cultural relationships. As a result, bad values are greatly upheld by corrupt and greedy people who fill many facets of the national life of Nigerians at the expense of the good values that should move the nation forward to the level of socio-economic and technological development. The book, corruption in the leadership structure of Nigerian Polity captures this clearly when it states thus: "in Nigeria, corrupt political elites, working hand in hand with greedy business people and unscrupulous investors, are putting private gain before the welfare of citizens and economic development of the nation".²

Is there no moral implication for the acquisition of power or wealth, with reference to the means to such power or wealth? Is it true that for one to get power, one must do away with morality? Due to the fact that most Nigerians are determined to take their share of the national cake, they will stop at nothing but struggle at all costs for the proceeds from oil resources and for political posts where money can be acquired inordinately and indiscriminately. To some Nigerians, the only thing that matters is money or wealth and how it is gotten is nobody's business.

Asouzu, in his own contributions to Machiavellian philosophy posits that in line with the Machiavellian principle of "the end justifies the means", no one has an iota of trust for another, as one is served with Swindle in diverse shades and colours even with pomp and pageantry. This explains why slogans like: "shine

your eyes”, “wake up”, “how far” are common slangs in vogue in Nigeria. How many have entrusted a close relative with a responsibility involving power or money without stories to tell? Asouzu captures this situation thus: “It has become almost impossible to do business with anyone based on trust. Fundamental confidence, which is the basis of human cohabitation, is almost a scarce commodity within the Nigerian interpersonal context”.³ In Nigeria today, many contracts involving public utility are often awarded without contract tender boards and project monitoring units. These contractors are chosen not because they have the requisite expertise but because of their connections. As a matter of fact, Nigerians know the usual revelation of this form of episode: it is either the job is badly done, partially done, or not done at all.⁴

In what appears to be a summary of the moral decadence in Nigeria, Uduigwomen says:

It would be merely over stressing the obvious to mention that Nigeria is a corrupt nation. That Nigeria is a country with a dirty record of unmitigated incidents of bribery, nepotism, naira trafficking, smuggling, avarice, graft, unbridled sexual promiscuity, favouritism, embezzlement of public funds, wilful destruction of public property, electoral malpractice is an indisputable fact.⁵

The picture painted above about the moral decadence in Nigeria which is also a direct offshoot of the Machiavellian

principle of “the end justifies the means” appears to give little room for the possibility of a decent Nigerian Polity. It is the view of this work that no matter how gloomy the sky appears, there is always a silver lining. Thus, in the face of the corrupt nature of the Nigerian Society, there is still the possibility of achieving a morally stable nation. Not a few philosophers have argued that the development of an authentic self is the central lifelong project for each man. Socrates, the father of moral philosophy, happens to be the first to call man’s attention to himself. Little wonder, his subsisting dictum is “Man know thyself”. The examined life and examined beliefs lead to lives that are responsible and fully awake. Socrates’ thesis is that making oneself as good as possible is the true goal in life and the key to genuine success. To this end, Nigerians must cultivate the habit of desiring only what is right and just. Napoleon puts it emphatically thus:

When men first come in contact with crime, they abhor it. If they remain in contact with crime for a long time, they become accustomed to it, and endure it. If they remain in contact with it long enough, they finally embrace it and become influenced by it.⁶

Moss, on his own part, sees the emergence of godfatherism as one of the evils of Machiavellianism in Nigerian politics. The emergence of godfatherism cannot be totally divorced from the long years of military rule that created a class of Big Men or “Big

Man" rule in Nigeria. Moss describes Big Man rule as a cliché underscoring a system dominated by individuals and personal relationships, which ensure peace by the distribution of money, jobs and favour.⁷ This is reinforced by the cultural attitude in Africa that encourages deference, sometimes fear for the powerful, with the hope that the Big Man in power will protect and provide all forms of political empowerment for those in his political camp and punish those who seem to belong to opposition group.

In line with this thinking, Alchukwuma puts it that godfatherism is a form of landlord-tenant relationship that exists between the godfather and his godson. In this context, the godfather acts as the power broker because he can deploy his political and material resources to influence party policies and decisions in favour of his godson. He also has the capability in a negative way to manipulate elections in favour of his godson.⁸

Mary Dietz wrote in the American political science review that "no political thinker was more aware of how crafty assault by deceit could serve as a substitute for brute assault by violence than Niccolo Machiavelli"⁹. Her analysis of the Prince was that it was a finely tuned work of political deceit; the ultimate objective being the overthrow of the Medici regime in the hope that it would undertake the measures proposed by Machiavelli, which would result in an uprising in Florence getting rid of their tyranny once

and for all. She asserts that Machiavelli's agenda was driven by a desire to "trap" the prince by offering carefully crafted advice (such as arming the people) designed to undo the ruler if taken seriously and followed.

Baruch Spinoza and Jean Jacque Rousseau believed that it was a cautionary warning of what tyrants could and would do, and that Machiavelli wrote it as a work of satirical genius.¹⁰ Rousseau held that the real lesson of the Prince is to teach the people the truth about how princes behave and thus to expose, rather than celebrate, the immorality at the core of one-man rule. Rousseau further said that in the guise of advising Princes, Machiavelli was in fact instructing the people on how to secure a republic.

Some scholars, such as Garrett Mattingly have pronounced Machiavelli the supreme satirist, pointing out the foibles of Princes and their advisors. The fact that Machiavelli later wrote biting popular stage comedies is cited as evidence in support of his strong satirical bent. Thus, we should take nothing Machiavelli says about moral conduct at face value, but instead should understand his remarks as sharply humorous commentary on public affairs.¹¹

Benedetto Croce saw him as an anguished humanist; he lamented the flaws in man that made the course of action outlined in the prince politically unavoidable in order to live in a secure state. For Croce, Machiavelli was the man who finally divorced

ethics from politics.¹² He is of the view that Machiavelli is simply a “realist” or a “pragmatist” advocating the suspension of commonplace ethics in matters of politics. Moral values have no place in the sorts of decisions that political leaders must make, and it is a category error of the gravest sort to think otherwise. Machiavelli does not claim the ends justify the means as such but that the ends excuse the means so long as the outcome is just.

Machiavelli was denounced as an apostle of the devil. In his work, *“thoughts on Machiavelli”*, Leo Strauss sees him as a “teacher of evil” on the ground that he counsels leaders to avoid the common values of justice, mercy, temperance, wisdom and love of their people in preference to the use of cruelty, violence, fear and deception.¹³ Strauss has argued that Machiavelli lacked any clear political “agenda” but who adapted himself to whatever was around.

Ernst Cassirer, *“in the myth of the state”*, posited that Machiavelli simply adopts the stance of a scientist – a kind of “Galileo of politics” – in distinguishing between the “facts” of political life and the “values” of moral judgment. Thus, Machiavelli lays claim to the mantle of the founder of “modern” political science, in contrast with Aristotle’s classical norm-laden vision of a political science of virtue.¹⁴

Quentin Skinner, on his own part, gave a simple explanation of Machiavelli’s philosophy. He says that Machiavelli’s ethics

operates in a different frame work. If the conventional ethical norms deem necessary the universality of actions, Machiavelli's ethics has only one rule: to do the best act for the given moment. And the best act is that which accordingly maintains the order in the state.¹⁵ what may appear vicious to the conventions may be the "best act" in Machiavelli's ethics. The fundamental question goes thus, Is marrying one's own relative in order to maintain one's family's sovereign status a good act? Using Machiavelli's rule, of course it is not good; it is the best. How about conforming to conventional morals? Machiavelli prefers rulers to conform to them because it is their best front. Ethics is cultural. The morals followed by individuals are formed and conditioned by the set of principles valued by the family or the community. This is why Machiavelli always speaks of ethics as a convention. It is dictated by the common and habituated practices of the people. Thus, there is nothing wrong in changing these rules because everything is temporary.

In a recent interview with the New York Times, Pulitzer Prize-winning author, Jared Diamond was asked which book he would require President Obama to read if he could. His answer was Niccolo Machiavelli's "The Prince", written about five hundred years ago. He said that: ...while Machiavelli is frequently dismissed today as an amoral cynic who supposedly considered

the end to justify the means, he is infact, a crystal-clear realist who understands the limits and uses of power.¹⁶

Diamond insists further that what has continued to make "The Prince" compelling reading for today's political leaders is Machiavelli's insistence "that we are not helpless at the hands of badluck".¹⁷

In his own criticism, the British philosopher and Nobel Laureate, Bertrand Russell sees the Machiavelli's Prince which famously argues that the ends, no matter how immoral justify the means for preserving political authority as "a handbook for gangsters". He therefore maintained that: ...while Machiavelli's intent is unknown, this much is indisputable: the book continues to be a searing meditation on the means some people use to get and maintain power.¹⁸

The eighteenth century historian of philosophy, William Enfield, in his own view maintained that the Prince was a satire on the unruly and selfish behaviour of political leaders. Enfield declared that, since Machiavelli was an enemy of despotism in his actual conduct, the Prince was intended to "pull off the mask from the face of tyranny"¹⁹. If it really was meant by Machiavelli as a satire, then it has to be the driest, most bitter and most convincing satire ever written, and one that has fooled many scholars and leaders alike for centuries.

Politics in Nigeria has been characterised by deceits, lies, dishonesty, craftiness, fraud and it has undergone different stages from pre-colonial era to the present era. Critics of politics and politicians abound in Nigeria and often speak badly of politics as “dirty” and politicians are “liars”. Commenting on this, Onyeocha puts into writing what his mechanic friend bluntly said in his assessment of politics and politicians: The only difference between a politician and a crook is in the spelling. Politicians and crooks are spelt differently, but they mean exactly the same thing as far as I am concerned. They tell you one thing and mean the opposite.²⁰

This assessment was given credence in the thought of the famous Russian Philosopher Nicolai Berdyaev, when he said that, “in politics, falsehood plays a great deal and small place is left for truth. States have been built on lies and on lies have they been demolished”.²¹

On the other hand, Keith Hancock, viewed him as a cold and complete politically neutral scientist. In his view, he undertook an entirely objective study of political science. Like any good scientist would do, he announced his findings to the world upon completion.²²

Ogugua condemned the present day “canonisation” of Machiavelli as the father of modern politics by our politicians, which showcase them as people who crave to get power and do

everything to wield power. The fact remains that it is not all who crave to have power actually have it. Hence the reasons people scramble to get it at all cost and exercise it. Ogugua sums it up this way: This unbridled lust for power gives rise to series of maneuvers, generating upheavals and heat of immense intensity which results in seeing our land impoverished and undeveloped.²³

The issue of politics and governance is of utmost importance. Plato recognised this when he stated that the most basic question in political philosophy is who should rule? There is therefore need for a government that can build up and develop the individual and the nation under the eyes of the law. Rousseau captures the necessity of governance thus:

“My ideas had been greatly broadened by my study of the history of morals. It had been seen that everything is rooted in politics”...²⁴

From the above, we can see that politics is inseparable from morality. Again, we say that the state exists for the preservation of the common good of its citizens. The mere mention of common good already suggests that we are integrating politics and ethics in human affairs. This is contrary to Machiavelli position, which divorced morality from politics and bred the worm of destruction and an inferno which have engulfed mankind. A critical study of Plato and Aristotle and even some recent scholars will show a logic integrating ethics in building a politics edifice. This is majorly

due to their acceptance that morality is a spiritual force which grounds the state and is superior to the strength of the state.

There is an urgent need for servant political leaders in Nigeria and Philosophy as an intellectual exercise has what it takes to cultivate the environment and make it amenable to the emergence of servant political leaders. We conclude this with the submission of Njoku; some honesty and integrity must colour the profession of politics as a practical engagement of people exchanging ideas on how best to achieve the common good or full human flourishing.²⁵

Today, we have it on record that most Nigerian politicians and top government functionaries do not really think that politics has anything to do with ethics and morality. They have dichotomised these two concepts placing one opposite the other. For them, politics is one thing and ethics or morality is another. The reason for this is not far-fetched; the politicians draw their theoretical orientation from the works of the Italian Philosopher, writer and diplomat, Niccolo Machiavelli. Little wonder, Machiavelli is said to have introduced amoral principles into political life; and that Machiavelli's principles have contributed to the "dirty politics" that characterised the body polity of Nigeria. What is so worrisome about this is the dependent on the Machiavellian character of our so called "political class". As a matter of fact, Machiavelli's fundamental argument in "The Prince" was that a

Prince is justified to use any means to acquire and retain power. Any means here could be killing, threat, intimidation, election rigging, maiming and so on.

This work is of the view that most Nigerians who adopt the Machiavelli principle fail to put to review the environmental context of the Italian state then. Machiavelli took the position he did towards politics in those days because Italy was constantly assaulted by neighbours as a result of weak leadership. And so in order to salvage the Italian state and return her past glory, Machiavelli theorised of a Prince whose princely virtue will involve assessment of the elements of self interest in political situation and take action based on it. This implies that the Machiavellian principles were actually meant for the Italian state and therefore it will be wrong for one to transplant those principles into the Nigerian polity. Nigerians will have no good and sufficient reason to follow the footpath of Machiavelli by drawing a line between politics and morality. The politicians who subscribe to the Machiavellian school of thought have turned polling stations into war fronts, as they battle to rig themselves into offices. The snatching of ballot boxes and elimination of political opponents as an ideal form of political strategy if one must win, have been of serious concerns for politicking in Nigeria.

Egbewole and Etudiaye also discussed the feasibility of the practice of Machiavellianism in the Nigerian polity. They started by

mentioning that the political class in Nigerian has always adopted the Machiavellian approach to gaining political power by making the end to justify the means. They see the Machiavellian principles as something that has greatly influenced Nigerian politicians to perceive politics as a dirty game that is meant only for people that can deceive, manipulate, and are greedy, to participate. They maintained that due to this perception of Machiavellian practice, the Nigerian people have resigned themselves to fate and this is possibly further compounded by poverty, illiteracy, and lack of political education on the part of majority of Nigerians. But they are optimistic that with the involvement of a few principled individuals in partisan politics, the Nigerian situation will get better. The question is how far will a few principled individuals go in salvaging the political situation in Nigeria? The so called few who are decent are likely to be suffocated by the corrupt majority in the system.

Law Mefor, on his own part, explained that the problem with Nigeria is neither tribe nor religion but rather...the inept, Machiavellian elite.²⁶ He proclaimed that the Nigerian elites are among the worst to be found in our time. They are leaders without the requisite knowledge or commitment to move the nation forward. They have abandoned the only good aspect of his recommendation that says leaders should abhor corruption, to the

extent that seeking for an uncorrupt leader in our society has become a wild goose chase.

Machiavelli believed that evil could never be eradicated from the world because it is part of human nature that we cannot divorce evil or violence from politics. But if we agree with Machiavelli that any means that leads to the achievement of our ends is legitimate, then, it is goodbye to morality and normal society. It will inadvertently mean a return to Hobbesian state of nature where life is a condition of a general disposition to war of every man rising against every man. Strongly, this is where the Nigerian nation is entrenched and nobody seems to be alarmed.

Ndugbu also discussed the amorality of Niccolo Machiavelli in relation to the state or politics in Nigeria. He maintained that "Machiavelli was convinced of the improbable actualisation of classical political programme."²⁷ Though Ndugbu was in agreement with the classics and Kant that morality should always inform politics, he also recognises Machiavelli's counsel of being a fox and a lion. He opined that morality and politics are intimately linked in the Greek city-states. Citing Barker, Ndugbu said that "...the polis was an ethical society; and political science as the science of such society became in the hand of the Greek in particular as predominantly ethical."²⁸ He stressed further that for the classics, there is no distinction between moral life and political life. At the end, Ndugbu rejected the political views of Machiavelli

especially as the view of the classics and the interwovenness of morality into politics on one hand stands contrary to the defects of immorality in societal life.

Nnamdi Azikiwe in his *"Democracy with Military Vigilance,"* posited that "...it is now imperative for political scientists to recognise the emergence of the armed and security forces as the fourth arm of the state. Unless this new dimension in political theory is recognised, no state in the modern world can be secure from internal problems which could lead to violent changes."²⁹

Despite all these negative influences of the principles of Machiavellianism in Nigerian politics, it would be like throwing away the baby with the dirty water if we fail to recognise some basic tenets of Machiavellianism which could be very useful to the Nigerian political situation since every political system has some good aspects. The first is Machiavelli's concept of religion. In Machiavelli's discussion of religion and the state, he confined himself only to its political function. He was not engaged in any theological dispute about the truth of any particular religion but only about the estimable role of religion in the lives of the people, that is, its unitive social function. To this end, he saw religion as performing an ideological and physical function which could guide and unite the people of the state effectively under the government. In a heterogeneous nation like Nigeria, this notion could be a unifying factor if the state gets the people to believe

that irrespective of their divergences and differences they are still united in the service of one Supreme Being.

Secondly, Machiavelli's idea of patriotism could also be of help in shaping the Nigerian nation. This therefore means that the prince should ensure that there is a high sense of patriotism and nationalism among the populace. The love for one's country helps the individual to perform his civic duties selflessly.

Lastly, Machiavelli's concept that a state should engage in the conscription of citizens into the army as opposed to mercenary armies is an idea which should be noted not only by Nigerians but also by other African Nations. Machiavelli contends that mercenaries not only drain the nation's purse but ultimately fail the nation in time of dire need.

This work is of the view that one striking and permanent trait that runs through the veins of all politicians in Nigeria is their preference to always thwart the political principles and processes for their selfish corrupt objectives. In strict compliance with Machiavellian principles, Nigerian politicians upon assumption of political power destroy completely the old order to avoid being destroyed themselves by what is already on ground. This accounts for the unending impunity among the political class in the running of the Nigerian project till date. The effects of all these are that politics in Nigeria has been criminalised and crime politicised. The Machiavellian principles which do not see anything

morally good in politics seems to have taken root in Nigeria and has variously manifested in the form of deception, treachery, lies, betrayal, dishonesty and so on.

This work recognises the truth of the matter that we cannot deny the fact that in today's world of politics, the theories of Machiavelli have their place in the power strategies of our politicians. But on the other hand, the politicians should not forget the philosophical sensitivity to the unseverable umbilical cord between morality and politics. One cannot therefore adequately practice politics without morality as the two go side by side. Certainly, immoral conduct such as rigging of elections, nepotism, bribery and corruption exists among the political class in leaps and bounds. Today, most of our politicians are immorality personified. It is no longer news that the politicians don't usually reveal the real reason of doing something unless it is somehow advantageous to them. This deceitful behaviour or common attitude among the political class does not in any way promote the growth and ideals of democratic values and good governance, and therefore should be discouraged. This work posits that Machiavellianism is not the ideal way to go as politicians who engage in it do so out of expediency to satisfy their selfish interests at the detriment of the masses. This work concludes this review by strongly arguing for a collective, total and unconditional rejection of the Machiavellian philosophy in Nigeria. It therefore

recommends that the Nigerian voters should be bold enough to reject imposition of candidates on them at the polls on Election Day. Also, in a multi ethnic society of Nigeria, politics should be made free.

Endnotes

1. C.L. Ocholor, *et al*, Machiavellian Philosophy of Wealth Acquisition in Contemporary Nigeria: A Critique, in Canadian Social Science, Vol. 9, No. 2, (2013), P.56.
2. T.T., Mamadu, Corruption in the Leadership Structure of Nigerian Polity. (Lagos: Theomadex Ventures, 2006), P. xiii.
3. I.I., Asouzu, Effective Leadership and the Ambivalence of Human Interest: The Nigerian Paradox in a Complementary Perspective. (Calabar: University of Calabar Press, 2003), P.13.
4. Ibid.
5. A.F., Uduigwomen, Introducing Ethics: Trends, Problems and Perspectives (2nd Ed.). (Calabar: Jochrisam Publishers, 2001), P.194.
6. Hill Napoleon, Think and Grow Rich, (New and Revised Nigerian Ed.). (Benin City: Rhema Publishers 1966), P.169.
7. T.J., Moss, African Development Making Sense of the Issues and Actors. (London: Lynne Rienner, 2007), P.87.
8. O., Aluchukwuma, The Contradictions of Godfatherism in Nigerian Politics, A Conference Paper Presented at the

1st International Conference of the Faculty of Administration, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria, September 4-7, 2007.

9. Mary Dietz, Trapping the Prince: Machiavelli and the Politics of Deception, (The American Political Science Review, 1986), P. 778.
10. Isaiah Berlin, Against the Current: Essays in the History of Ideas, (London, 1979), P. 26
11. Mattingly, G, Machiavelli's Prince: Political Science or Political Satire? (The American Scholar, 1958), p. 482.
12. Ibid, p. 29
13. Leo Strauss, Thoughts on Machiavelli, Glencoe, (IL: The free press, 1957), pp. 9 – 10
14. Ernst Cassirer, The myth of the State, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1946).
15. Skinner, Q, The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, vol.1: The Renaissance, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1970), P.285.
16. Machiavelli's The Prince; Still Relevant After All These Years at: [http://www.bu.edu/today/2013/Machiavelli the-Prince-still- relevant-after](http://www.bu.edu/today/2013/Machiavelli-the-Prince-still-relevant-after). Retrieved on 28/6/2013.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid.
19. Vincent Barnett in "History Review" available At:[http://www.historytoday.com/Vincent barnett/niccolo Machiavelli](http://www.historytoday.com/Vincent-barnett/niccolo-Machiavelli).
20. Izu, M, Onyeocha, Idealism, Politics and Nation Building. (Owerri: Assumpta Press, 1994), P.36.
21. Nicolai Berdyeav, Christian Existentialism, Trans. DonaldLowrie, (New York: Harper touch books, 1965), P.324.

22. Isaiah Berlin, op cit. P.29.
23. P.I, Ogugua, et al, Philosophy and Governance in Africa, (Awka: Nnamdi Azikiwe Journal of philosophy, vol.5 No.2, 2013), P.14.
24. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, The Confessions, trans. J.M. Cohen (London: Penguin Books, 1953), P.377.
25. F.O.C. Njoku, Philosophy in Politics, Law and Democracy. (Owerri: Claretian Communications, 2002), P.217.
26. W.O Egbewole and M.A Etudaiye, "Religion, Politics and justice: interplay of forces in Nigeria" in Mefor (ed) Nigeria: Which way forward. (Ibadan: Obe Publishers Ltd, 2005), P.71.
27. P. Ndugbu, The Relationship between Morality and Politics in Western Philosophy in O. Eze(ed). Society and the Rule of Law. (Owerri: Total Publishers Ltd, 1987), p. 8
28. E. Barker, Greek Political Theory, (London: Methen & Co Ltd., 1918), P. 1
29. N. Azikwe, Democracy with Military Vigilance.(Nsukka: African Book Company Ltd, 1974), p. 22

CHAPTER THREE

MACHIAVELLIANISM AS A POLITICAL IDEOLOGY

The term "Politics" has remained a topical issue ever since man began to articulate his thought in a systematic pattern. The nature of politics in any state has always revealed an underlying ethics. In line with this, Aristotle maintained that there is a natural transition from ethics to politics. Ethics therefore cannot be divorced from politics as it guides and guards politics on the right path. Any possible alienation of ethics from politics vests the latter with a new meaning which goes for all but the common good. Thus politics without ethics is nothing but an aberration.

However, Niccolo Machiavelli propounded a political ideology that is strongly devoid of ethics which has enthroned deceit and impunity in governance leaving morality out of the context. For him, the morality of every political action is measured in terms of its success. Machiavellianism as a political ideology has eaten deep into the fabric of the contemporary politics such that we are faced with an eventual collapse of all the structures which make us rational.

3.1 General Meaning and Notion of Politics

Etymologically the term "politics" is derived from two Greek words; "**Polis**" meaning state and "**Techne**" meaning craft, art, method or skill. The word "Politics" is very ambiguous and has numerous conceptions attached to it.

Politics arouses a thought of such activities as political parties, electoral campaigns, elections, etc. A more profound reflection reveals that nearly none of the pre-colonial societies associated themselves with these activities of today's politics. Politics, is that which one cannot claim ignorant of. And in line with this, Odey writes, "*if you claim that you have nothing to do with politics, whether you like it or not, politics will surely have something to do with you... it will very often hold you to ransom*".¹ Following this line of thought, it is still obvious that in spite of what we do to avoid politics in our everyday lives, it still has a lot to do with us. Politics therefore serves not as a personal affair or a private property as people often see it to be, rather, it is a public function which is intended to order the society and for the perfection of man's social nature without exceptions.

In the words of Udoekpo, politics is "*the art of organising men in a society to live and interact with each other to the full realisation and actualisation of their social nature*".² Nwoko in his work, "Basic World Political Theories", defines politics as: "*the science of power, of government, of authority, of command, all human societies not only in the national society*"³. On his part, Appadorai in his Substance of Politics, defines politics as:

*The relations of the individual members of society with one another, that need regulation of government when a body of people is clearly organised as a unit to purpose of government, then it is said to be politically organised, so politics may be defined as the science concerned with the state and of the condition co-essential to its existence and development*⁴.

From the above, we can infer that men require the institutionalisation of their social structure such as the establishment of legal and government systems to facilitate this

interaction. These institutions in turn organise and consolidate the people for law as a defined independent sovereign territory, a political society or a state.

On the other hand, Ejizu in his own contribution, defines politics as: "a dynamic process that entails the mobilisation of human and other resources, managing, directing and enforcing the affairs of public policy and decisions towards the regulation of social order"⁵.

Politics therefore, is for the good of everybody without exception. It is not a personal affair or a private property rather, it is a public function which is intended for the perfection of man's social nature and as such orders the society. It is not an avenue of amassing and looting the wealth of the nation at the expense of the poor masses as seen in Nigeria.

Today, the word "politics" makes many people uncomfortable because of the connotation it carries. For some people, politics is a "dirty game" and politicians "dirty people". It has then become a term of abuse for the activities of those who engage in its function. Even our politicians themselves not only attest to this fact but also stress that it is a game of money and numbers. This misconceived notion is brought about by the attachment of corrupt practices to politics. Also, commenting on the wrong notions of politics, Onyeocha observes that: "*Politics has gotten a rather pejorative sense when referred to any activity of humans*"⁶. By the above it means that, if you tell someone that

he or she is bringing politics into this matter, he or she will feel as though you have accused him or her of a heinous crime.

In the social and political thought, there are also variety of popular views about the meaning of politics. Among such ideas or views is one made by Niccolo Machiavelli. He singled himself out by separating politics and morality. Politics became for him the art of conquering and keeping power by all means as he writes, "*politics is seen as the blind irrational and immoral thirst and struggle for power. It involves the gross abuse of morality*"⁷.

Over the years, it is indisputable that Nigerian politics has been devoid of morality while corruption has become the greatest bane of our politics. Baring his mind on this, Udoekpo observes that; "Since Nigeria was introduced into an independent parliamentary system of government, no military or civilian leader, governor or head of state has become devoid of an electoral ritual of graduating ceremonies in schools of corruption and fraud"⁸

A critical look at the above promptly reveals that our politics has been viewed by some political leaders to be synonymous with corruption, crime, and deceit which does not in any way foster a healthy national politics.

Politics is for the good of man and hence perfects man's social nature and right orders in the society. Politics for Pope John Paul II is not only a unifying but also the prudent concern for the

common good ⁹. That means that the end of politics is to direct man towards the attainment of the good. Politics therefore is to mediate and stand in for the demands and interest of the various groups within its jurisdiction.

Finally, politics therefore is that which serves to establish order, justice and equity in various social groups. Hence, political aspirants should try and understand that politics aids in protecting the right and privilege of a minority and at the same time, it also serves as a tool for unifying everyone into a community of friends. Politics must be safe-guarded from corrupt practices.

3.2 The Birth of Machiavellian Politics

Machiavelli was known to be the father of modern diplomacy. A great Italian political thinker, a product of that chequered political history of Italy, Niccolo Machiavelli was believed to have been influenced by the situation of the Italian State during his days. Machiavelli was a sharp political thinker who had a vision to better the condition of Italians. But he was bugged by the kind of instability and division that characterised Italy during his time. The condition in Italy during his time was rough and demanded a ruthless solution to any part of Italian State that seeks to resist the foreign domination. In an attempt to explain what he meant, he maintained that for the above task to be successfully done one thing is required from the leader, that is;

One must know how to colour ones action and to be a great liar and a deceiver. Men are so simple and so much creatures of circumstances, that the deceiver will always find someone ready to be deceived. Every one sees what you appear to be, few experience what you really are ¹⁰.

Machiavelli sees politics as a purely mechanical play of forces without ethical value; and holds that success counts irrespective of the means used. Machiavelli believes that politics lies on the accumulation of power and greatness through fair or foul means. For him, politics was a struggle between virtue and fortune. He dwelt much on how to cultivate a political virtue. For Machiavelli therefore, the first law that governs politics is expediency and not moral consideration. On this, Omoregbe comments; "Virtue for him means cruelty, energy, strength of character, ambition, ability to win power and preserve it" ¹¹. Aristotle disagreed with the Machiavellian stand point of "the end justifies the means". He says that; "Every end is a good and every good is an end... all activities are not possible... attainment of some end for the sake of some good" ¹².

Machiavellian political thought centers around the Prince who desires to acquire and retain political power. The system came to be what we know today as Machiavellianism. In discussing politics, Machiavelli exclaimed; "*I love my country more than I love my soul, the food that is mine alone is politics and that was what I was born for*" ¹³.

From these lines of thought, it can be seen that Machiavelli perceived politics as an essential part of his life. In his advice to the ruler, Machiavelli divided virtue thus; "Men who want to act virtuously in every way necessarily come to grief among so many who are not virtuous, therefore, if a prince wants to maintain his rule, he must learn how to be virtuous according to need."¹⁴ Though he had died many years ago, his political tenet has continued to constitute one of the handy tools for political duplicity, deceit and despotism by politicians.

For Machiavelli therefore, how to defend the State and maintain the principedom with everything within his political power is what matters most. For him, a prince must defend his State with either his own subject or mercenaries, or auxiliaries. Mercenaries are utterly untrustworthy. If the captain were not an able man, the prince will probably be ruined, whereas if he were an able man he will be seeking a goal of his own. This has been perpetually exemplified among the cities and states in Italy that have sought to maintain themselves by taking foreigners into their pay.

A prince, then who would be powerful should have no care or thought but war, lest he loses his domains. If he were ignorant of military affairs he can neither be respected by the soldiers nor trust them. Therefore, he must both practice and study this act. For the practice, the chase in many respects provides an excellent

training both in knowledge of the country and in vigour of the body. As to student, a prince should read history, note the actions of great men and examine the causes of their victories and defeats while imitating those who have been renowned. The prince must be a lion, but he must also know how to play the fox. He who wishes to deceive will never fail to find willing dupes.

Another outstanding point made by Machiavelli was his advice to the ruler when new States were conquered; "When new states are conquered, their laws and customs should not be immediately changed. All these laws that pretend to further their interest should be introduced at least to win the confidence of the people"¹⁵.

Finally, Machiavelli assured rulers that virtue is a task that must be fulfilled at all cost. His notion of politics was that for a politician to conveniently and successfully carry out his task of unification, consolidation and influence, he must be above the law, a lion, ready to play the fox and outside morality for him to accomplish this task. "*The prince must freely use the tools of perfidy, cruelty, murder and any other means accepted and expediency for the achievement of his objects*"¹⁶.

Machiavelli advocated a republican form of government but he realised that it was not the best of government, under all circumstances corrupt societies require an absolute form of government. Machiavelli believed that humans are generally evil,

selfish, deceitful, ungrateful and fickle. He was very pessimistic about human nature. Men are driven by an insatiable desire for material gain and the nature of human beings is such that will never change with the passage of time. To say the least, Machiavelli's politics is tripartite in nature as he outlined in his discourses, "*The best of state is one that has a strong central authority and in the government of which both the aristocracy and the populace have a voice*".¹⁷ From the above, we can see a mixture of aristocracy, monarchy and democracy.

He maintains that humans are not all equal, some are better suited to rule than others. Fortune dictates a large role in our lives. Machiavelli believes that deceit and violence, cruelty (not used mindlessly but cautiously) was justified in pursuing and maintaining political power. He took the state to be a self sufficient entity capable of establishing formidable back bone for statecraft which includes the politics of effective internal control with the ardour of external invincibility.

3.2.1 The Means and the End

The terms means and end are always complementary. None can go without the other in this particular respect. Thus, Ferdinand LaSalle enunciates; "... end and means on earth are entangled that changing one you change the other too..."¹⁸. So this work shall explain their meaning as paired. Scientifically speaking, Means implies the system, method, process by which a

result may be obtained or achieved. A means to an end is a way of achieving something. While on the other hand, End implies the purpose, aim for which something is done, the point where something stops, or beyond which it does not exist.

Life is a process; there are series of actions, counter actions and changes in life, which most times contribute to these actions. There we should be concerned with man's life and not with animals or plants. Life as we know is not a univocal term rather it is an analogical term. Man possesses an intellectual soul and as such, the soul has the capacity to think and reason. The sensitive as well as the vegetative function is also present in man. Therefore, man is a rational, social and moral being. Man is a being that lives in the society with others. Further, man being a finite being is a goal seeking being; a being seeking an end in all his activities. Since man is a goal seeking being, there must be a means that must aid him in achieving these goals (ends).

Man's goal such as acquiring political power, property, religious power, economic power, intellectual power and so on has various means both legitimate, and illegitimate to attain them. For instance, the ambition to become the president of Nigeria. The end here is becoming the president of Nigeria while the means include formal declaration of intent to contest for this office, registration as a presidential candidate, scrutiny and acceptance by the party members and electoral commission,

subsequent electioneering campaign, and properly conducted elections. On the other hand, one arrives at this end through the means of bribery, political thuggery, rigging, violence, forgery and murder.

Every end or goal therefore has a corresponding means or method of attaining it. The difference is that, a particular end can have series of co-ordinated means to achieve it. The problem now arises; should the end be attained irrespective of whatever means used? Does the end justify the means? Or do the means justify the end? However, justification implies that an act is right, reasonable and proper justification is in the realm of morality and man being a rational and a moral being possesses the faculty of moral judgment. Therefore, man can judge an act good or bad; moral or immoral.

3.2.2 Does the End really justify the Means?

Having critically explored the meaning of end and means and their complementarities, the problem now is which one justifies the other, the end or the means. If for instance, we say that the end justifies the means, then it implies the means itself is ethically sound even if it is evil. On the other hand, when we hold that the means justify the end, we may be involved in a dilemma; granted that good means may lead to good end and evil means to an evil end. But evil means may and can lead to good end. In this case now, does the end justify these means to be good. This

becomes a problem. However, there seem to be a clash between deontology and teleology in this philosophical question "Does the end really justify or not justify the means"? The force and fascination of those who hold to the principle that the end justifies the means lies precisely in its compulsive rationality. Surely, if we must agree that sometimes it is not merely pardonable but morally imperative to tell lies to save a patient from demoralisation or a public from panic. Sometimes, we may also agree that it is a positive duty to assassinate a tyrant, to commit one murder to prevent a holocaust. These premises once admitted seem that we have become a kind of committed to conceding to the principle that 'the end justifies the means'. Hence, Kant in opposition emphatically enunciates;

Objectively right behaviour may be inspired by prudence; by benevolence, by respect for the moral law, or by still other motives but the highest and the only unqualifiedly moral motive is respect for the moral law. It is therefore considerations based on concern for one's own well being or well being of others indicated a cause of action at odds with that dictated by respect for moral law, respect for moral law should prevail.... It is wrong to tell a lie even to save another man's life. Moral rules are universally valid and admit of no exceptions. ¹⁹

Nevertheless, Ross held a contrary view, for him, there is no universal validity of moral rules. The fact that an act violates a moral rule is, he says, a prima-facie reason for not performing that act. It can and does happen that one moral rule conflicts with another. In such cases, we are obliged to choose between them. Thus, the sort of ethics represented by those who held to the

principle: the end justifies the means could best be described as the reduction *ad absurdum* of Benthamite utilitarianism. For it seems that if morality is to be more than a mere disordered series of uniformly ultimate imperative, immune to criticism and not susceptible of any systematic rationale, then we must resort to teleology in some form or the other.

One first tempting move is to slash at the insistence by some of us that evil means can as a matter of fact never lead to good end. The only thing we can contribute is to apply the ethics of consequence by ourselves. Take for instance, the goal of building a house is a noble one. But if one takes the means of armed robbery, duping and embezzlement to attain this end then the bizarre consequences at these means are quite devastating and catastrophic. One has successfully arrived at the end which is building a comfortable house but the means that one used had either deprived others of their rights and properties or made them quite uncomfortable and count the various societal consequences of achieving this good end through evil means. Can we then reasonably hold to the principle that the end justifies the means. All human actions, says Aristotle are performed in order to attain some end. In other words, every human action is a means to an end, seen as good.

Moreover, some people insist that where evil means are believed to lead to a good end, then that by itself is sufficient only

by implication and with respect to some particular class of embarrassing cases. Suppose, for instance, that one wants to allow exceptions in favour of tyrannicide or suicide of a societal terrorist. What then becomes the case? However, unless one can think up some reasonable non-consequence venial argument for such embarrassing cases, the more it will be a mere avoidance, *"an attempt to conceal teleological practice beneath a deontological disguise"* ²⁰

In conclusion, the problem of ends either justifying or not justifying the means of achieving good means by evil means and so forth assume before hand, that we are dealing with something analogous to a field game in which the objective is unitary and given the crux of the matter is to find some way to reach it or to select one or another of the various alternative routes, all of which lead to the same place. The first and most obvious way in which we may derail in this model is to presuppose that it is genuinely the same end that is reached by the different means as one may go to the same town using different routes such as by land, air, bus, train etc.

Simply put, the truth lies in the fact that people find it very difficult to remain unaffected by what they do. Therefore, in ethics, the means used will usually affect the end achieved and the different routes most often lead to different places, though we may not totally reject the thesis that good end can as a matter of

fact be achieved by evil means. It is still philosophically sound to hold to the fact that the end does not justify the means because what is supposed to be alternative means are most often not means to some end. Nevertheless, some may view this stand as controversial but they should understand that if the end justifies whatever means that were used, then there will be no room for morality in human affairs and in the society.

3.2.3 Implications of the End Justifies the Means

The “End Justifying the Means” usually involves doing something wrong to achieve a positive end and justifying the wrong doing by pointing to a good outcome. It cannot be denied that there are implications and difficulties when unworthy means are used to achieve worthy ends. However, one thing is sure: if an end or goal is worthy, any means to achieve that end is justifiable provided that both ends and means are noble and good.

The question whether the end justifies the means depends on the type of goal or end a person wants to achieve and the means they use. If both the means and the ends are equally noble and good, there is no question because the ends are justified by the means. This work agrees with the belief that both the ends and means should be good. Individuals are known at times to use Machiavelli’s phrase as an excuse when they try to achieve their

own goals no matter how immoral, illicit, and wrong their means are. For many individuals, it does not matter what means are used as long as they get what they want. To justify their ends by some type of means sometimes involves doing a wrong thing when trying to achieve a positive end. They justify the wrong act by pointing to the outcome that was good. The wrong justifications can be seen in some horrors in human history such as the Holocaust, the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the world wars, and even the bombing of the world trade center. There are a lot of justifications made by many people about the ends these events serve, but one thing is true, the ends are noble but the means are not.

The means used must also be ethical, social and morally upright. Therefore, if one means in itself is morally bad, it cannot really serve an end that is good, even though it would appear good on the surface. A goal or purpose achieved through an upright approach is the thing justified, not those immoral, illicit and wrong.

One significant proof of a justified means to an end is exemplified in the non-violent demonstration against segregation fought by Martin Luther king Jr. Here, we can see that both the means and the ends are noble and good.

The wrong means used can lead to ruin rather than good.

3.3 Machiavelli's View of Man and Politics

Machiavelli was interested in man not as he ought to be but as he is. Man, as Machiavelli viewed him is self-centered. In this thinking, man existed not to seek God's favour but to seek and satisfy himself. He conceived man as essentially egoistic, dynamic and absolutely bad. That except if ruled with beastly disposition, the progress of the state and the autonomy of the ruler could be easily jeopardised. That man is after reputation so as to make his mark and create some image of himself which others found impressive. *"Man, for him, is both self preserving and self assertive"* ²¹. In other words, Machiavelli's conception of man and politics just as his practical advice to princes were the products of his experience as a civil servant in Florence coupled with his reflections on contemporary Italy then. He used history to support the conclusions reached by his reflection on personal experiences and observations about man and politics. This portrayed him as a practical philosopher.

Man generally is self centered and selfish and always seeking after his own interest and well-being. This fact underlies any ruler's desire for power. For him, man generally aims at keeping what he has and strives to acquire more, and there is no limit to man's desires for he is essentially selfish.

Machiavelli was concerned with practical politics in the sense of efficient political thought or action. "The Prince" revealed

his belief that governments depend largely on coercion and craft politics. His interest lied mainly in what makes government strong and how power is most easily obtained and preserved. He thought and spoke of society and government differently from other socio-political philosophers like John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, and others. Machiavelli stood outside the main tradition of classical political thought. Therefore, if compared with most philosophers, it would be discovered that he took keen interest in history more than any of them. Most of his arguments were supported by copious examples taken from the past and contemporary events. For Machiavelli, history is the abundant and fascinating source of political wisdom.

3.3.1 Exposition of Machiavelli's Political Thought

A state as an organised political community was viewed by Machiavelli as the kingdom of the kings, the duchy of a duke, the dominion of an independent lord and the government of a free city. *"For him, the reason for a state is for the king to have charge of every affair"* ²². In 'The Prince', only three major ideas are obvious: the means and methods of acquisition of political powers, the consolidation of this acquired powers and the mechanism and dispensation of the power by the Prince.

Machiavelli advocated that a prince must avoid all forms of moral attitude if he is to succeed in politics and he must be ready to conquer and destroy or else he cannot consolidate his power.

And that men must be pampered or crushed because they can gain revenge for small injuries but not for grievous ones. A new prince for him, should know how to survive and prosper in a hostile environment. He sees governance as something that deals with expediency. To this end, he insisted that only one interest should be paramount in the ruler's consideration, that is, the enhancement of his power and that in pursuing his objectives, the ruler should execute programmes that would weaken political competition. It was all about how existing government would be kept in power. Machiavelli, in his political thought recommended and attributed prudence as that which consists in being able to assess the nature of a particular threat and in accepting the lesser evil. He also asserted that a ruler should be shrewd and cunning. He must pretend to be pious or virtuous while seeking for his own interest. That he must not be virtuous but can be generous but extremely careful and prudent. *"For him also, a prince should cheat whenever he gets the chance and covet whatever he can, win people's heart or destroy them so as to consolidate his power"*²³. That a prince should avoid those who speak truth to him always except his wise ministers only when he seeks their opinion. But the last decision is always his. That he should pay much attention to what is than to what ought to be. He must campaign for power and must change as situation changes. He should not trust anyone but work with those who fear him than

with those that seem to respect but hate him for they could throw him out of power. He should kill his enemies and if necessary, his friends but should not be miserly to avoid being suspected and hated. Machiavelli also advised that a prince or ruler should keep his subjects happy and never disarm them lest he offends them. That he must choose wise ministers and must seek their advices when he wants to, but must be a constant questioner.

In Machiavelli's thought, any state or ruler worthy of this designation must be of great power to enable it ensure a hitch-free government as well withstand external powers or invasion. "*Lawlessness is a threat to any given state and the prince is to do all in his power to curb such a situation*"²⁴. For such is a reason for a prince to exist in a state.

Machiavelli's thought on political morality is virtue based on expediency: 'the end justifies the means' syndrome. Any method adopted to reach that political target is justified. Such is an indispensable instrument used to acquire and consolidate power. It must be borne in mind that Machiavellianism was against the accepted governing principle of any ideal society. In moral sense, the government must rule for the good of the state and people²⁵. Human nature in any case is meant to be guided and perfected and not to be attacked or destroyed either.

3.4 The Doctrine of Power in Machiavelli

The notion of power raises a pertinent question in politics. Power generally implies the ability of someone to produce a certain effect on another person or on a group of people. It also connotes the ability of someone to have control or influence over others. Similarly, power relationships could also be described in terms of the causal factors that enable one person or group of persons to determine the actions of others.

This work will at this point examine the doctrine of power from Machiavelli's point of view. Machiavelli never gave any definition of power. He only gave ideas as regards to the influence of power and how power can be acquired and preserved. The acquisition or preservation of it he regarded as the political end and any means used in obtaining it whether by force or otherwise, for him is justified. He maintained that the most important thing a prince can do is to preserve him in power and ensure that there is stability in the state. This portrays Machiavelli as a strong believer in craft politics. For him, power is for those who have the skill to seize it in a free competition. The implication of this is that he believed that anybody who has the skill or ability to seize power can do so. Thus, for him, the question of legitimacy does not arise. He opined that if a ruler or prince decides to retain his power and remain a ruler, he must do anything that is necessary to maintain himself without respect to ethical leaning. His conduct

according to Machiavelli must be determined by the demands of present conditions and future probabilities. In other words, he should be or have a flexible disposition varying as circumstances dictate.

To say the least, the exposition of Machiavellian doctrine of power goes with his famous dictum of "The end justifies the means". His view of power is dictatorial, tyrannical and despotic. One of the bad qualities that flavours his view of power and its realisation is deception. For him, whatever means through which power can be acquired is 'ipso facto' justified in as much as the sole aim of power acquisition is actualised. In exposing such inhuman view of power, Arthur Nwankwo asserts that Machiavelli's book, 'The prince' is "*universally acclaimed as the bible of state terrorism*"²⁶. Nwankwo also maintains that; *Machiavelli is perceived as a reactionary philosopher whose deduction from the practice of statecraft in his day form the organising basis and unifying matrix of the ideology of state terrorism*²⁷.

Machiavelli was not a silent, theoretical political philosopher. He was a political statesman who sharply captured the politics of Florentine society. He simply states that state terrorism or tyrannical power wielding constitutes an integral force of his own contemporaneity; and that to successfully capture and retain power or to radiate confidence, strenuous and concerted efforts

should be made to silence every dissenting political view or opinion, muzzle public opinion and chastise all opponents to the degree of annihilation (if that becomes necessary).

Machiavelli's inability to place any value judgment on his material participation in the vicious and violence prone regimes of his time, might be the attributes that qualify him as one of the strongest apostles of despotism and state terrorism.

For Machiavelli, power is the constitution that dictates who is right and who is wrong. The conqueror is right while the vanquish is wrong. He throws his weight behind the erroneous and anti-human idea that "power (might is right)".

He refutes any belief or idea that negates the irrational and unnatural assertion which states that 'the will of the Prince (ruler) is the supreme good'. According to Ramon M. Lemos, "*The possession of absolute power is the depravation, the extreme term of government and brings it back finally to just the law of the strongest*"²⁸. This is Machiavellian, for what determines what is just and what ought to be done is powerfulness and strongness. His doctrine of power sings the chorus of 'survival of the fittest' and 'jungle justice'. For Machiavelli, every power or principality is measured by the ability of the Prince to build a bastion and have much artillery so as to conquer any internal insurrection and external interference.

This outlines the fact that Machiavellian notion of power takes 'might as right'. Here the justification of any ruler or Prince is weighed by his efficacy in thrashing, brutalising and annihilating his opponents or any person or group of persons who resent his leadership. The "Laws" promulgated here are the laws of the strongest but such laws for Rousseau lack legitimacy in the proper sense of the word or term law. The Machiavellian doctrine of power is crude, unnatural, dehumanising and draconian. This notion of power is focused on objectifying and depersonalising the subjects or citizenry who according to Rousseau are the sovereign and not the despotic and tyrant Prince who parade themselves as political leaders. But those who buy this wicked doctrine of power do it only out of expediency and to successfully establish themselves as rulers and to force people to justify the reign of the power that be. Machiavelli sees power as an end in itself and ultimate among other scarce desires of the state.

3.4.1 The Acquisition and Application of Power

Prior to any claim of rulership. There must be first, the acquisition of power. Here, we are going to see the nefarious, brutish and inhuman methodology of power acquisition in Machiavelli's estimation.

He holds in high esteem the means used in attaining this goal. For him, any kind of mayhem, mention them are permissible to bring an about – to – be ruler into power especially in

authority. He says that he who desires to come to power should exterminate the family of his rivals, destabilize the existing order and suppress the citizens of the state by any means he deems fit. For Machiavelli, what matters most is for one to get himself enthroned on the seat of power and authority, using all possible means.

As a result of these, Machiavelli perceives, it is expedient to educate the Prince that if he (the Prince) desires to keep hold on his new possession that he must bear in mind that the family of the old Prince must be completely ruined. For him, it is the exclusive right of the prince to run after power by any available means whether by foul or fair means. To get power under any guise is the desired good as far as Machiavelli is concerned. But Rousseau rebuts this Machiavellian stance when he contended that might does not make right and that duty of obedience is owed only to legitimate power.

Machiavelli stood his ground that compulsion is the best means of acquiring power. He preaches violence and all its associated evils in the bid to secure the state power. The purpose of power acquisition is nothing but for its application Machiavelli has an offensive and criminal device of power application for he says: *People must be either crushed or pampered because they can get revenge for small injuries but not grievous ones, that any*

injury a prince does a man should be of such a kind that there is no fear of revenge”²⁹

It is endemic that Machiavelli instructs the prince who has acquired power to apply it insofar as the purpose suits his will. He believes that all the conventional and traditional beliefs, virtue, honesty, generosity, love, courage, charity and piety, must all be subservient to the quest and control of power. These he says are good only as long as they make for the enhancement of power.

For him, anything that will lead to the grief and sorrow of the prince should be discarded. In his injunction, he says; “Shun the vice and lose your state power”. Still in one of his injunctions, he holds that the prince should know how to do good services if need be but should know how to resort to evil if necessary.

For him, the prince must hold, maintain power at the cost of good morals even if it means by deception and by pretence. If dishonesty and force would assure him power and honour let him use them. To buttress this fact, Tuner said; “*The good and the protection of the state should command any means to preserve life and liberty, not minding justice or the good and wrong involved*”³⁰.

Therefore, the concept of power and acquisition of power for Machiavelli is no longer the question of moral justification of a

state and authority as traditionally conceived but more of legitimising power, power in the 'de-facto' situation.

3.4.2 Retention of Power

Power once acquired is good to be maintained. How this power is maintained, is what this work will examine in Machiavelli's notion of retention of power. Machiavelli teaches that the prince may in trying to retain power, pretend to be virtuous, but not to his own detriment or that of his sovereignty. His rejection of virtue as a moral principle is based on the assumption that those who act virtuously are in most times grieved and eventually come to regret at last. With this in his mind he writes; *"the fact that a man who wants to act virtuously in everything necessarily comes to grief among so many who are not virtuous. Therefore, if a prince wants to maintain his rule, he must learn how not to be virtuous"*.³¹

Machiavelli further maintained that, taking everything into account, he will find that some of the things that appear to be virtuous will, if he practices them, ruin him while vices will bring him security and property. He suggests that there are certain things a prince has to do in order to retain his power. He said that although in human history, men acknowledge and praise honest princes who keep their power by laws, but the successful princes are the crafty ones who adopt force. Hence he holds; *before deciding upon any course... men should well consider the*

objections and the dangers which it presents: and if its perils exceed its advantages, they should avoid it even though it had been in accordance with their previous determination. ³² He went further to out-line more guidelines for princes on how to retain power. Another thing necessary for the Prince in order to retain his power if he wishes is Deceit. He cited an instance with Alexander IV whose success was made possible because he was the greatest deceiver that ever lived. He believes that;

A prince needs not necessarily have all good qualities... But he should certainly appear to have them. If he has these qualities and always behaves accordingly he will find them harmful; if he only appears to have them, they will render him service. He should appear to be compassionate, faithful to his word, kind and devout. And indeed he should be so, but his disposition should be such that, if he needs to be the opposite he knows how. ³³

The prince should as much as possible avoid being despised. For Machiavelli, in order to win the favour of the people, the prince must avoid those things that would make people hate him or treat him with contempt, such as being greedy or grabbing, violating other people's rights. He suggests that men ought either to be well treated or crushed, because they can revenge themselves of lighter injuries, of more serious ones they cannot. Therefore, the injury that is to be done to a man ought to be a kind that one does not stand in fear of revenge.

In giving recommendations to princes who wish to retain power, he continued that the prince should use force ruthlessly.

For him, it is the most important rule for the prince to observe about states which are acquired when they have been accustomed to live at liberty under their own laws. Machiavelli suggested other ways of holding them; the second is to go and live there in person and the third is to allow them to live under their own laws, taking tribute of them and creating within the country a government composed of few who will keep it friendly to him.

The question of goodness and how we ought to live should not be given much emphasis because, how we are is not different from how we ought to live. Lending his support to this, he writes;

How we live is no difference from how we ought to live... A man striving in every way to be good will meet his ruin among the great numbers who are not good. Hence, it is necessary for a prince, if he wishes to remain in power to learn how not to be good and to use his knowledge or refrain from using it as he may need.³⁴

To retain power acquired solely by good fortune, especially those to whom some state is given either for money or by the favour of him who bestows it. When one finds himself in this position, he has to be prepared at once to hold that which fortune has thrown into his laps and then later lay the foundations others have laid before they become princes. Unless they are men of great worth and ability, it is not reasonable to expect that they should know how to command, having lived in a private condition. Besides they can be friendly and unfaithful.

Another way of retaining power as suggested by Machiavelli is the use of persuasion artfully. Power is not always maintained by the use of force, especially among the prudent rulers. Secondly, force is an expensive and inefficient instrument of government. Hence to retain power, a prince must learn not to be always good. Stumpf in his commentary buttressed this fact as he writes; *"Let the prince therefore aim at conquering and maintaining the state, the means will always be judged honourably and passed by everyone"*.³⁵

It is clear from the above statement that Machiavelli encouraged the prince to fear nothing except the loss of power. Moreover, he suggested the art of war as the surest means of retaining political power since power justifies every means used to acquire it. He then advises the prince to have a clear knowledge of war and its disciplines. This is because, the shortest way to loose a state is by neglecting the art of war whereas being skilled in the art of war enhances the retention of power in the state, hence; *"a prince therefore must have no other object or thought nor acquire skill in anything except war, its organisation and its discipline... The first way to loose your state is to neglect the art of war; the first way to win a state is to be skilled in the art of war"*.³⁶ Power can also be retained by acting decisively. This is what people call having fore-sight. The act of one moving promptly and firmly without fear of making mistakes rather than

hesitating or procrastinating. Hesitation, Machiavelli maintained is one sure way to destruction.

On another note, for a prince to retain his power, he must have and maintain a strong National Army. To act decisively implies having a strong National Army backing him always otherwise, he will be crushed. He emphasised the danger attached to having army composed of mercenaries and auxiliaries and further laments that when one has such an army, he is neither firm nor safe. Finally, to retain power, a wise prince ought to adopt such a course that his citizens will always be in every need of the state and of him and then he will always find them faithful.

3.4.3 The Loss of Power

Machiavellian doctrine holds that a leader is one who is combat ready; ready to defend, expand and consolidate his territory at all costs. And so power or coercive dealings is all that matters for the ruler in Machiavellian views and not all the mandated authority of the people.

The sound foundations will therefore serve as an underlying factor for not losing power in the state. Machiavelli further maintained that the art of war is inevitable in the state. Therefore, the art of war is all that is expected of a ruler. He should be able to organise his army, inculcate the necessary skill and discipline in them to make them effective. For him, rulers with arms will succeed while those with crosses and rosaries will fail. He

maintained that we are bound to meet with misfortune if we are unarmed.

Machiavelli maintained that prudence is needed always in all that we do. The application of prudence will then make the ruler not to get entangled with the things which will make him lose his power. A ruler equally in order not to loose power must avoid the hatred of the people which leads to rebellion against him. He should not associate himself with blame worthy acts rather if he must do so it must be through a proxy and therefore should change to action that are praise worthy.

3.4.4 Power and Morality

Power, literally speaking, is the ability of a person to produce a certain effect on another person or affect the behaviour of other people intentionally. Morality, on the other hand, is concerned with rightness or wrongness of behaviour. The term 'moral' also deals with character or actions judged as being good or evil, right or wrong. There are certain actions which generally would be condemned by people as morally wrong or considered as morally good. One sometimes wonder if there is any morality in politics. For Machiavelli, a prince should base his actions on how circumstances present itself and not strictly on whether the action should be considered good or bad. In acquiring power, a prince could use evil means to attain his goal. Machiavelli's work on 'The Prince' and 'The Discourses' showed equally the qualities for which

he has been specially known such as the use of immoral means for political purposes and the belief that government depends mainly on power. He said therefore that a prince did not necessarily have all the good virtues but he should certainly appear to have them. He went further saying that if a prince has these good virtues and behaved accordingly, he would found them ruinous. And that when he only appeared to have them, they would render him services. A prince cannot observe all those things which gave men reputation for virtue. This is because, for him (prince) to maintain his state, he is often forced to act in defiance of good faith, kindness, religion to mention but a few.

Machiavelli objected to the demands that a prince is supposed to be the embodiment of human virtues, expected to be merciful and faithful to his obligations. He warned rulers to disregard the question of whether his actions would be called virtuous. In acquiring power, a ruler ought to do whatever is appropriate to the situation in which he find himself and may lead to success.

On some occasions, cruelty, loyalty and valiancy might be the right course of action. He was neither concerned with good nor evil but only with political efficiency. If a ruler, for Machiavelli, is always good, he will perish. He must be as cunning as a fox and fierce as a lion. He should be faithful when it is advantageous to do so but not otherwise. He must at times be faithless. Machiavelli

opined that a prince should seem to be religious when it becomes a necessity in maintaining and preserving the state. He should see religion as a means towards this end. He should be cruel and merciless but pretend to be virtuous while preserving his power. This is because it is assumed that all virtuous rulers lose their kingdoms. The ruler in Machiavelli's view is above morality. And it is not necessary for him to be an upright man, to be faithful to his promises and to be humane. It is very necessary for a ruler to feel free in disregarding the dictates of religion provided he gave the impression of observing them. Without regard to ethical teaching, a prince must do anything that is necessary so as to retain his power and maintain his state. In terms of present conditions and future probabilities, a ruler's conduct should be determined by the demand he found himself. Nevertheless, there were times the practice of moral qualities would be demanded from the prince as the necessity in maintaining his power.

Machiavelli's claim was that in political sphere, a good end justifies what is morally bad. Some actions could be morally wrong by Christian or theological standards but morally right by pagan or atheistic standards.

In his opinion, men and political groups were entitled to use all possible means and weapons to ensure their preservations. This means could be immoral or regarded as evil but Machiavelli saw nothing wrong in them as long as they are directed towards

an end. He never showed the slightest wish to re-interpret morality so as to be subordinate to a theory of the state as was done by Hegel. Hegel in his conception, made the state superior to morality. He regarded the state as a synthesis of abstract right and morality. This implies that it integrates abstract right and morality. Hence, the state in Hegelian context was regarded as a complete whole and superior to morality. The sense in which in effect Machiavelli advocated a political morality is not in terms of divorce between ethics and politics but in terms of the basic and heroic dignity given to politics and political actions in classical pagan morality. He considered two types of morality, each making conflicting demands. These were the 'Morality of the soul and the morality of the city'. For him, morality of the soul represented the Christian type of morals while that of the city represented the morality found in a prince who wished to maintain his power.

He noticed that in reality everyone is torn in these two directions. He saw clearly that the best type of men, of action did not represent the inferiority of action to morality but that they pursued different ends which demanded for and clearly or certainly got different kinds of justification.

Thus, on power and morality, Machiavelli persistently insisted that the exercise of power could only be justified in an irreligious terms. He opined that power was concerned with practical actions not made for any belief of thought.

3.5 The State in Machiavelli

Machiavelli was the father of modern diplomacy. And was noted to be the first to use the word 'State' in the modern sense as a result of his separation of politics from morality. According to him, the state is the kingdom of the king, the abode of a ruler and the government of a free city. In Machiavelli's time as it is today, the states sole reason for being was to serve the citizens, not vice versa. The state, in the modern understanding is said to be an organized political community with its apparatus of government and independent territory. However, taking cognisance of this modern form of a state, Machiavelli enunciated his basic conceptions of the state. Little wonder, his principle for the maintenance and preservation of the state is his concept of reason of the state.

Machiavelli used the tactics of confusion and misrepresentation to advance his concept of the ideal state. The reason of state for him, is the fundamental ethics of 'modus operandi' of the state. This 'modus operandi' of the state determined the actions of the statesman pertaining to the preservation and maintenance of the state. The ruler's do's and don'ts are particularly encoded in this mode of conduct. The state as an organised political community can only achieve its goal by being faithful to the reason of state. Consequently, this reason of state, which enables the state to achieve its various goals, must

be properly and thoroughly be studied and understood. So, the rulers of the state must have adequate intelligence of the state. The intelligence of the state implies knowledge of the path through which the state can be led in order to achieve its goals. As such, this demands thorough education of the state affairs.

Nevertheless, we should note that the reason for the state is never universal but relative to states. So, every ruler must try to patiently detect the one that is peculiar to his state. However, where the ruler is unable to do this, he can carefully select a goal and way for his state. In effecting this, the ruler must have been an expert in grasping his subject's means. This will enable him to come out with a proper and convenient way of ruling them. Machiavelli maintained that the reason of the state is to take into account the preservation and safety of the state, thus: *"for where the very safety of the country depends upon the resolution to be taken, no consideration of justice or injustice, humanity or cruelty nor of glory or of shame should be allowed to prevail. But putting all other considerations aside the only question should be what course will save the life and liberty of the country"*.³⁸ Machiavelli states that, morality, religion and ethics are out of question when the life and interest of the state is concerned. So, the state can render nothing of the systems of value such as ethics and religion when the integrity of the state is in jeopardy. To this end, everything should be done no matter how deadly, cruel,

disastrous and dangerous to preserve and defend the state. This is because, "... *the state was an end in itself, exhausted for its own sake, lived its life, aimed at its own preservation and advantage and was not bound by the obligation which should determine the action of private person*"³⁹. But there seem to be a problem here, since the state is an organism capable of self maintenance, why then does it require a ruler who would look after it? This means an attempt by Machiavelli to absolutise the state as an autonomous system of value. In the same line, Appadorai remarks that the state,

... Is an imperishable organism whose life extends beyond that of the individual who are its transitory elements. They are born, grow up, die and all substituted by others while the social units always retains its identity and its patrimony of idea and sentiment which each generation receives from the past and transmits to the future.⁴⁰

In this sense, without the individual, there will be no state. So whoever holds that the state is solely capable of self-maintenance is simply exaggerating. Further, man being a social being must contribute to the smooth-running of the state by maintaining the state through making laws and keeping them. Thus, the principle of reason of state prescribes and stipulates these laws which man must follow for the maintenance of the state.

Above all, Machiavelli believes that tyranny or despotism is not the best way of governing a state, except for a corrupt

society. He recommended democracy as the best form of governing a state that is not corrupt and ordered. For him democracy cannot function in a corrupt state because; *“where the body of the people is so thoroughly corrupt that they are powerless for restraint; it becomes necessary to establish some superior power which, with a royal hand and with absolute powers may put a curb upon the excessive ambition and corruption of the powerful”* ⁴¹.

Finally, Machiavelli recommends tyranny for a corrupt state and democracy for a good and peaceful state. Thus, he is both a moral and an amoral political philosopher. Nevertheless, he totally rejected aristocracy, that is, the government of the nobles and rich for it is totally against democracy and their interest is at variance with the interest of the common people.

3.5.1 His Concept of the Ruler

Like other Western philosophers, Machiavelli was influenced by the early Greek philosophers, especially Plato and his notion of ideal state. However, in many cases, Machiavelli seems to be arguing against Platonic Philosophy. Plato believed in just rulers, who ruled via moral virtue. Machiavelli believed in ‘virtue’ that a good leader’s main responsibility is to preserve his country first.

There has been a debate since the institution of modern political science as to whether the statesmen should observe the same Universally accepted form of morality or not. This debate

resulted from the general conception of man as being selfish and fickle by nature. However, "*Machiavelli supplied their want. He painted men as they actually were and not as they pretend to be in realist. And then with a brutal frankness, he explained to them in the only language, which they could understand, how best they might succeed in their savagery*".⁴² Therefore, he maintains that, the only purpose for a ruler was to make war, and protect her citizens from attacks by other states. The ruler, therefore, is justified in doing whatever is necessary to maintain the country, even if it is unjust irrespective of ethical principle especially when their actions are for the interest of the state. He advised the rulers to possess the public form of morality instead of the private form of morality in order to succeed.

For Machiavelli, the fundamental concern of any ruler should be the acquisition of, retention and expansion of power. Thus,

In the action of men and especially of princes from which there is no appeal the end justified the means. Let a prince therefore aim at acquiring and maintaining the standard, the means will always be judged honorable and praised by everyone for the vulgaris always taken by appearance.⁴³

Consequently, if an action helps in the acquisition and retention of power by the rulers, then it is to be judged morally good. This is because men are ill-tempered and often deceived by shadows and so any ruler who is able to acquire and retain power no matter the means is honoured and praised by men of

appearance. Again, Machiavelli advised the rulers to advance the interest of others so long as they can make good use of them and to kill them the moment they threaten to become popular. This is because the ruler being an ambitious man cannot afford to have rivals. A successful nation should have a single master while the rest must be slaves. A ruler for him should receive but not confer benefits. Similarly, he remarked, "*...every act of a ruler or government is permissible...especially in matters of foreign affairs as long as those acts work to the advantage of the ruler or the government*"⁴⁴ It is certain that Machiavelli is naïve, and in many ways sanctions evil acts on the ground that they are expedient for the maintenance of the state and advantage of the ruler. Machiavelli believed in the value of insincerity. He advised the ruler never to be frank. To be good is harmful; but to appear to be good is useful, in order for a ruler to preserve his power and plunder it is often necessary for him to act in opposition to justice, charity, humanity and good faith but his subjects must not be aware of this. They must be fooled into thinking that he is noble, compassionate, pious and just. A ruler should always be vigilant; study the situation and know when to use moral, immoral, humane or cruel means. In other words, a successful ruler should make his subjects believe that he is protecting them at the very moment when he is crushing them. He admonished rulers to have mercy in their tongues and evil in their hearts. For this reason,

Machiavelli states; *"whenever possible, the leader will of course observe the conventional standards for this will strengthen his popular support, whether in a tyranny, a popular government or mixed regime. Even where he feels compelled to violate conventional belief. He will always strive to give reason for that"*⁴⁵

It is only a brute for Machiavelli that can succeed as a kind. Lovers of justice, enemies of injustice, human and kindly rulers come to a bad end. Goodness never pay. A ruler in order to retain the obedience of his subjects and the respect of his soldiers should stifle the man in him and develop the beast. In a similar vein, Machiavelli instructed the ruler to be as ferocious as a lion and as cunning as a fox. For, force is greater than justice and frown more powerful than truth. Equally, the ruler should not bother about keeping his word for nobody does and it is very easy for a ruler to break his promise because men are stupid. So, Machiavelli posits; *"He who best known to play the fox has had the best success. If all men were good, this would not be a good advice, but since they are wicked and do not keep faith with them. No prince need ever be at a loss for plausible reasons to choak a breach of faith"*⁴⁶

Most considerably, war should be the top most in the agenda of the ruler. For him, a ruler must devote himself exclusively to the art of killing, 'for war is the sole art looked for in one who rules'. Hence a ruler should never allow his attention

to be diverted from military pursuits. In time of peace, a ruler should always prepare himself for war. As such, his conversation, his studies, his games, his reading and all his most serious reflections should be centered on the one question of how to conquer his fellow men. In the Machiavellian state, all road leads to war. Consequently, to this very day, war is so prevalent because most countries are governed or rather misgoverned, by his disciples and the politicians the world over. A ruler should rely on the strength of his army rather than the strength of his allies. He should beware of those among his subjects who flatter him, especially among his ministers.

For Machiavelli, one can become a ruler either through his qualities or abilities or by inheritance. It could also be through violence and crime or by election. All these means are justified for him in so far as they help one to gain the political power successfully. Machiavelli combined the traditional, classical, and Christian thought in the purpose of presenting his concept of power. He cautioned rulers not to allow such Christian virtues as patience, forgiveness, meekness, mercy, humanity, self-denial, compassion in his state because these virtues would make his subjects and the state weak. These virtues for him are negative and unproductive. Machiavelli advised that a ruler should rather encourage such virtues as ambition, strength of character, vitality, energy, thirst for power, desire for fame, patriotism,

ability to achieve one's aim no matter how. For him, these are positive virtues that transform men into strong and dynamic men and turn the state into a strong one.

3.5.2 His Concept of Followership

The followers are considered as the individual men and women in any organised political community that do not in any way belong to the ruling class. So the followers are the class of the ruled. However, Machiavelli being morally blind failed to see the world as a unit. Humanity, in his view, is not a closely-knit family of brothers but a scattered horde of brutes and simpletons as the followers. And for him, it is the business of the brutes to use the simpletons for their own ends and the best way to use them is to oppress them. Machiavelli came to this disastrous conclusion because he has a very pessimistic view of man. He sees man as being egoistic and self centered. By nature, for him, man does things that are gainful and shuns everything that could lead him to lose. So, man submits entirely to the caprices of any person that could guarantee his profit and still he is ready to abandon the person any moment he senses danger.

In furtherance of this, Thomas Hobbes taking side with Machiavelli's concept of man's depravity, states that in the state of nature, 'Man is a wolf unto man' *Homo Homini Lupus*, implying a war of all against all. This is a state where might is right, that is, survival of the fittest. Man's inhumanity to man become more

glaring. So, he contends that man is devilish by nature. In corroboration with this view, Hobbes posits: "... *Human beings naturally are competitive, aggressive, greedy, antisocial and brutish, if left untamed they would be perpetually at war with one another*"⁴⁷. Besides, Machiavelli is of the opinion that all men are not the same but each is a function of the place of his birth. He commented; "*Man is made at day, but every man is in other sense made of day that is of his own land, where he was born and where over the centuries of his ancestors have returned to dust*"⁴⁸

Thus, it seems easier for men to understand each other when they were born on the same soil and beneath the same sky.⁴⁹ This explains that man is heavily influenced by his society of origin. Equally, the evolutionary theory of man tends towards Machiavelli's materialist concept of man. According to the evolutionists, "*what man is now must be different from what man will be five thousand years from now*".⁵⁰

This process of change will continue and so man is basically material and dynamic. Therefore, Machiavelli upholds this view when he advised the rulers to learn how to act like a lion and be as cunning as a fox. At any rate, his conception of man's nature is very negative. He sees man as being entirely bad as well as dynamic. Consequently, he holds that, the followers should be crushed at any slightest opportunity. For him, the followers are nothing but slaves that should be treated as the master likes.

They should be maneuvered and deceived for their nature deserves it.

Since this work has comparative analysis as one of the methods of research, it becomes necessary to critically examine other political philosopher's views of man and the state with that of Machiavelli.

3.5.3 Machiavelli and Other Political Philosophers

There is always a close connection between a philosopher's conception of what man is, what is peculiar to man, how he is placed in the world, his doctrine about how man should behave, what he should strive for, and how society should be constituted.⁵¹ Because of the above point of view, this work shall examine Machiavelli's conception of man and use it as one of the factors for understanding Machiavelli's philosophy. His position is that human nature is essentially selfish.

According to Machiavelli, government is really founded upon the weakness of the individuals who are unable to protect themselves from the aggression of other individuals. Human nature is generally aggressive and acquisitive. Thomas Hobbes shares this view with him when he asked why a society without absolute power should be chaotic. In his response, he based his answer entirely upon a psychological theory about the nature of man. For him: Man is by nature selfish and egoistic. He is

motivated by selfish desires which requires satisfaction if he is to be happy.⁵²

Hobbes also added that there is the inherent natural urge of aggressive and acquisitiveness in man; men keep what they have and crave for what they need. Machiavelli, in view of human nature, asserts that men are in strife and competition which threaten good government and such needs to be restrained by the power of the law. He frequently remarked that men are generally self-centred and bad, and that a good ruler should aim at the security of life and property of his people. The reason is that these are the most universal desire of human nature. He says that it is better for a Prince to be feared than to be loved where both are impossible. For him one can make the following generalisation about man:

They are ungrateful, fickle, liars and deceivers, they shun danger and are greedy for profit; while you treat them well, they are yours. They would shed their blood for you, risk their property, their lives, their children, so long, as I said above, as the danger is remote; but when you are in danger they turn against you.⁵³

From his analysis of human nature, and the presumption of a government that will suit it, Machiavelli was encouraging despotic rule and a totalitarian system of government. One could also accuse him of committing a fallacy of hasty generalisation by

his harsh conclusion of human nature. From what we have discussed also we can make this assertion that most political philosophers propound their political theory from their perception of human nature. A quick look at some of these philosophers and a guess into their political philosophical theories reveal what we mean. Just as Machiavelli sees man as self assertive, Hobbes also sees man as self assertive but considers him from the point of security in a world of self-seeking men. He puts a high value on prudence and consistency of purpose, he says that an organised society is a discipline which the prudent accepts and the imprudent must be forced to submit to.

Thomas Hobbes' political ideas were expressed in his main work, "The Leviathan". He lived at a time when there was great unrest in England. The "Leviathan" gives us a historical account of the origin of the society and the state. It began by examining the nature of human society prior to the setting up of organised society. In Thomas Hobbes' state, there was no laws, no authority, no morality, no sense of justice or injustice. Everybody simply pursued the satisfaction of his self interest. According to Hobbes, the state of nature was a state of war and insecurity among men. The problems were portrayed to have culminated in a chaotic type of situation in which there was war between everybody against everyone. Feeling that they could no longer continue in such situation and to remedy the inconveniences of

the state of nature, the people came together and made a social contract. They formed a political society and empowered the sovereign to decide what is right and what is wrong. In the "Leviathan", he says; *"That a man be willing, when others are so too, as far-forth as for peace and defense of himself he shall think it necessary to lay down his right to all things; and he contend with so much liberty against other men, as he would allow other men against himself"*.⁵⁴

This implies, to avoid the chaotic conditions that prevail in the state of nature, it is necessary for this existence to be agreed upon by all. Then, the creating of the commonwealth came into being. The state was created and this was the birth of the commonwealth. The state in Hobbes' political theory was an authoritarian state in which virtually unlimited power was vested in the sovereign or Leviathan by the citizens. According to his theory, when we become members of a political society, we surrender to the sovereign the right which we have by nature to govern ourselves and submit ourselves completely to his sovereign power and authority. The sovereign was not accountable to the people in Hobbes' theory. He was above the law of the land. He was the sole source of laws and the sole interpreter of laws. Whatever, he does is right because it is his prerogative to decide good and evil in the state. He decides what was considered as morally wrong or right in society. There is

indeed, only one limitation on the sovereign power. He cannot command a man to kill himself. To do so would be the only act that could be a breach of the covenant on the sovereign's part. This is because the citizens did not surrender to the sovereign their rights of self-preservation. As part of the covenant, the citizen has authorised the sovereign to deal or kill him if he wants but did not tell him that he (the citizen) will kill himself.

Hobbes told us that the reason why the sovereign was vested with such virtually unlimited powers over the citizens was to be able to ensure peace, avert chaos, anarchy and civil war. The citizen needs peace and protection. To ensure this, the sovereign need such power. The citizens owe him allegiance as long as he is in full control of the state and can provide them with the peace and protection they need. Their loyalty to him ceases if things go beyond his control in the state and he is no longer in the position to provide the citizens with the peace and protection. They will no longer be under any obligation to obey him. Thus, in Hobbes' view, the sovereign power of a commonwealth is absolute and not subject to the laws and obligations of citizens.

Next to Thomas Hobbes in the history of English political thinkers who held the mechanistic view of the state and nature was John Locke. He built a comprehensive theory of the state in his work "Second Treatise of Government". John Locke like most political philosophers of his time started his theory with a

consideration of man's state of nature. While Hobbes argued that life in the state of nature was solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short, Locke claimed that it was a state of peace, goodwill, mutual assistance and preservation. He reminded us that the state of nature was not a state of war. He differentiated between the two as; men living together according to reason without a common superior on earth with authority to judge between them is properly the state of nature. On the other hand, force exercised without right, created a state of war because it contributed to a violation of the state of nature, that is, of what it ought to be. In Locke's theory of nature, there was lack of important wants. The want of an established "settled known laws", the want of a "known and indifferent judge"; and that of executive power to enforce just decisions were lacking in Locke's theory. It was therefore a condition which however free was full of fears and continual dangers and man's right was very insecure. According to Locke, men made a contract to enter into civil society so as to get out of the state of nature. The state was instituted by way of remedy for the inconveniences of the state of nature, that is, to avert not to escape from a state of war. The political state then was created through the voluntary consent of all. It was a contract to which all must consent to give up to their community, individual natural rights of enforcing the law of reason in order that life, liberty and property may be preserved. In Locke's view,

the 'original contract' must be understood as involving the individuals consent to submit to the rule of the majority. *"It is necessary, he argued, that the body should have that way wither the greater force carries it, which is the consent of the majority"*.

⁵⁵ Locke saw the ills of vesting absolute power on one person or a group of persons. Having seen the abuse of such powers by monarchs in his time, he therefore, sets a limit to the power to be entrusted on government. The legislature, he said was to be supreme organ of government. That it must exercise its supremacy through laws properly promulgated and applying equally to all groups and classes. Locke, in applying the doctrine of separation of powers as a way of limiting the government, spoke of balancing the power of government by placing several parts of it in different hands. The legislative and the executive powers should therefore be separated. The third arm of government in Locke's theory was not the judiciary as we have it today but what he called the 'Federative'. This seems to correspond with present day's Ministry of External Affairs. This arm of government in his theory is vested with the power to deal with matters affecting the relationship between the state and another state or community of persons outside the state.

In Lockean society, the community still retained 'sovereign power' not the government. The community was supreme but its power was latent. Locke recognised the power of revolution which

was vested on the people. For if rulers do not exercise their trust in the interest of the governed, then resistance was justifiable and a new government may be instituted. The dissolution of government can take place while society still remains intact.

Thus, political power, according to John Locke means that power which every man having in state of nature, has given up into the hands of the society and therein to the governors whom the society hath set over itself, with this express or tacit trust, that it shall be employed for their good and the preservation of their property. For him, the end of law is not to abolish or restrain but to preserve and enlarge freedom.

Rousseau on his part, sees man as a victim of society who lost his integrity, society derives from his needs, develops his features; yet is oppressive to him. Jeremy Bentham sees man as a subject of desire, who, unlike other animals can compare and foresee; he sees him as a competitor and collaborator with other men in procuring of what satisfies his desires. He then maintains that the proper function of the state is to see that competition and collaboration are as effective as possible. For Hegel, he sees man thus; "As a creature who become rational and moral in the process of coming to understand and master an environment; he sees him transformed and devoted by his own activities".⁵⁶ He equally sees men as changing from age to age, and he sees the

cause of these changes as 'implicit' in his nature; and also in his capacity to reason and to will.

On his own, Karl Marx sees man as a creature whose image of him and the world is a product of what he does to satisfy his basic needs; yet he also sees him as a product/creature that comes in the end to know himself and the world, understanding his condition and accepting it, and thereby attains freedom.

3.6 The Mechanism of Government in Machiavelli

This simply deals with the methods or techniques of governance as espoused by Machiavelli. His sole purpose concerning the art of governance was directed towards certain ends such as making the state strong by introducing such policies which would enable the state to expand its power and establish good government. In line with this, political and military measures were mainly the areas of interest for Machiavelli and he carefully divorced these almost entirely from religious and moral considerations. He believed that since the Italian people of his age were said to be corrupt, deceitful and vicious, therefore for a prince to control his people and maintain his government, political behaviourism of some sort is necessary. This implies that the prince should introduce some political measures which would change his subjects behaviour and thus direct this towards the attainment of his end.

Machiavelli also maintained that, for a prince to rule his territory effectively, he must always be on the lookout for political disorder and in case there is any, he should quickly try to find solutions to it. If it is allowed to escalate to the point that every citizen recognises there is political disorder, remedies might be too late. This might endanger the stability of the state. He went further to say that if a prince conquers a city or principality which he hitherto has been living under its own laws, in order to hold it securely and govern it effectively, he should bear three methods in mind. Firstly, he should devastate the inhabitants of the city concerned; secondly, he should go and live there in person and thirdly, he should let them keep their own laws but extract tribute from them. By so doing, the prince would gain the friendship of the inhabitants of the conquered territory thereby maintaining his authority and ruling them effectively.

Machiavelli was of the view that for a prince to rule effectively, religious and moral considerations should not be of priority or utmost importance to him. He felt that even if a ruler has to commit vices so as to rule his subjects, he is justified and should carry on with it. This again was proven in his writing, 'The Prince' that in any action one embarks upon, it is the end result that one looks at. Hence, it is the end that matters. This is because political life itself or the art of governance is a struggle and Christian virtues could endanger political effectiveness.

Christianity through its doctrines might weaken a political society. However, this does not imply that Machiavelli never gave any consideration to religion. Quite contrarily, he saw religion as a weapon with which the prince could rule his people, though depending on circumstances that presented itself. He considered religious beliefs as perhaps the crucial element in governance. His main involvement was to inquire how the prince could use religion for his own ends. He also considered the utilisation of religion for civil purposes as one of the areas in which the rulers of the Roman kingdom and republic succeeded.

The art of ruling, in Machiavelli's view requires vitality. The possession of vitality is the quality most necessary for a prince or political leader since the maintenance of government depends largely on power. Tactics and strategy are also important prerequisites for effective government. Machiavelli believed that for a prince to rule effectively, the employment or adoption of strategy and tactics are very crucial. The art of governance requires skillful planning coupled with ability on the part of the prince to use existing means to achieve a desired result. Machiavelli has contempt for rulers who in carrying the task of rulership, go about it unintelligently. He believed that a ruler should be able to apply his intelligence perhaps, in manipulating the subjects, the affairs of the state as a means for the attainment of his objective which is that of a good and peaceful

government. *"He was of the opinion that the introduction of reforms by the prince is very essential for the stability of his government".*⁵⁷ He stressed greatly on the necessity for periodic changes in laws. Changes in laws and customs would generally be for the benefit of the citizens and in most cases re-organisation has to be cruel so as to be effective. However, he warned that the ruler, in introducing reforms should not go about it hastily. Doing so might pose a threat to his survival and that of his government. New princes are obliged to introduce new laws and methods of government so as to establish themselves.

Roman experience, for him, suggested that those who desired to reform an existing government do not go about it hastily. *"The Romans understood that in reforming an existing government, the reforms of the old must be preserved even though the substance is altered".*⁵⁸ Machiavelli thought that if both form and substance were changed suddenly, civil disruption might likely occur.

With this, the possibility that the state itself might as well fall is there. The changes in laws and customs might be either for the benefit of the ruled or to maintain the ruler, though the prudent ruler would give the state the new laws and customs as required by necessity. He would go about it with care, disturbing as little as possible the minds of his subjects for without the ruler, a state is unlikely to be reformed.

A prince must learn how to thwart plans of the powerful and unscrupulous enemies if he expects to rule successfully. At times, he might achieve this by acting in complete accord with the moral virtues. What Machiavelli meant was that the prince should avoid being generally accused of such vices as that would weaken his hold in his state. It would make his subjects to think that he was unpopular, easily deceived, a coward and lacking military experience. On the other hand, he should not hesitate to adopt any vice that would be of assistance to him. *"In the light of this end, all moral considerations disappears, similarly, vices likely to instigate and encourage enemies must be recognised and abandoned"*.⁵⁹ Moreso, if a prince has tyrannical tendencies, he should not portray them before his subjects. If he does, he renders himself hateful before them and they may easily rebel against him. Machiavelli admitted that a well organised military power should be considered very important. In other words, the possession of a strong military force should be composed of natives instead of mercenaries. He warned princes to respond to foreign ruthlessness with equal toughness. He acknowledged the fact that in practice, successful governments are always ready to act ruthlessly in attaining their ends. A well-ordered military power can maintain a badly organised civil organisation. On the other hand, if there exists a state well ordered for peace but with defective military force, it would not survive. A prince can

maintain and extend the limits of the state with a well equipped and well disciplined force loyal to the state. Without this, he becomes a prey to civil strife within and to the ambitious neighbouring princes.

In my own point of view, the driving force behind Machiavelli's idea of reforms by the prince was as a result of what he experienced in Italy of his time. Italy, during his era was very corrupt and thus, he felt it was in need of a complete re-organisation. Military virtue was apparently lacking in Italy which necessitated the use of mercenary soldiers. This was because its old regulations in military affairs were outdated and no one with the knowledge of finding new regulation has risen up to the task. Thus, Machiavelli viewed reforms in the state as very essential. The above illustrated the methods of government as espoused by Machiavelli.

Endnotes

1. J. Odey, *Politics and the Nigeria Dilemma* (Enugu: Snap Press, 1998), P. 8.
2. M. Udoekpo, *The limits of a Divided Nation*, (Enugu: Snap Press, 1999), P. 48.
3. M. Nwoko, *Basic World Political Theories*, (Owerri: Claverianum press, 1988), P.3.
4. A. Appadorai, *The Substance of Politics*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1975), P. 3.
5. C. Ejizu, *Ethics of Politics in Nigeria, The Christian Perspective in Bulletin of Ecumenical theology*, (Vol. 2 No 1, 1989), P. 47.
6. M. I. Onyeocha, *What is Religious about Religion*, (Owerri: Claretian publication, 1992), P. 109.
7. O. Eze, *Society and Rule of law*, (Owerri: Totan Publishers, 1987), P. 89
8. M. Udoekpo, *Corruption in Nigerian Culture; The Liberty Mission of the Church*, (Enugu: Snap Press, 1994), P.17
9. John Paul II., *Laborem Excerens*, Encyclical on Human Worth (1981), P. 98.
10. Ibid. P. 55.
11. J. Omoregbe, *Ethics, A systematic and Historical Study*, (Lagos: Joja Press, 1993), P. 195.
12. Aristotle, *Politics*, tr. T.A. Sinclair, (London: Penguin Books, 1983), P.125
13. N. Machiavelli, *The Prince*, (London: Penguin Books, 1995), P. 7.
14. Ibid. P. 14

15. N. Machiavelli, *The Prince*, (Chicago: William Bentham Publication, 1981), P. 16
16. *Ibid.*, P. 48.
17. L. Walker, *The Discourses of Niccolo Machiavelli*, (London: Routledge and Keyan Publication, 1997), P. 91
18. F. Lassalle, "End and Means" in *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy Vol. 1 and 2* (New York: Macmillan Publishers and Free Press, 1967), P. 510.
19. I. Kant, "De Ontological Ethics" in *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, (New York: Macmillan Pub. And Free Press, 1967), P. 343.
20. J. Omoregbe, *A Simplified History of Western Philosophy, Vol. 1*, (Lagos: Joja Press Limited, 1991), P 61.
21. N. Machiavelli, *The Prince*, in Rieu E.V. (ed.), (London: The Chaucer Press Ltd., 1975), P. 23.
22. B. Russell, *Power: A New Social Analysis*, (London: George Allen and Unwin Press Ltd., 1975), P. 25.
23. N. Machiavelli, *Op. Cit.*, P. 5.
24. J. Plamenatz, *Man and Society, Vol. 1* (United Kingdom: Longman Group, 1963), P. 25.
25. J. Omoregbe, *Ethics: A systematic and Historical study*, (London: Global Educational Publishers Ltd., 1979), P. 127.
26. Arthur Nwankwo, *African Dictators: The Logic of Tyranny & Lesson from History*, (Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd. 1998), P. 54.
27. *Ibid.*
28. M. Lemons Ramons, *Rousseau's Political Philosophy: An Exposition and Interpretation*, (Georgia: The University of Georgia Press, 1970), P. 214.
29. Niccolo Machiavelli, P. 212.
30. W. Tuner, Quoted in M.I. Nwoko, *Basic World Political Theories*, (Lagos: Claverianum Press, 1988), P. 62.

31. E. Cassier, *The Triumph of Machiavellianism and its Consequences "In the History of Political Thought"* (New Jersey: 1969), P.139.
32. N. Machiavelli, *Op. Cit.*, P. 48.
33. *Ibid.* P. 58.
34. *Ibid.* P. 14
35. S. E. Stumpf, *Philosophy History and Problem*, 4th ed., (New York: Mac Graw, Hill Book company, 1983), P. 211.
36. N. Machiavelli, *Op. Cit.*, P. 46.
37. G.H. Sabine et al, *A History of Political Theory*, (Hong Kong: Dryden Press, 1973), P. 318.
38. *Ibid.* P. 528.
39. L. Strauss *Thought on Machiavelli*, (Illinois: Glenco Press, 1958), P. 242.
40. A. Appadorai, *The Substance of Politics*, P. 229.
41. N. Machiavelli, *Discourse*, Bk. 1, P. 55.
42. T. Henry, *The Story of the Human Race*, (USA: the Independent Press, 1936), P. 66.
43. Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince and Discourse*, tr. Lerner Marx, (New York: Random House, 1950), P. 66.
44. T. Kier man, *Who's Who in the History of Philosophy*, (London: Vision Press, 1966), P. 112.
45. G. S. Milford, *Political Idea and Ideologies in the History of Political Thought*, (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1976), P. 302.
46. T. Henry, *Op. Cit.*, P. 336.
47. *Ibid.*, P. 338.
48. T. Hobbes, *The Leviathan*, tr. Michael Oakes, (New York: Macmillan Press, 1967), P. 40.

49. N. Robert, *The Life of Niccolo Machiavelli*, (Baronata Florence: University of Chicago press, 1985), P. 63.
50. E. Washmann, *The Problem of Evolution*, (London: Trabuel Press, 1957), P. 49.0
51. J. Plamenatz, *Man and Society: A Critical Examination of Some Important Social and Political Theories from Machiavelli to Marx, Vol. 1* (London: Longman Group Ltd 1963), p.xvi.
52. T. Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. by G. Macpherson, (England: Penguin Books Ltd, 1968), P. 186.
53. N. Machiavelli, *The Prince*, Trans George Bull, Penguin Books Ltd. (England: Harmondsworth, 1975), P. 96.
54. T. Hobbes, *The Leviathan*, (ed.) MacPherson, C.B., (England: Penguin Books Ltd, 1968), P. 190.
55. J. Locke, *The second Treatise of Government*, (ed.) Gough J. W., (London: Oxford Basic Blackwell Press, 1976), P. 11.
56. J. Plamenatz, P. XVII.
57. M. Sibley, *Political Ideas and Ideologies*, (London: Harper and Row Publishers, 1970) P. 306.
58. W. C. Philip, *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (New York: Macmillan Publishers, 1972), P. 381.
59. B. Russell, *Power: A New Social Analysis*, (London: Allen and Unwin Press Ltd., 1975), P. 495.

CHAPTER FOUR

MACHIAVELLIANISM IN NIGERIAN POLITICS

The seed of Machiavellianism planted in Italy in the 15th century grew like the mustard seed and has negatively affected many political systems round the globe. And Nigeria is not an exception.

4.1 A Reflection on the Constitution of Federal Republic of Nigeria.

As every state is a community of some kind, a state without a constitution is like a house without a roof. Therefore, each society or community has its own constitution that determines the behavioural patterns of the people in that particular state. And so a constitution is very important in every organised country. The Nigerian constitution, just like any other constitution in the world today is a sacred and fundamental document. As much, it was designed to guide as well as regulate the affairs of governance. It has a fundamental scheme of rights which should be respected and adequately protected by the government for there to be any meaningful development. These specific rights can be divided into six families:

- Security rights that protect people against crimes such as murder, massacre, torture and rape.

- Due process rights that protect people against abuses of the legal system, such as, imprisonment without trial, secret trials, and excessive punishment.
- Liberty rights that protect freedoms in areas such as belief, expression, association, assembly and movement.
- Political rights that protect the liberty to participate in politics through actions such as communicating, assembling, protesting, voting and serving in public office.
- Equality rights that guarantee equal citizenship, equality before the law and non-discrimination.
- And social rights that require provision of education to all children and protection against severe poverty and starvation.

The afore-mentioned rights are boldly enshrined in the Nigerian constitution. The question is; do the Nigerian government's institutions and organs respect and protect these fundamental rights of the individuals? More often than not, one is confronted with cases of abuse, neglect, and infringement upon people's rights. The human rights record in Nigeria is at its lowest ebb. It is argued in some quarters that the long years of military rule in Nigeria were largely responsible for all these abuses and infringements on her citizens rights. The Nigerian government then, suffered severe sanctions as a result of this ugly and bad human rights record, and was regarded as a pariah nation. But

with the inauguration of the civilian administration in 1999, there were high hopes for a better and democratic approach to the issue of freedom and the protection of human rights of Nigerian citizens. Despite the euphoria that greeted this civilian administration, much is still expected from the democratic government, as abuses and infringements upon people's rights still abound. No doubt, we have failed in many ways; Nigeria has failed to meet the requirements of agreements on freedom and human rights like those in the universal declaration of human rights of 1948, the international covenant on economic, social and cultural rights in 1966, and the African charter on human and people's rights in 1981. Nigeria has failed to promote and encourage the fundamental freedom and rights of her citizens and in effect failed to satisfy the international standards in this regard. To underscore the importance of fundamental freedom and rights, Pope John Paul II emphatically noted the inalienable rights of all men within the society as one of the greatest needs of man. His voice resounds even more so in our own Nigerian situation;

Every man has the right to life, to bodily integrity, and to the means, which are suitable for the proper development of life; these are primarily food, clothing, shelter, rest, medical care, and finally the necessary social services. Therefore, a human being also has the right to security in cases of sickness, inability to work, widowhood, old age, unemployment, or in any other case in which he is deprived of the means of subsistence.¹

The Nigerian constitution outlines the national objectives for itself and all her citizens as well. This view is strongly supported by Marcel Onyeocha when he says; *"the constitution of the federal republic of Nigeria provides an indispensable reference point for the country's national life"*.² The constitution besides its emphasis on the citizen's freedom, calls on all Nigerians to obedience to the nation as free beings of rational nature; *"Arise O compatriots, Nigeria's calls to obey, to serve our fatherland with love and strength and faith. The labour of our heroes past shall never be in vain one nation bound in freedom, peace and unity"*.³

The national anthem reveals the great integrity of our nation. It calls us to a commitment to nation building. Little would this ideal be realised unless the general state of human rights and freedom is guaranteed and restored by the State. The opening statement of the Nigerian Federal constitution reads;

We the people of the Federal Republic of Nigeria have firmly and solemnly resolved to live in unity and harmony as one indivisible and indissoluble sovereign nation under God... To provide for a constitution for the purpose of promoting of good governance and the welfare of all persons in our country on the principle of freedom, equality, and justice, and for the purpose of consolidating the unity of our people.⁴

From the above, it can be deduced that the constitution set for every Nigerian two basic ideals:

1. Living in unity and harmony as one indivisible and indissoluble nation under God.
2. The promotion of good governance and welfare of all persons in Nigeria, based on the principle of freedom, equality and justice for the consolidation of the unity of our people.

But it is most unfortunate that many a time, our political leaders ignore the letters of the constitution and take arbitrary decisions to suit their selfish purposes and desires. Decisions are taken at will without consulting the constitution, thereby making mockery of governance. The situation is not something to write home about. This made Francis Ogunmodede stress; *"The greatest problem in the practice of democracy in Nigeria today has to do with how political power and control can move and be enjoyed by one ethnic group after the other, if it is not to break up after all".*⁵

4.1.1 The Purpose of a Political Constitution

There is no social animal group, therefore, in which the leadership phenomenon is naturally more manifest than in the human group: families, villages, towns, and states. Leadership among humans, whether by nomination or by election, has a very positive significance. According to the veteran political theorists

and anthropologists, humans unlike the lower animals, act in view of realising purposes.⁶ Aristotle rightly states that “ every state is a community of some kind, and every community is established with a view to some good, for everyone acts in order to obtain that which they think good.”⁷ The ultimate purpose of politics pivots on how to manage or organise the affairs of a state for the common good. A. Appadorai, rightly points out that politics is concerned with the state and of the conditions essential to its existence and development.⁸ In the review of the book on Politics, Leadership and Development, Sam Amadi observed that “politics is the handmaid of leadership and development”⁹

According to Thomas Aquinas, “*that which is particular differentiates, while that which is common unites*”.¹⁰ The common good refers to the efforts individuals make for the attainment of those things that are necessary for man’s physical, mental and moral well being.¹¹ The Catholic Church states it clearly that;

The purpose of the state is the promotion of the general, political common good, which consists in the establishment of justice and order, the securing of domestic tranquility, the provision of common defence, the promotion of general welfare, and the ensuring of the blessings of liberty for all.¹²

“*The common good is a good to which all members of society have access, and from whose enjoyments no one can be easily excluded*’.¹³ In the view of Katrina Vanden Heuvel, common good can only be spoken of if it is orientated towards the concrete promotion of the welfare of people.

Yes, common good but only if it means economic dignity and social justice and the ending of corruption and the special privileges that have allowed the very richest to amass great fortunes while the vast majority of Americans struggle to make ends meet without any of the security of affordable health care, good jobs and a quality education. Common good if it means making the government more responsive to the needs of the majority of Americans. Common good if it means public investment in our people, in our infrastructure, in research and development that serves human needs. Common good, if it means political reform and making every person's vote count. Common good, if it means being a good neighbour to the world and a force for building common security and common property.¹⁴

"The realisation of the common good does not depend on the government of a state alone. It demands for "the responsibility of all to work towards the provision and realisation of the common good".¹⁵

The rationality of the common good calls on political office holders to engineer and organise the social mechanisms inevitable for the social good. If the common good is paramount, it underscores the fact that political positions are not meant to "create" demi-gods who instead of serving the expected intentions of their offices, must wait, in reverse, to be served by their subjects. The political leader is an elected or appointed servant of the people. The leaders constitute not only the functional brain-box of the given polity, but also the symbol of unity, peace and confraternity among the people. The government of any human community is chosen for the entire welfare of the community in

question. The people did not choose to enthrone dictators and oppressors over themselves, but those who through their creative leadership would establish environments for full human flourishing. The common good is paramount in every social set-up without which societies would be nothing but gangs of wolves, lions, tigers and vipers.

Politics then is not an overall egoistic profit-making adventure. Leadership is tied-up with governance – the art of conducting the activities of the state to their fruitful ends – the well being of each and every member of the state. The leader tasks himself/herself to see to the fulfillment of the dreams and visions of the human association, which placed him in power. The leader is a mandated servant of a group. The leader is supposed to have acquired the art of governance. Politics is the art of governing a society to the attainment of its ultimate goals. Leadership is thus tied with the moral responsibility of seeing to the total welfare of society. The leader is expected to have developed the spirit of self-sacrifice and fore-sightedness. He is supposed to be fatherly, non-discriminatory, protective and seen working assiduously for the material, moral and physical welfare of both the society and the individuals.

4.1.2 The Derailment of Common Good Politics

The politics of the common good got apparently twisted off-track by Machiavelli, who, in the 15th century, devalued the role of

morals in politics in order to project the realisation of individual interests at all costs. With Machiavelli, politics radically shifted from the virtuous pursuit of the common good to the utter attainment of the personal ambition of the politician and the means of achieving and holding on to power. In the view of Machiavelli, if a prince succeeds in establishing and maintaining his authority, the means will always be judged honourable and be approved by everyone.¹⁶

Machiavelli's conception of means-end relationship convinced him to insist that "the end justifies the means". Politics does not require being virtuous, what is paramount is the employment of all means possible to accomplish the purpose of the political leader in question. The political leader should adopt all means possible to remain in power – might is right.

The freedom and welfare of Nigerian citizens might surely have coloured the political efforts of our veteran leaders who fought and gained independence for the nation in 1960. Irrespective of ethnicity and separation threats, Nigeria has continued to exist. The military, legal, academic, industrial, commercial, health and civil sectors have continued to function till now. Nigeria has proven in many ways to be a strong force to reckon with both in Africa and beyond. Some instances can be pointed out where Nigeria has done creditably well especially in the area of sports and military services. Many Nigerians are proud

that in spite of it all, Nigeria has celebrated sixteen years of uninterrupted democracy. In her 49th anniversary, the former governor of Delta state, Emmanuel Uduaghan believes that Nigeria has made tremendous growth and development despite teething challenges confronting it as a nation.¹⁷

Uduaghan might find himself so much alone in his conception of the history of Nigeria as a nation. Majority of Nigerians, contrary to Uduaghan, rather believe that the trend in Nigerian politics has witnessed, with time, a swift shift from the politics of the common good outlined by the founding fathers of the nation to the Machiavellian political pretensions. It is a common view that modern Nigerian politicians have radically shifted from the ideals of politics mapped out by Zik, Awolowo and Tafawa Balewa to an unphilanthropic style of politics that is bedeviling the nation.¹⁸ The 1966 coup d'état in Nigeria revealed and ushered in a politics of power, of the Machiavellian picture, that has inflicted serious hard-healing ulcers on her body politic. Assuming the Machiavellian clothing, Nigerian politics has virtually become a 'do and die affair'. Heads have rolled in Nigeria in the bid to clinch and hang on to power irrespective of all odds. The passion to become Eze (Igwe), Oba, Sariki, Local Government Chairman, Governor, President or get Associate Ministerial posts have generated homicides and insecurity among those who call themselves brothers. At its forty ninth (49) anniversary, Nigeria,

which proudly calls herself the giant of Africa, is being worldwide described as a failed state.¹⁹ It is not without reason that contemporary Nigerians are disgusted with Nigeria's present political image. There is a strong desire for the rebranding of Nigeria's political strategies. No matter how we might pretend to defend Nigeria's social development, political analysts are well convinced that Nigeria's political road maps have atrophied. The furtherance of the common good, which objectively constitutes the hallmark of every constitution, has narrowed down into unrepentant egoism, looting and inter-ethnic hatred that have bedeviled Nigeria's social set-up. Since 1960, we have run a self-defacing politics that has brought Nigeria, the self-acclaimed giant of Africa, to her knees.

By all dimensions, Nigeria should be one of the most prosperous of the world's developing countries. Instead is one of the poorest. Its journey from independence to statehood reveals a chequered existence (...) ethnic and religious conflicts, political instability, wide spread official corruption, an ailing economy (and) other problems (...) on a scale incomparable in modern Africa.²⁰

The Machiavellian methodological option has bred self-imposed unpatriotic leaders, who truly run a might is right government. They converted politics from its altruistic objective to an egoistic investment enterprise. Having assumed a business-like structure, those who staked their money for any political post and who doggedly achieved their purpose, after deadly combats with

rivals, would surely not feel any obligation to the polity. The winner takes all. They take up the mantle of office to be served rather than serving the nation. They acquire by their victory reverential personalities. They feel by their positions that they have acquired an extra-ordinary divine nature that compels their subjects and rivals to feel inferior, incompatible and incomparable to them. They become after their "election" "gods" to those who "elected" them. They have no governance duty to the people, it is the people rather who have the obligation to serve and respect them as super human beings. Their victory does not call for responsibility and personal sacrifice, but opens-up new liberal avenues of economic affluence.

4.2 Political Thuggery and Rigging of Elections

The hallmark of every democratic culture and government is periodic elections. It could be in four, five or six years respectively depending on the constitutional provisions in any given country. In Nigeria, for example, elections are held every four years and due to the inordinate ambitions and deceits of the political class; it is seen as a 'do or die affair' and a 'must win' at all cost. This is to say that in Nigeria today, we have witnessed a great deal of politics marked with impunity, lawlessness, thuggery and massive rigging of elections. Nigeria as a nation is still struggling to get herself out of the woods politically.

The aim of politics is to make the lives of individuals as good as possible according to Bertrand Russell in his political idea but the above assertion is the opposite in Nigeria's political sphere, as our politicians have submerged morality to the lowest ebb of the political pyramids. Omoregbe in his work in ethics noted that Nigerians have been made to believe that politics and morality do not go together and that once a person starts politics, he ignores morality. Although it is widely believed that politics is a dirty game, but ideally, it is not rather the unscrupulous men made it seem or look dirty. Buttressing this claim, Omoregbe said:

We are made to believe that politics and morality do not go together, that once a person starts playing politics he must ignore morality. Hence, we often hear it said that "politics is a dirty game", by its nature, politics involves the use of immoral means. Thus Nigerian politicians have followed Machiavelli in removing morality from politics and in thinking that the best way to be successful in politics is to use immoral means...They have also subscribed to his view that..., there is nothing wrong in using immoral means to grab political power and retain it.²¹

The politicians have perfected the art of rigging, thuggery and other forms of electoral malpractices to the extent that winners emerge even in places where elections did not hold. And the number of votes recorded in some places is higher than the number of registered voters. Little wonder, John Odey in his book, this madness called Election, described it as "Electoral coup" and "political charade".

He laments further that Nigeria will not be a home “as long as politicians continue to turn political elections into a kind of civil war when young people are denied all decent opportunities and are conscripted into the burgeoning and money-spinning industry of political thuggery, where they kill and maim the so-called political opponents”.²² Later on, they set up election tribunal even though it has yielded some positive result; it is yet to measure up to the expectation of the masses. But the fundamental question is, how can one expect anything good from it since it was set up by the perpetrators themselves?

4.3 The Role of Deceit and Brutality

In Nigeria today, the game and practice of politics among politicians has been shrouded with deception, pretence and brutality apparently in obedience to the Machiavellian principles and teachings. This has made our political leaders to stop at nothing in their quest to satisfy and achieve their selfish desires for power. Machiavelli’s principle on the use of deceit in the art of governance is chronically looming large in the contemporary society. His political theory has eaten deep into our moral and spiritual fabrics. The implication of this theory is that morality has been relegated to the background in our life as rational beings. The contemporary politicians have resorted to the use of deceit and pretence as a political strategy to perpetuate themselves in power. This is in strict compliance to Machiavelli’s

recommendation to princes that they should as a matter of fact, use cruelty, perfidy, murder, or any other means provided if only they are used with sufficient intelligence and secrecy to reach the end.²³

It is because of this Machiavellian suggestion that contemporary leaders appear and seem to possess some fine qualities as being kind, generous, compassionate and even religious. Hence he should have plausible excuses to colour his bad faith. Greater lies are preferable to honesty in keeping promises. This is one of the imports of Machiavellianism in contemporary politics.

Furthermore, Machiavelli advocated for a life of deceit in order to be a good ruler. A ruler should not keep to his words always, more especially when it does not favour him. Hence he says; *"a prudent ruler cannot and must not honour his word when it places him at a disadvantage and when the reasons for which he made his promise no longer exists... no prince ever lacked good excuses to colour one's actions and to be a great liar and deceiver... the deceiver will always finds someone ready to be deceived"*.²⁴

From the above, Machiavelli means therefore that as a ruler, deceitful acts contribute immensely to one's political progress. It is obvious that the effect of deceit in the art of governance is that, the generality of the people would be

deceived beyond limit. Cynis according to Machiavelli deceived his nephew by killing him with his cohorts to usurp his position.

The quality of cruel behaviour (brutality) is another lesson from Machiavellianism. The word cruelty, perfectly understood is always a negative term, no one can be justified in any cruel action no matter how good the resultant effect is. Machiavelli distinguishes between good and bad cruelty. He demonstrates this more elaborately by using Agathocles as an example who, owing to his cruelty, was able to hold all conspiracies against his enemies. He posits;

I believe that here is a question of cruelty used well or badly. We can say that cruelty is used well... when it is employed once for all, and one's safety depends on it, and then it is not persisted in but as far as possible turned to the good of one's subjects. Cruelty badly used is that which although infrequent to start with, as time goes on, rather than disappearing, grows in intensity. Those who used the first method can, with divine and human assistance, find some means of consolidating their position, as did Agathocles: The others cannot possibly stay in power.²⁵

Machiavelli, in the above, distinguishes between bad and good cruelty, but the word cruel from all indications connotes evil. In any case, Machiavellianism is an arid and absurd doctrine. Somebody must be stepped on or deceived for someone else to rise up. An evil means can never lead to a good end. If it does,

logic is falsified. One simply cannot do evil in order to achieve good results, even in logical terms, no positive conclusion could validly and soundly follow from negative premises. Hence cruelty and deceit in their vitriolic nature connote evil and therefore must be violated.

4.4 The Exclusion of Objective Morality

The ethico-political dimension of man has offered an explanation for the inseparability of Ethics and politics. Though politics strives towards maintaining order by giving to everybody his rightful due but it is not within its competence to say: this is your right or this is not your right!. It is at this point that ethics comes in to direct politics. Thus politics has ethical principles as basis for its actions. It is ethics that checks the abuse of political power and authority. In this regard, Onwuanibe says; *"any government divorced from morality will surely fall. Immorality is the genesis of the ruin of any political authority because the former permeates the latter"*.²⁶

Following the above line of thought, it means that the state cannot exercise her function creditably without recourse to morality. The citizens only share in the morality of the state to which they belong because the whole is always prior to the parts and the citizens are of necessity integral parts of the whole which is the state.

The relationship between Ethics and politics should be in such a manner that the latter does nothing without appealing to the former. Ethics determines what, where, how and when politics should act. Politics left alone cannot effect the realisation of the cravings of the state. This is to say that politics and morality go hand in hand. And the two should always work together to ensure the realisation of the common good of the citizens in the state.

However, the emergence of the great Italian political thinker Niccolo Machiavelli in the scene of politics marked a great turning point in the history of ethics. Ethics now assumed a new meaning which is derogatory in nature, a discipline that should not be associated with politics because it obstructs and hampers political progress. The prince for Machiavelli should be callous and to maintain his power, he should not pay any attention to the morality of his actions.

Machiavelli himself affirmed this when he said, "*indeed, there is no surer way of keeping possession than by devastation, whoever becomes the master of a city accustomed to freedom and does not destroy it may expect to be destroyed himself*".²⁷

From the above citation, one readily sees that the type of politics Machiavelli is advocating for is one of which power is the Alpha and the Omega, as far as progress in the state is concerned.

For Machiavelli, politics should be seen from a realistic point of view. And to look at politics from a realistic view point during

the renaissance to which Machiavelli belong is how to acquire, maintain and increase political power. Hence, to ensure the effectiveness of his course, there should be no regard as to the morality of the method employed. So he says, "*... rulers should not be limited by the common ethics, if they are determined to hold and increase their power, and he advices them to apply scheming and duplicity in their dealing with both subjects and rivals*".²⁸

In fact, the moral teaching of Machiavelli is apparently the worst area of his tutelage that has attracted to him the severest criticism. He has a lax attitude towards morality. For him, the means to political advancements and successes and that which places man on the conspicuous power stands, measures morality.

He writes; "*...political behaviour should be determined not by an appeal to Christian morality or private conscience but reason for action*".²⁹ Morality is here restricted to subjectivism, whereby the individual's perception and interpretation of good and bad is extolled. Hence, the real testimony of Machiavelli as regards his attitude towards morality is epitomised in the following words of Cassier; "*...Machiavelli contain the most immoral things and that he has no scruples about recommending to the ruler all sorts of deception or perfidy and cruelty is incontestable*".³⁰ Incontestable also is his inability to dichotomise between the principles of moral goodness and moral badness.

4.5 Autocratic Governance

Machiavelli was keenly interested in the form of government and the state for him, is supposed to be a self sufficient entity capable of establishing formidable backbone for state craft which includes the politics of effective internal control with ardour for external invincibility. Machiavelli therefore thought that no weakling could carry out this task of unification, stabilisation and invincibility without being a superman in Nietzschean sense or an autocrat in his own sense. Machiavelli's strategies of gaining and keeping political control is his notion of a ruler as an absolute monarch and legislator. This is monarchism and it is unlimitedly extended to all forms of governance, be it local, state, federal, republic, principality and sovereignty. At any rate he advocated for an autocrat, imposing ruthlessly his authority on his subjects and strongly resisting all internal and foreign dominations. A prince for him needs no rival.

Another outstanding point in Machiavellianism is that no just or unjust consideration should divert the prince from being tenaciously and absolutely an autocratic ruler. On this Machiavelli opines;

The prince who establishes himself in a province whose laws and language differ from those of his own people, ought also to make himself the head and protection of his feebler neighbours and endeavour to weaken the stronger and must see by

no accident shall any other stranger as powerful as himself find an entrance her.³¹

To this end, Machiavelli maintains that the ruler should not give room for the emergence of any rival authority in the state. He should make sure that his power is absolute in the state. Finally, Machiavelli has a pragmatic and utilitarian approach to political issues. Indeed every political action should be only with its practicability and usefulness to the fortunate polity of the prince. All his concern is for the ruler to expediently remain an absolute law maker and an autocrat.

With the abysmal failure of the parliamentary system of government via the first republic, Nigeria was forced to embark on a military dictatorship occasioned by the abortive revolutionary spirit of late Major Chukwuma Nzeogwu. Nigeria was in the highly sensitive military laboratory for good twenty nine years. This military incursion took place between 1966 – 1979 and 1983 – 1999 respectively, without arriving at any worthy hypothesis not to talk of formulation of theory. Moreover it is sad to note that the military built and destroyed more than what they built in the country. In view of this, Emeka Odumegwu Ojukwu lamented, *“the coming of the military into Nigeria politics entrenched indiscipline in Nigeria and everything we are suffering today can be traced to that indiscipline”*.³² Therefore, the twenty nine years of military experiment greatly affected and imprisoned the essence of this country. At this juncture, this work is of the view

that the military has no moral right again to meddle into the political affairs of this country for they are not trained to govern.

4.5.1 Ibrahim Babangida's Regime

It is an indisputable fact that Machiavellianism is most conspicuously the growing trend of African contemporary politics which Nigeria is involved. Little wonder, this has made most of the Nigerian leaders today to see politics as a "dirty game". And in line with this philosophy, Nigeria has become a place where the meaning of politics has been altered, the end and purpose of government completely altered. Also, there is a great devaluation of human rights. Infact the dignity of the human person has been slaughtered on the altar of power acquisition and retention where the use of force, survival of the fittest, deceit and total disregard of morality reigned as the rule of law.

Babangida was among the past presidents that deprived the nation of many good things especially on the human right issue, one may call him an abuser of human rights. He greatly devalued the distinguished classification of human rights which includes political economic, social, religious and cultural rights for the sake of power acquisition.

Ibrahim Babangida was an outstanding Machiavellian apologist. Babangida's regime recorded great mishap in the country's affair which the Tell magazine recorded thus; *"there is no leader that has been credited with so great a capacity for*

mischief, for evil as Babangida".³³ In the same vein also, the Tell magazine also recorded thus, *"this administration is deficit in honesty, deficit in honour, deficit in truth. The only thing it has in surplus is saying something and doing something else"*.³⁴

Babangida's regime cannot be credited with anything good. He was the one that started the issue of "419" business and even went to the extent of destroying the country's economy. The worst of it all, he crowns his words with deceit and lies. With regard to this, the Tell magazine has this to say; *"it has now got to a stage that when government says good morning, people will look out four times to ascertain the time of the day before they reply"*.³⁵ In conclusion, one can see that, the so called Babangida did more harm than good to this fragile nation.

4.5.2 Sani Abacha's Regime

Sani Abacha was once a president of this fragile Nation called Nigeria. Sani Abacha of blessed memory was an outstanding Machiavellian just like Ibrahim Babangida. Abacha's regime recorded the most ugly incidents that happened in Nigeria ever since the country gained her independence. Morality is forgotten, justice is relegated to the background, human rights and dignity was dragged to the mud. Indiscriminate assassination, victimisation, and intimidation were the order of the day.

Meaningful progress becomes a mere concept. Instability is whole-heartedly welcomed as an essential quality of the state.

Insecurity of lives and properties become so common a phenomenon to create anxiety. "Financial drainage" replaced embezzlement for the latter is too elementary to qualify for the gross mismanagement obtainable in public offices. Ritual killing and drug trafficking is no longer news.

The late tyrant used his authority and power as the president to intimidate people. For him "might is right". This he exhibited when he tried to succeed himself after five years of military rule. He wanted to come back as a civilian president but the pressure was much on him, and unfortunately for him, he died thereby not actualising his selfish dream. For Abacha, the Nigerian citizens are toys to be manipulated as he sees them as stumbling blocks in his administration. And so it is better to keep away from the citizens so as to succeed in whatever goal he wants to achieve. He adopted the Machiavellian principle, "the End justifies the Means". *The Tell magazine of June 13, 1994 reported thus; "socially, there is insecurity of life and property across the nation, corruption at the exception. Culturally, Nigerians are being made to mistrust themselves. Our unity in diversity is being manipulated into diversity in disunity".*³⁶

On the area of politics, it also reported thus;

Politically, the nation suffers from hopelessness, lack of direction, lack of unity of purpose and the value of cohesion. Economically, the value of Naira is at its lower ebb in the international

market, and domestically its purchasing capacity has been abysmally eroded. The industrial productivity, unemployment is alarming... Nigeria is now an unrepentant beggar nation.³⁷

4.5.3 Olusegun Obasanjo's Regime

The Nigerian nation was twice under the leadership of Olusegun Obasanjo both as a military and a civilian leader. His former and latter administration were not far from Machiavellian system of governance. Just like what Machiavelli said in his book titled the Prince. He says thus; *"the prince must renounce good or it will prove his own ruin. A prudent prince cannot and ought not to keep word except when he can do it without injury to himself. The prince must be a lion but he must also know how to play the fox"*.³⁸

Olusegun Obasanjo used deceitful means to achieve his political ambition. Looking critically at the present situation of this nation, one can easily conclude that Machiavellianism is still the order of the day. Tribalism is still in progress, embezzlement is still there, absolute power control is also there. Injustice and abuse of human rights are still the order of the day.

Obasanjo may have read and digested the political ideologies of Machiavelli. Firstly, he came into power and claimed to be "born again", while he is not, this means, he used in order to win the hearts of Christians. As if that was not enough, he banned the importation of frozen foods like chicken, turkey so

that the ones in his farm (OTA Farm) can be sold. Thirdly, he went to some foreign countries and deceived Nigerians in Diaspora that Nigeria is now a "Paradise" which is not true at all.

In fact, the country's economy was in shamble, how can the president of a country keep deceiving the citizenry by not being open to them, instead he lies so as to achieve whatever thing he wants to achieve. Obasanjo has no credit at all, reason being that upon all the money that came inside this country everyday is enough to grant every children in this country free education starting from primary school to university level. The only thing he was good at was to travel from country to country without having the interest of his followers at heart.

Olusegun Obasanjo's administration can be aptly characterised with the following, deceit and brutality in the sense that he deceived people but claimed to be innocent while he is not. There is also the issue of human rights abuse because there is nothing like freedom of the press; certain incidents which should be reported are not carried out, freedom of speech, and so many others.

Finally, Obasanjo should change his name to Machiavelli because Machiavelli was the only political theorist that interest him very well. In summary, Nigerian politics is one of moral indifference. It is one that have not only swallowed hook, line, and sinker the Machiavellian principle of "the end justifies the

means” but also accepts that the means is good insofar as it maintains the leader. The problem is not in our star but in us. At any rate, a leader worthy of the name, will not only eschew Machiavellianism but should have as priority the protection of his country together with her citizens against both internal and external injustices. The eventual collapse of Nigeria as a nation is imminent if she continues to excel in Machiavellianism as an ideology.

It is on record that all the previous administrations and the current ones in Nigeria are all partners in the practice and application of Machiavellian principles or tenets in the running of the Nigerian project. These immoral attitudes to governance by our political leaders have continued to impact negatively in the political growth of the Nigerian state, thereby making decent leadership impossible and unrealisable.

4.6 The Non-Relevance of the Citizenry

Machiavellianism today has given rise to master/slave relationship among the contemporary politicians (leaders) and their subjects. They have thrown into the abyss, the existential “I-thou” relationship in the words of Gabriel Marcel and Martin Buber. The very fact of the absolute power of Monarchism in the state has made the ruler to use his subjects to his advantage. Provided a good end is achieved, the means no longer matters. In

this sense, the rights of the citizens are thereby considered non-relevant in the state.

Machiavelli ill-advised the ruler to be using people for his own advantage. This can be seen clearly where he says that a prince must not necessarily honour his words especially when they places him at a disadvantage. Due to the fact that citizens have been considered largely irrelevant, their rights have been deprived in all ramifications. This will give an insight into the many reasons why citizen's right were deprived and denied them. Machiavellianism upholds the use of force, survival of the fittest and deceit as the rule of law. Human rights have been tampered with and violated in the present Nigerian state. The dignity of the human person has been slaughtered on the altar of power acquisition.

The issue of human rights deprivation has been so fumbled with today that the developing nations record the worst abuse of human right. A review of such leaders in Africa like the inglorious regime of Field Marshal Idi Amin of Uganda, Ferdinand Marcus of Philippines, Emperor Bokassa of Central Africa, Charles Taylor of Liberia, Sani Abacha of Nigeria and lately Nkurunziza of Burundi reveals the worst of human rights abuses.

People are said to be in mental slavery when they are considered non-relevant to the society to which they belong, thereby having no access to their society. Their contributions in

the societal matters are over-ruled. They are said to be in bondage where every sub-human conditions are meted out to the citizens by the so-called leaders. Under such situations, the citizens are frequently abused, butchered, assassinated and often times illegally detained without sufficient reasons. To this effect, the classification of human rights as out-lined by the United Nations which included: political economic, social and cultural rights are devalued.

In a situation like this, the dignity of the human person and access to an adequate standard of living, social security and his opinions in the state are not being honoured. Therefore, the political leaders and apostles of Machiavellianism should respect the dignity and worth of the human person at all times.

Endnotes

1. Pope John XXIII, Peace on Earth. P. 4.
2. I. M. Onyeocha, *Idealism, Politics and Nation-Building: The Nigerian Experience*, (Owerri: Assumpta Press, 1994), P. 111.
3. Nigerian National Anthem
4. Constitution of Federal Republic of Nigeria, (1999), P. 15.
5. J. O. Oguejiofor, (ed), *Power Shift in African Democracy*, (Enugu: Delta Publication, 2004), P. 326.
6. St. Thomas Aquinas. I q. 44 art 4c
7. Ibid., 1252a, 1
8. A. Appadorai, *The substance of Politics* (Mandras: Oxford University Press, 1975), P. 4.
9. Sam Amadi, "Politics Leadership and Development in Nigeria"
www.kwenu.com/publications/...amadisambookreview.htm,
2008
10. De regno, Lib, I, cap. 1,81-84.
11. E. E Amaku, *The Ontological Foundations of Human Dignity in the Thought of Thomas Aquinas*, (Enugu: Victojo Production Services 2009), P. 200
12. Karl H. Peschke, *Christian Ethics*, (Bangalore: theological Pubs. In India, 2004), P. 609.
13. <http://www.scu.edu/ethics/practicus/decision/commongood>,
1992
14. Katrina V. Heuvel, "A Politics of the Common Good",
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/commongood>, 2006.

15. F. O. C. Njoku, *Philosophy in Politics, Law, and Democracy*, (Enugu: Claretian Communications, 2002), P. 40.
16. Anthony I. Ejeziem, *Machiavellism in Nigerian Politics*, (Enugu: the Potter Creations Coy, 2006), P. 60.
17. *Daily Champion*, Tuesday, October 6, 2009, P. 27
18. *Daily Sun*, Wednesday, 12, 2009, P. 43.
19. *Daily Champion*, Tuesday, October 6, 2009, P. 30.
20. *Daily Sun*, Friday, September 11, 2009, P. 41.
21. Joseph .I. Omoregbe, *Ethics: A Systematic and Historical Study*, (Lagos: JERPL, 1998), p.26.
22. John Odey, *after the madness called election 2003*, (Enugu: snap press, 2003), P. 36.
23. G. H. Sabine, *A History of Political Theory*, (New York: Hary H. and Company 1950), P. 327.
24. N. Machiavelli, *The Prince*, (Chicago: Bantam Classics Books 2003), P. 55.
25. *Ibid*; P. 65
26. R. Onwuanibe, (Unpublished Lecture on Political Philosophy, B.M.S. Ikot Ekpene), 1989.
27. N. Machiavelli, *Op. Cit.*, P. 16.
28. Machiavelli, *New Standard Encyclopedia*, (Chicago: Standard Educational Corp, 1970), P. 493.
29. O. Thomson, *Political Ideals*, U.S.A: (Penguin Books Ltd, 1982), P. 24.
30. Cassier, E., *The Triumph of Machiavellianism and its Consequences in the History of Political Thought*, (New Jersey: Macmillan Publishers, 1969), P. 139.

31. N. Machiavelli, Op. Cit., P. 11.
32. E. O. Ojukwu, Because I am Involved, (Ibadan: spectrum Books Limited, 1989), P.43.
33. Tell Magazine, April 26, 1993, P. 22.
34. Ibid P. 15
35. Ibid P. 16
36. Ibid P. 22
37. Tell Magazine, June 13, 1994, P. 26
38. N. Machiavelli, Op. Cit., P. 48

CHAPTER FIVE

THE SEARCH FOR A SUSTAINABLE NIGERIAN POLITY.

The Nigerian nation is blessed with great providence but unfortunately has not fared well in politics and governance. Obviously, this was as a result of the criminal, immoral, corrupt, inept and inhuman leadership styles of our politicians. Little wonder, the foremost Nigerian Novelist Chinua Achebe raised an alarm and insisted that the Major problem with Nigeria is bad leadership. As a military head of state in 1976, Olusegun Obasanjo while addressing African diplomats in France once said that where a leader cannot lead, followers hardly follow.

Today, politicians kill one another simply because they seem to constitute obstacles on their way to getting money and political power. Truth telling, justice, honesty and sincerity which were inseparable moral principles that guided and cared for our togetherness have gone into oblivion. The place of equity and fairness as demanded of any leader is considered unprofitable. It therefore becomes imperative that every thoughtful Nigerian should rise up today and reject these habits which cripple our common aspiration and inhibits our chances of becoming a model country. After all, 'the man dies in him who fails to speak out in the face of tyranny' says Wole Soyinka.

In the face of a culpable failure in our political system, shall we fold our hands as a nation and apportion blame or see this

failure as insurmountable? The answer is emphatically no. Oliver Goldsmith, in stressing the possibility of our nation rising to the apex of political proficiency says, "our greatest failure is not in never failing but in refusing to rise anytime we fail". On his part, Achebe aroused our hope and the assurance of our nation becoming great politically when he says, "what I am saying is that Nigeria is not beyond change. I am saying that Nigerian can change today if she discovers leaders who have the will, the ability and vision"¹

Undoubtedly, our great nation can be changed for better. But this change mostly bothers on leadership, so we need leaders with impeccable integrity. In the actualisation of this onerous task, some concepts will be employed as guiding principles. These concepts are as follows:

5.1 The Rule and Supremacy of the Law

This means that nobody should be above the law. There should be no discrimination in the application of the laws. The same laws should apply to all persons. The law should not be circumvented to favour any person whether rich or poor, young or old, king or servant, literate or illiterate. That means the law is a respecter of no man.

The meaning of the phrase "Rule of Law" was defined by A. V. Dicey to mean the absence of arbitrary rule or government. That is, the government should rule the citizens according to the

constitution and laws of the country. And that the government itself should be subject to the law. According to Dicey's definition of the Rule of Law, complaints by the citizens against the government should be subjected to investigation by the court and under the same legal rules which apply to the citizens. Furthermore, this means that the laws of any given country are supreme. This is to say the laws are binding on all persons including the state authorities. There is no sacred cow at all. Also the law of the country being supreme determines whether a citizen should be punished or not and if it is on the affirmative, what proportion of the punishment rather than punitiveness should be imposed and inflicted on the innocent citizen by the wicked state authorities. The rule of law is one of the characteristic features of modern democracies. In essence, the concept of the rule of law means that the legal and social norms of the society shall control the conduct of all the citizens – both high and low, both the ruler and the ruled must be subject to the provisions of the laws of the land. The government of the society shall not be subject to the emotions and prejudice, whims and caprice of any individual or group of persons. It further means that no man, however great his position or status, is above the law.²

The concept of the rule of law further implies that the main arms of government – the Legislature, the Executive and the

Judiciary – and its organs and agencies are bound by the law of the land. Oputa has outlined the implications of the rule of law as follows:

The State is subject to the law and not above the law. The government should respect the rights of the individual citizen under the law and provide for their enforcement. Judges should be guided by the law, protect and enforce it without fear or favour and resist any encroachment, by government, political parties, or any other concentration of power, on their independence to administer law and justice. Lawyers should preserve the independence of their profession, assert and defend the rights of the citizens under the law and ensure that any citizen accused of crime is given a fair hearing.³

5.2 Respect for Fundamental Human Dignity and Rights

The right of the citizens must be entrenched in the constitution. Some of these rights are right to life, right to freedom of movement and right to freedom of expression. All these rights are basically inalienable rights of the citizens, known as the fundamental human rights.

When these rights are violated, the citizens are permitted and ordered by the constitutions of the country to seek redress from the law court without any interference. According to Osy Nwebo, *"the rule of law presupposes the instinct for liberty and it is this instinct which leads us to believe that free will and not force should be the true basis of government. For when the rule of law is force to abdicate then the rule of force usurps the vacant throne and what a tragedy"*.⁴

What manifest good leadership or government is its conscious application of the full meaning of the concept of Rule of Law. Nature has equipped man with the powers of reasoning, volition, and moral sense which constitute the natural basis of man's personal dignity, personal freedom and moral responsibility. Among serious philosophers these vital faculties and natural endowments are no longer debatable. That man is a rational being is evidenced by his capacity to grasp the links between cause and effect; that he is endowed with free-will is confirmed by his ability to choose between alternative courses or to abstain from choice without compulsion. And that he is a being endowed with moral sense (or conscience) is amply testified by his natural sensitivity to moral standards of human conduct (that is sense of propriety and impropriety, of fairness or unfairness, of justice or injustice, etc).

These natural attributes of man require that every human being be recognised as a subject (and never an object) of rights and duties; and "as centres of valuation, decision and choice"⁵. There lies the dignity of every human being, the sacredness of human life and the consequent inviolability of his natural rights. The 1999 Nigerian constitution as amended like many other modern constitutions and the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights of 10th December, 1948 are in accord with their recognition of the dignity and rights of the human person.⁶

5.3 The Development of Moral Character.

The development of moral character consists in the development of man's potentials for moral goodness and excellence. This is achieved through the education of conscience, the training of the will by the practice of such virtues as courage, temperance, prudence and justice, and through the practice of self-control and the regulation of the irregular passions and emotions of man.

Excellence and strength of moral character are essentially characterised by clear and enlightened conscience, resolute moral consistency, strength of will-power, moral courage to live and stand by the truth and by one's convictions and a sound sense of honesty and justice.

The importance of sound moral character can hardly be overemphasised. It is the indubitable criterion of the good life and the veritable fountain-head of other authentic human values.⁷ In personal life, it is the source of success and good neighbourliness. In social life, it is the basis of and the guarantee for discipline and public morality in society. Social growth and progress can only be predicated on the assured positive moral qualities of the citizens. As Sharif rightly remarked: *"for the true growth of a society, there is need for the development of moral character. Lack of moral character marked the decline and its presence the rise of all*

*great civilisations. When Greek civilisation was declining, Greek intellect, was still the highest in the world*¹⁸.

In contemporary Nigeria, public morality is in a state of crisis. The need for a sound ethical regeneration of the nation is widely, deeply and urgently felt; and therefore all hands must be on deck to find lasting solutions to this serious national moral predicament.

5.3.1 Patriotism

Patriotism comes from the latin word, 'patria' which means father-land. So patriotism as a quality of citizenship means love of and devotion to father-land. The test of true love in ordinary human relations is the degree of service and self-sacrifice exhibited. In a like manner, the measure of one's patriotism is one's service, sacrifices and contribution to one's country, in whatever capacity and position one find himself.

Patriotism is therefore characterised by the spirit of service to one's country and the willingness to defend and promote her legitimate interests and values. In a developing nation like Nigeria, the need for dynamic patriotism is obvious. Its importance is acknowledged in the national pledge which requires all citizens to serve Nigeria with all their strength and to defend her honour and glory.

In the name of patriotism, mature citizenship would require all citizens,

- a. To contribute their honest services for the growth and welfare of the country;
- b. To promote the good name and national image of the country;
- c. To refrain, at home and abroad from all acts capable of weakening the nation or tarnishing her image;
- d. And to discharge their civic and legitimate responsibilities as and at when due.

There lies the sort of dynamic patriotism which Nigeria as a developing polity requires of her citizens. Growth in patriotism, it must be pointed out, is the measure of citizenship. Meaningful commitment to unity and to worthwhile and satisfying national goals will not fail to generate patriotism or the spirit of love and dedication to the aspirations and interest of the fatherland. To nurture the spirit of patriotism, our educational institutions must be able to convince both the young and the old that the Nigerian nation is of relevant and substantial significance in their lives, represents and stands for values worthy of emulation. Pious repetition of pledges and admonitions ritualistically administered by the ruling elite cannot generate true patriotism among the citizenry.⁹ The educational system and our institutions have an arduous task here to perform.

Education is the most fundamental and vital aspect of social engineering and the husbanding of human resources. Education

seeks to refine man by developing his potentials and equipping him to live a meaningful, productive and responsible life in society. In the light of the above, much still remains to be done in terms of up-dating our attitude to education, of reviewing the system and of educational expansion. It is the view of this work, therefore, that one of the vital functions of the educational system is the inculcation of ethically and socially desirable values for the achievement of social order. Here in Nigeria, as a young and developing democracy, such values must be able to meet the ethical, spiritual, social and political requirements and aspirations of the citizens.

5.3.2 Constitutionalism

This is a belief in constitutional government. This concept propagates the idea of an existing government and its subjects to do everything according to the dictates of the constitution of the land and not by passion, self-will and the order of the powers that be.

The concept is diametrically opposed to the erroneous belief of might is right. For Chukwudifu Oputa, "*the instinct for justice leads us to believe that right is right and that might is wrong and that right and not might should be the basis of society*".¹⁰ By this, any act by the leadership which questions that constitutionality of the law is ipso facto arbitrary and unjust.

5.4 Free and Fair Election

Coup d'état is an arbitrary way of creating a government, and any rulership that emerges by this crude and brutish way is as a matter of fact a 'defacto' government. After all, what is a government? It is a group of people who are responsible for controlling a country or a state. Now what matters in the above definition is the word "responsible". No one has a responsibility without it being given to him. By this, no military "government" is given the responsibility to rule or control the state but their duty is constitutionally to defend the state. So any military government by contravening the constitutionality of the law is factually unjust.

The word 'government' is meaningful and sensible when it is applied to a democratically elected civilian leader. Government has to do with responsibility and responsibility goes with mandates. No military "government" is constitutionally mandated to rule. While democratically elected civilian leader presupposes a government. Military "leadership" is meaningful when it applies to the word "regime" because regime is a government not fairly elected or constituted. The only democratic way of enthroning a civilian government is by election. For election is the foundation of any civilian government and David in the Bible in Psalm 11:3, says if the foundations be destroyed what can the righteous do". The strongness and greatness of any building is determined by its foundation, so it is to any government. The way to ensure a

formidable foundation of any civilian rule/government is by free and fair election. Free and fair election refer to one conducted in an atmosphere devoid of harassment, intimidation and other coercive means in order to bend the will of the voters and according to constitutional procedures. In this type of election, all electoral vices are eliminated; the will of majority of voters prevails. Candidates who did not win in the election are never imposed on the voters in a free and fair election. But before any election is adjudged free and fair, there must first be an election. Election is the process through which people choose those who would represent them in government by voting.

The sustainability of democracy in our country depends so much on free and fair elections and the respect for the will of our people. Quite often, the Nigerian nation has witnessed massive civil unrest that even threatened its stability before, during and after elections.

The soul of democracy is the freedom people have to choose their leaders. But if this freedom is denied them through imposition of leaders, then this subverts the will of the people. It therefore becomes imperative that the sanctity of the people's votes must be preserved and respected at all times to ensure stability and meaningful development in Nigerian polity. Our electoral laws should be continuously amended until we can devise an electoral process that is simple and fraud-proof to

ensure free and fair election. Conducting all elections in one day will also create a more conducive environment for free and fair elections. And severe penalties should be prescribed for electoral law violations. This will help the people regain confidence in the electoral process. The Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) must be made truly independent in terms of appointments of the members of the commission and funding.

5.4.1 Separation of Power

After a successful free and fair election by which a civilian government emerges to rule, the power of such government should not be centrally concentrated. There is need for separation of power which will inhibit the absolutisation of naked power exhibition which result to abuse of power.

The doctrine of separation of power is credited to a French political philosopher known as Baron Montesquieu (1689 - 1755) published in his book entitled 'The Spirit of the Law'.

This doctrine states that the three governmental powers, namely, the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary should not be exercised by the same body of persons. They must be separated in both function and personnel. This is to allow for efficiency in administration and prevent the misuse of power. The application of this doctrine is one way of ensuring the protection and liberty of the citizenry. With this, the chances of tyranny or dictatorship will be reduced to the barest minimum. Without any

iota of doubt, when these concepts and doctrines are fully contextualised in the Nigerian body polity, it will serve as a formidable pillar against the continued spread of Machiavellianism.

5.5 Recovering the Nigerian Political Track

Machiavellian politics has inflicted deadly wounds on Nigeria. In recovering our political track, firstly, it demands a profound sense of shame, one of the strong distinguishing factors between man and the animals. Nigeria should feel ashamed that she has not played her political role well enough since independence. Indeed, there is no reason why she should not apologise to other African countries and the whole world for her backward march since her history. World leaders have without regret boycotted visiting Nigeria because of Nigeria's reproachable political canvas. Obama's case attests to this fact. Self consciousness awakened by the sense of shame should inspire the nation to a more responsible effort to salvage her lost image.

The historical predicament of the black races should constitute the backbone of Nigeria's political energy. We should not have easily forgotten our international history and image as a black race. Black Africans were once enslaved and categorised as a race a little higher than the chimpanzees, pre-historic, pre-logical, without art, technology, and incapable of any sort of remarkable development. We should have tasked ourselves to

prove the Whiteman wrong since our liberation from imperialism. Nigeria should lead in developing the philosophy of Negritude, a certain kind of existential resilience that encourages the black race to assert her image equally like any other race in the world.

The fifty four years of independence should have shaped out a polity in which every individual is proud of being a Nigerian. We should stop imagining that our true homeland is in the United States of America, or in any part of Europe. The spirit of nationalism should be expressed in our philanthropic attitudes, and in our unrelenting pursuits of common goals. We hardly see the Nigerian flag produced in T-shirts forms or even as shirts, as it is the case with other countries. The spirit of nationalism should synergise the common effort of seeing to the development of every cranny of Nigeria. Unpatriotism is a serious disservice to our collective image as a nation.

Proper Education is an inevitable prerequisite for establishing a political system that not only promotes the common good, but also capable of defending and asserting the dignity of the black race in the world. Our frontline political leaders should demonstrate that they are thoroughly groomed in politics and can favourably compete worldwide in political matters. Ignorant leaders have the likelihood of committing heinous mistakes capable of leading nations into inexplicable troubles. Francis Bacon is known for saying that education is power (*cognitio est*

potestas). Grassroot disseminated education on the value of the common good and the necessity of a collective effort towards its realisation strengthens properly motivated political enterprises. The history and objectives of Nigeria as a nation should inform the educational enterprise at all levels. The rule of law should colour our sense of justice. The spirit of unity, confraternity and co-habitation and the essence of leadership should be mandatory in the classrooms, inform seminar topics and conferences.

What everybody has regularly decried is the bane of Machiavellian leadership in Nigeria. Selfish and uninformed leadership is known to be the product of the vices of the looting of public goods, marginalisation, nepotism, tribalism, cheating, poor salaries, political thuggery, kidnapping, crippled economy, jaundiced industry, eclipse of the educational systems, poor communication systems, lack of veritable nationalism, poor sense of Nigeria's international image, the problem of harnessing God-given natural and human resources. Egoistic politics has brought Nigeria on her knees and this is the view of the *Announcer Express*, which writes:

History is replete with so many actors on leadership stages of all parts of the world that came from the altar of Machiavelli and crashed. Their names are not good enough for whistling today. Yet the same mistakes they made and crashed are being made by some living puppets of the selfish power elite in Nigeria. The ultimate warning is nothing good can come from evil desires. Raping the will of the people for any reason cannot return positive reward.¹¹

Patriotic and visionary leaders who have sense of shame about the image of the black race world-over, and who are aggrieved that Nigeria, despite its enormous resources, is at the back-door of universal developments, would work hard to prove the worth of the blackman and to defend the integrity of their fatherland. These are the sort of leaders Nigeria has lacked right from the historical coup d'état of 1966. We need leaders who love Nigeria as Nigeria and who are ready to see it grow like any other civilised nations. This is where we should be careful allowing those with double nationalities to pilot the affairs of the nation. They would surely be doing us disservice in the country to the crude swelling of their oversea accounts.

Envisioned politics would re-evaluate and harmonise exaggerated salary scales through which devilish politicians loot public accounts; enforce accountability at all levels, fight corruption in all its shapes and forms, promote freedom of the press, create proper ambient for commercial enterprises, establish solid industries for employment opportunities, give room for developmental purposes.

Solidly re-strategising Nigeria's politics seriously implies that the citizens must never allow politicians to do whatever they like in office and get away with it. In any legitimate polity, the people are the sovereign. The people are obliged to resist and rise against unjust rulership. Eye-service politics leads Nigeria to

nowhere. Supporting unjust leadership for personal benefits suffocates national development. We must join forces in condemning the unjust and supporting the right for collective wellbeing.

The undeniable fact is that Machiavellianism, selfishness, unpatriotism and inter-ethnicism and hatred detracted Nigerian's political map. Scepticism about the resolution of these political vices has compelled many to predict the breaking-up of Nigeria before 2015. For John Onaiyekan, we do not need a prophet to tell us that Nigeria would breakup.¹² According to Mike Oberabor; *"why Nigeria is failing is that our politicians are not serving the god of democracy (...) but without basic and fundamental electoral reforms before 2011 elections, only God knows what will happen in this country. I am seeing violent breakup of this country, if the elections are not properly conducted"*.¹³

Positivists think that despite all, Nigeria's political system can be rebranded. Breaking-up might not be the best option, what is most important is to work for the best for Nigeria during elections. Those who love Nigeria and want Nigeria to compete with the rest of the world in all honest development should be accorded the opportunity to shepherd the affairs of the nation. Without good leaders, the common good is merely a political dream, I conclude with Yunus Ustaz Usman statement; *"the Problem is that those at the corridors of power in their heart of hearts don't believe that they've come to serve the people but to serve their pockets and their stomachs. Anybody who tells you it's any other problem is lying. The moment they divorce themselves from this, they would now be leaders"*.¹⁴

Endnotes

1. C. Achebe, *The trouble with Nigeria*, (Enugu: fourth Dimension publication company Ltd, 1998), P. 2.
2. A. L. Goodhart, *The spirit of English law*, (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1953), Pp 11 – 17.
3. C. A. Oputa, *The law and the twin pillars of justice*, (Owerri: Government printer 1981), P. 4.
4. Osy Nwebo, *Critical Constitutional Issues in Nigeria* (Umuahia: Versatile Publishers, 1998), P. 49.
5. R. S. Peters, *Ethics and Education*, (London: George Allen Unwin, 1969), P 211.
6. *The Nigerian Federal Constitution (1999)*, Chapter IV, Section 30 - 42
7. M. M. Sharif, *National Integration and other Essays*, (Lahore: Institute of Islamic culture, 1965), Pp. 43 – 44.
8. A. K. C. Ottaway, *Education and Society*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966), P. 186.
9. Elechi Amadi, *Ethics in Nigerian culture*, (Ibadan: Heinemann Educational Books, 1982), Pp. 15-17.
10. Osy Nwebo, *Op. cit.*, P.49.
11. *Announcer Express*, Thursday July 23, - July 25, 2009, P. 15
12. *Daily Sun*, Tuesday October 6, 2009, P. 4
13. *Daily Sun*, Thursday August 27, 2009, P. 2
14. *Daily Sun*, Thursday 29, 2009, P. 25

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

6.1 Evaluation

In course of this work, we saw how Machiavelli launched a revolution in politics by radically divorcing morality from politics. We have also seen the devastating implication of such a radical step. The Nigerian Machiavellian politics has given way to debilitating unenlightened leadership. Plato believed in the efficacy of specialisation. He validly instructed that, for the development of a society, each person should be placed in the very area in which he can perform best. Perhaps that is a lesson Nigeria did not grasp very well.

The pathology of Nigerian politics consists in the fact that it is a game of whosoever fights his way through. Many of our past leaders did not have thorough formal education at all. They just acquired money, joined the "right party" and took up the mantle of leadership. Politics is simply looked at as a contested business enterprise; whoever wins has it all. It is ridiculous that what counts in Nigerian politics are power, wealth and belongingness to the "right" political party. Whoever is rich and has the support of political god-fathers – the king makers, would attain to any desired height not minding whether he is intellectually capable or not.

Today in Nigeria, we still have people assuming leadership in areas in which they lack proper competence. Is it not surprising for a well trained medical doctor to abandon the syringes perhaps to become the commissioner, not for health of course, but for agriculture? It is normal in Nigeria for someone who did engineering to become commissioner for health. It is no news that someone who majored in agriculture becomes commissioner for finance or science and technology. What of when an illiterate aspires for the presidency just because he has the money? What do we expect from a leader who lacks the political philosophy of self-consciousness, self-identity and self-assertion in the world of so many political agenda? Of what good is a mere business politician to Nigeria at large? What do we expect from an illiterate politician? A Latin maxim says: "no one gives what he has not" (*nemo dat quod non habet*).

Having gone thus far, this work is set for critical evaluation. In the first instance, credit is due to Machiavelli for conscientising the populace on their rights politically. And considering the circumstances that led him into formulating his ideology, that is, the unmitigated corruption in the Italian politics of his time, one cannot but hastily brand him a first class patriot. On the other hand, Machiavelli's separation of morality from politics marked the beginning of his failure in the political scene. For Machiavelli, to maintain that the morality of a political action should be looked

for in the successful end principle which holds that for an end to be good, all the means must be equally good, otherwise the act is vitiated.

To erase justice which is the watch word of a state from the political vocabulary rids politics of its meaning. While we talk about law and justice in terms of principles applicable in realistic terms, Machiavellianism talks of them as though they were concrete tools and instruments to facilitate all political enterprises. And so, he juxtaposed law with arms and instead of discussing law any further, he continues talking about arms and the use of them. In this regard he says, *"the main foundation of every state, new states as well as ancient or composite ones, are good laws and good arms, and where there are good arms, good laws inevitably follow, I shall not discuss laws but give my attention to arms".¹*

Arms therefore take the place of laws. What rules the state is no longer reason but might, and human beings therefore conform, not because they see the reason to conform but because they are coerced, and are in strong phobia of the dictators over lordship.

Man is consequently reduced to the level of *"En Soi"*. Inhumanity then becomes the order of the day.

Another fundamental error in Machiavelli's politics that calls for critique is his absolutisation for power which he erroneously considers as the ultimate goal of politics. The ultimate goal of

politics is not the grabbing of power but the rendering of service to the people. The acquisition of power is itself a means of rendering service to the people. Another loophole in Machiavellian philosophy is the employment of cruelty and deceit as means to attain power and maintain it. On the issue of human rights, it is in the nature of man to be endowed with basic rights but Machiavelli says no to that and insists that the prince should mark out the right of the citizen but John Locke argues that citizen's right should always be respected. With that in mind, Locke opines, *"no one can be put out of his state and subjected to the political power of another without his consent. The only way whereby any one can divest himself of his natural liberty and put on the bonds of civil society... agreeing with other men to join and unite into a community for their comfortable safe".*²

Machiavelli's demolition of religion creates another big loophole in his politics. For him, religion should not be mentioned at all. Where it is not for its social usefulness, his utilitarian and pragmatic view of religion has some atheistic implications. Virtue has no place in his political philosophy and this very statement has led some authors to describe Machiavelli as devil's advocate. A closer look at Machiavellian use of deceit and brutality, one wonders if Machiavelli actually was writing out of the conviction of his heart or as he proved himself a greater deceiver than ever lived. In that case, if Machiavelli's doctrines were to be followed

strictly by rulers, one can rightly conclude that such rulers are devils in disguise more especially in our contemporary world.

On the other hand, the Machiavellian philosophical principle and political ethics - the end justifies the means does not hold because politics has its own morality. It is not amoral since man who is a moral being is also a political being. Politics should therefore equally be moral and not immoral. So it is with all other affairs of men. So, Machiavelli's stand point that evil is good provided it ensures the acquisition of power and leads to a good end or result is simply unimaginable and absurd. It is an aberration from the true concept of morality. However, the end does not justify the means because for the end to be justified, the means used must be good and the end itself must be good also. Once there is a gap in one aspect, then the negative consequences emanating from it will definitely render it unjustified.

6.2 Recommendations

This work having made a conscious effort in appraising the negative effects of Machiavellianism in Nigeria politics has offered some major recommendations that would help Nigeria overcome the menace of Machiavellianism and achieve a viable democratic polity. The first is strengthening the spread of the philosophic life, deepening Nigeria's civic education curriculum, sensitisation of the people and moral regeneration.

6.2.1 The Need to Intensify the Socio-Philosophic Life

We are all born into a society and as Aristotle remarked: "whoever cannot live in a society must either be a beast or a god". Individuals constitute the society, but an individual cannot grow into full maturity without the society. The society nurtures an individual for the enhancement of his/her survival logic. The degree of the development of a society depends on the intellectual empowerment of its citizens.

This is where the society needs formation not only in the practical sciences but also in the theoretical sciences. The objective of the theoretical sciences is the truth and they include those sciences which search for the truth through the power of the mind. The mother of the theoretical sciences is philosophy. Philosophy, in its committed and objective search for wisdom, aims at discovering the truth through impartial reflections. The philosophic study is a rational vocation for man to make the best out of his existentiality. Philosophy is man's intellectual invitation to undertake life objectively, to shun the deceptions of appearances and superficialities. To this end, Bertrand Russell says;

The man who has no tincture of philosophy goes through life imprisoned in the prejudices derived from common sense and opinions, from the habitual beliefs of his age and culture and from uncritical convictions grown up in his mind without check and consent of his deliberate reason. To such a man the world becomes definite, obvious; things rouse questions; unfamiliar possibilities are contemptuously dismissed or rejected. As soon as we begin to philosophise false certainties begin to fall, new questions arise; new horizons open for us. In the presence of those questions, philosophy is able to suggest many possibilities that enlarge our thought and free us from the slavery of custom and prejudice.³

On the superficiality of irrational life which Russell has written about, this work recall that Socrates had centuries before emphasised that "an unexamined life is not worth living". An examined life is one in which there is constant rational effort to distinguish appearance and reality, truth from falsehood. Philosophy educates and empowers the individual to avoid simply following the crowd or to be led by the nose, but to personally grasp the essence of his/her practices. Philosophy trains her candidate to think objectively before acting, to be rationally convinced about his beliefs and practices, and be personally responsible for them. A philosopher does not take things for granted or do things because tradition, or culture, or a group, or a club habitually does so. Without neglecting his cultural background, a philosopher examines the rationality of cultural practices and beliefs thoroughly knowing their consequences before engaging in them. A philosopher does not act by the whims

and sentiments of the moment but out of personal conviction principally through reflection.

Man by nature is a philosopher, because he is endowed with reason. This work cannot say that Nigerians lack philosophical knowledge. The science of philosophy, it must however be said, is absent in the secondary schools and it began lately in the universities because attention was paid more to the legal and productive sciences. But that was a mistake. Philosophy is inevitable for the comprehensive development of the individual and the state. What rules the world are ideas and not simply food and technology. Descartes hammered it into the ears of the French world that the degree of the development of a nation depends on the strength of its philosophy. Philosophy not only builds on intellectual visions and ideas, but also criticises for a better understanding of the implications of the pretensions of the sciences on society and humanity at large. One of the problems in Nigeria is that philosophic study has not spread wide enough as to enable people comprehend the necessity of developing enlightened responsible characters for the general welfare of the nation. It is unfortunate that the mother of all the sciences is somehow treated with ignominy in a developing nation like Nigeria.

The social maladies in Nigeria are that people do not quite understand the implications of the ideas they propagate.

Philosophy rationalises society, empowers society and people to be critical of what they do and say. Philosophic study would help in no small measure to take Nigeria out of tribalism, egoism and individualism to the spirit of altruism, nationalism and patriotism. Enlightened philosophic minds would easily comprehend the necessity of truth-telling for the building of common trust. People would not be easily moved by religious “abrakatabra” after acquiring some tints of critical thinking. The spirit of black resilience, nationalism, patriotism and altruism and of the common good would acquire more profundity where there is broad education in political philosophy. We would not have been running a crippled educational system if we had rightly intellectualised the inevitability of education for the growth of a nation. If the developed world have branded Africans lazy, it is because we have not been properly sensitised on the need to take up our destiny in our own hands. We have chosen to become the dumping ground of the goods/wastes from other nations, because we chose to be mere consumers.

We have refused to be groomed in the philosophy of labour and of self-assertion in a world in which nations are throwing their weights around proudly avoiding servitude of whatever sort to other nations. We have resorted to exploitations of all kinds because of laziness, poor economy, and lack of personal initiative even after attending and attaining university education.

Inauthentic existence abounds every where because people have not been helped to think and live according to their means. They falsely measure their weights with societal opinions even though it brings them pains. Only philosophic life can help individuals manage their lives according to their means and not in view of what people would say. Inter-ethnic hatreds and discrimination, the mounting disrespects for the human person and the denial of human rights are due to poor instructions on the science of man. We are worried that the western patterns of life are gradually eroding our traditional values because there is hardly any philosophy to protect our cultural identity in the universe of cultures and traditions. Whenever cultural practices fail to inspire and sustain their logic, they would easily give way to new ones. We need philosophies to sustain ancestral values, and to wisely modify outdated ones. The philosophic study cannot be over emphasised for building a highly flourishing state.

6.2.2 The Imperative Need for Civic Education and the Re-branding of the Nigerian Political System

Opinions may be divided over the present condition of Nigeria as a country. Some might be of the view that Nigeria is developing properly as any other nation, others might feel that it is retrogressing. However, the major sensibility is that Nigerians are grossly dissatisfied with the present political condition of their fatherland. Nigeria of the present does not fulfill the dreams or

expectations of most of its citizens. If like other developed nations, civic education had been strengthened in Nigeria, we would not be singing the woes of today.

Civic education is different from academic profession. One can be professionally literate, responsible and yet ignorant of civil etiquettes. One can be industrious only on selfish purposes. Civil education trains citizens on how to employ their various expertises in contributing to the entire growth of a nation. Civil education is the social virtue that facilitates the consciousness for communal survival. Individuals are trained to be aware of the fact that in their various fields of work they are not working strictly for themselves but for the welfare of all.

On May 29 2015, Nigeria celebrated sixteen years of democratic constitution. Intellectuals would easily concur that no democracy functions properly without profound civic education. Margaret S. Branson has observed that "*Democracy is a dialogue, a discussion, a deliberative process in which citizens engage*"⁴. If Nigeria is wobbling today, it is simply due to the fact that the citizens have not been properly trained regarding their civic duties and rights. Establishing a viable democratic polity is not the exclusive duty of any ruling government alone; it demands the effective co-operation of each and every citizen that makeup the polity. Civic education is what we require in addition to

professionalism to harness, for our common welfare, the human and natural endowments of the nation.

The *Latin* 'Civis' is a common gender meaning "a citizen". It is related to 'civitas' meaning "citizenship", the power of belonging to a commonwealth.⁵ "Within a given political or ethical tradition, civics refers to the education of citizens". "Civics is truly "the study of rights and duties of citizenship. In other words, it is the study of government with attention to the role of citizens – as opposed to external factors – in the operation and oversight of government".⁶ Citizenship education, therefore, has to do with the conscientisation of the members of a nation on their specific rights in the society, and more especially on the necessity of their contribution towards building a flourishing nation. Citizenship education is seen as "the basis for effective participation in and contribution to the life of the society; character and moral training, and the development of sound attitudes; developing in the child the ability to adapt to his changing environment".⁷ "Civic education in a democratic society most assuredly needs to be concerned with promoting understanding of the ideals of democracy and a reasoned commitment to the values and principles of democracy".⁸ Civic education recognises the fact that the construction of a flourishing state lies not in the hands of the governments alone; it demands the effective educative co-operation of all the citizens. An American president once said that

“people should think of what they should do for their nation and not what the nation should do for them”.

This work states that Nigerians have not been trained or educated enough to think of what they can do for their fatherland; the reverse is rather the case. This is where civic education differs from merely being literate and just specialising in a particular profession. People can be taught how to earn their living through employment with proper comprehension of their roles in nation building. They simply think that it is solely the government’s duty to do everything for the people. Unfortunately, election campaigns promises all that. The Nigerian slogan of “sharing the national cake”, the looting of public treasury by politicians, the embezzlement of academic funds, money laundering for a better life abroad, the poor conditions of our roads, the increasing wave of fratricide – religious and political, negligence of the poor and the weak and other human abuses, laziness in carrying out public duties and all other indifferent attitudes to public responsibilities, are simply the fruits of poor civic education.⁹ People approach society mainly from what they can gain and not what they can contribute.

It is required now that Nigerians be trained to see the good in contributing to the general welfare, rather than stealing and cheating the public and eventually themselves. In the view of Sadiq Abdullahi, “with roughly over 140 million Nigerians; 36

states, a weak political and economic system, and persistent, ethnic and religious conflicts in Nigeria, education provides the best alternative for national stability, security, unity and prosperity".¹⁰ Civic education should help Nigerians understand the history, philosophy and purpose of Nigeria's existence as a nation. It should educate the citizens to understand the symbolic nature of the Nigerian flag, the National Anthem, the Coat-of-Arms, and National Monument. It should inculcate in the people the purpose of unity in diversity and the spirit of tolerance in difference. Human respect at all levels should be at the frontline of our social-political interactions. The Military men should be trained to respect Nigerian citizens and not to take laws into their hands by exploiting and abusing them on the roads or taking undue advantage of their military might. Nigerians should be taught to obey and respect the rule of law. Cheating, stealing and duping should be addressed as serious social evils. The danger of corruption and looting of public properties should be drummed into the ear of every Nigerian citizen.

Citizenship education should, positively, encourage the spirit of honesty and hardwork. The importance of dedication to duty for our common survival should be paramount. We should all learn to contribute positively in baking the national cakes and not always seeking dubious ways of sharing it. The spirit of cooperation, unity, understanding and tolerance should inform our formative

polities. Nigerians should be taught to exercise the spirit of patriotism, nationalism and altruism rather than racial ethnicity and taking undue opportunities over other ethnic groups. There is need for Nigerians to honour and respect Nigeria as a nation and not do things that can tarnish her image. Civic education should teach Nigerians to be honestly proud of their fatherland and contribute meaningfully in sustaining its steady development.

Civic education should take place in all the strata of the nation. It should spread from the homes to the nursery, secondary and tertiary institutes; all the various military camps and all the towns and village squares. Not only should an organisation be dedicated to spread the spirit of pan-Nigerianism, but also public conferences and radio programmes should disseminate the importance and content of civic education for the nation.

Moral regeneration on the part of all and sundry will go a long way in solving the existing and emerging problem. A morally sane society will produce morally inclined political leaders. Various ethical orientation and awareness programmes by past governments must be revived while the present attempts at inculcating morality must be executed objectively, fearlessly and with sincerity of purpose.

The Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) must demonstrate a high sense of responsibility in handling

electoral matters. The commission should be absolutely independent of the ruling party or government; and there is an urgent need for impartiality on her part. The members of the commission should be men and women of proven integrity and their salaries must be charged on consolidated fund in order to ensure efficiency. In other words, the body must be financially independent of the government.

Commenting on this, Oyeshile Olatunji notes that, "morality in every human society arises from the need to distinguish right or good conduct from wrong or bad conduct so as to ensure harmonious living in society".¹¹

6.3 Conclusion

Machiavellianism in contemporary politics has become a method and manual for the enhancement, preservation and appropriation of political power. It is therefore high time deceit and brutality were dethroned so as to pave way for the enthronement of morality in the political scene. The Nigerian politicians should bear in mind that, "The end does not justify the means" rather what they should bear in mind is that for an action to be good, the end must be good and the means for achieving the end must also be good.

The Machiavellian ideology has brought a lot of retrogression in the political, economic, social and religious growth and development of this nation. So, those who are well

trained in political matters must be allowed to rule. As Plato once said, not until philosopher kings or intellectuals are allowed to rule, there will be no best government and no peace will reign. Righteousness and good morals are the basis of good government. A brutal and deceptive beast must not be allowed to rule this country as Machiavelli had proposed.

Undoubtedly, the infiltration of Machiavellianism into the Nigeria's political arena is no blessing but a curse. A redress must be sought beginning from the individual in the cultivation of his personal life to the whole community at large and their sincerity of purpose and will. Evil must not be condoned but must be frowned at and blatantly exposed. Everyone must be conscious on how he or she is being ruled. Let us vote in who is qualified and not those who have bribed us, because the problem is not in our star as Shakespeare once said, but in ourselves. Virtuous individuals will eventually form a virtuous state.

At any rate, the position of Machiavelli in matters of politics and morals had deepened the sense of wonder in most moral philosophies and has posed a perennial problem for mankind in the sphere of politics. But man is a being that shows his authenticity by taking his stand in the midst of reality.

And finally, let it be said that no country that has the interest of her citizens at heart will take to Machiavellianism under any political situation. The most probable place for the survival of

Machiavellianism is the Hobbesian state of nature. It is for the brutes that are devoid of conscience. Machiavellianism is a rape on human dignity. And since the strength of a nation is in the collective will of the citizenry, all hands therefore must be on deck to eradicate this menace called Machiavellianism. In conclusion, there is need to re-direct our political thought in such a way that Nigeria will deliberately avoid Machiavellianism in all its ramifications because it is not the right way to go.

Endnotes

1. N. Machiavelli, *The Prince*, (New York: New American Library Inc, 1935), P. 77
2. John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, (Macpherson: Hacket publishing Inc, 1960) P. 52
3. B. Russell, *The Problem of Philosophy*, (London, Oxford University Press, 1974), p. 126.
4. S. Margaret Branson, "The Role of Civic Education"
http://www.civiced.org/papers/articles_role.html
5. Lewis & Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, P. 346
6. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/civics.html>
7. A. Sadiq Abdullahi, "Education and Democracy in Nigeria: Vision 2020" <http://www.nigeriansinAmerica.com/articles/1465/.1/Education-and-Democracy-in-Nigera.html>
8. S. Margaret Branson, "The Role of Civic Education",
http://www.civiced.org/papers/articles_role.html
9. Omo-Ojugo, "An Assessment of Citizenship education in Nigeria ", http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3673/is_1_130/ai_n35650924/html
10. A. Sadiq Abdullahi, "Education and Democracy in Nigeria: Vision 2020" <http://www.nigeriansinAmerica.com/articles/1465/.1/Education-and-Democracy-in-Nigera.html>.
11. Olatunji Oyeshile, *Religious and Secular Origins of Morality within the Yoruba Framework: Implications for Man and Society in Orita*, *Ibadan Journal of Religious Studies*, xxxvi/1&2, p.152.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Machiavelli N; *The Prince*, (London: Penguin Books), 1961.
-; *The Discourses*, (London: Penguin Books), 1964.
-; *The Chief Works and Others*, A.Gilbert, trans. (Durham: Duke University Press), 1965.
-, *The Prince and Discourses*, (ed.) John Plamentz, (Great Britain: Glasgow, William Collins Ltd), 1986.

Secondary Sources

- Amaku, E.E., *The Ontological Foundations of Human Dignity in the Thought of Thomas Aquinas*, (Enugu: Victojo Production Services), 2009.
-, *Later Modern Philosophy*, (Owerri: Austins Books), 2003.
- Anglo, S., *Machiavelli: The First Century*, (London: Oxford University Press), 2005.
- Appadorai, A. *The substance of politics*. (New Delhi: Oxford University Press), 1975.
- Aquinas, A., *The Political Ideas of St. Thomas Aquinas*, Dino Bigongian (ed), (New York: Hartner Publishing Company), 1953.
- Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, (New York: Penguin Books), 1955.
-, *Politics*, Trans. T.A. Sinclair, (New York: Penguin Books), 1983.
-, *The Politics*, Trans. Benjamin Jowett, (New York: Modern Library Classics), 2001.
- Asouzu, I.I. *Effective Leadership and the Ambivalence of Human Interest: The Nigerian Paradox in a Complementary Perspective*. (Calabar: University of Calabar Press), 2003.

- Berdyev, N., *Christian Existentialism*, Trans. Donald Lowrie, (New York: Harper Torch Books), 1965.
- Butterfield H., *The Structure of Machiavelli*, (New York: Collins Books), 1962.
- Christian, J.L. *Philosophy: An Introduction to the Art of Wondering*. (Australia: Thompson Wadsworth), 2003.
- Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999.
- Copleston, Fredrick. *A History of Philosophy* (vol. 5); British Philosophy Hobbes to Hume. (London; Continuum International Publishing Group), 1942.
-, *A History of Philosophy, Vol. IV*, (New York: Image Books), 1960.
- Ebestein A.W., *Great Political Thinkers*, (New York: Holt Rineehart and Wisdom), 1962.
- Ebenstein W. *Modern Political Thought Part 111*, (London: Oxford University Press), 1960.
- Edward, P. (ed), *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company), 1967.
- Ejeziem, I. A., *Machiavellism in Nigerian Politics*, (Enugu: The Potter Creations Coy), 2006.
- Ejizu, C., *Ethics of Politics in Nigeria: The Christian Perspective in* (Bulletin of Ecumenical Philosophy vol. 2 No. 1), 1989.
- Eze O. (ed.) *Society and the Rule of Law* (Owerri: Totan Publishers), 1987.
- Fagothey, A., *Right and Reason in Theory and Practice*, (London: Mervil Publication Company), 1981.
- Fischer M; *Well Ordered License: On the Unity of Machiavelli's Thought*, (Lanham: Lexington Books), 2000.
- Flew, A., *Means and Ends in the Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (U.S.A: Macmillan Publication and Free Press), 1967.

- Forsyth, M.S., *The Theories of International Relations*, (London: Oxford University Press), 1970.
- Frost. S.E. *Basic Teachings of the great Philosophers*. New York: Anchor Books, 1942.
- Ghost Shankar, *Political Idea and Movement in India*, (Mumbai: Allied Publishers), 1975.
- Grant R.W; *Hypocrisy and Integrity: Machiavelli, Rousseau and the Ethics of Politics*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press), 1997.
- Grazia, S., *Machiavelli in Hell*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press), 1983.
- Henry, T., *The Story of the Human Race* (U.S.A: The Independent Press), 1986.
- Hobbes, T., *The Leviathan*, (New York: Penguin Books), 1951.
- Hornby, A.S., *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English* (6th Ed.) (London: Oxford University Press), 2007.
- Iroegbu, P.O., *Nigerianism*, (Owerri: Assumpta Press), 1986.
- Iwe S.S. Nwachukwuike., *Socio-Ethical Issues in Nigeria*, (New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc), 1987.
- Kant, I., 'De Ontological Ethics' in *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, (New York: Macmillan Publication and Free Press), 1967.
- Keen Soper, *A Guide to Political Classics*, (London: Oxford University Press), 1988.
- Kier Mon, T., *Who's who in the History of Philosophy*, (London: Vision Press), 1966.
- Lasalle, F., *End and Means in the Encyclopedia of Philosophy 1 and 2* (New York: Macmillan Publication and Free Press), 1997.
- Lewis, C.T. *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), 1989
- Locke J; *The Second Treatise of Government*, (Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill), 1952.

-, *The Second Treatise on Civil Government*. (New York: Prometheus Books), 1986.
- Mamadu, T.T., *Corruption in the Leadership Structure of Nigerian Polity*. (Lagos: Theomadex ventures), 2006.
- Mansfield H.C; *Machiavelli's Virtue*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 1996.
- Milford, G.S. *Political Idea and Ideologies in the History of Political Thought*, (New York: Hamper and Row), 1976.
- Njoku, O.C. Francis, *Philosophy in Politics, Law, and Democracy*, (Enugu, Claretian Communications), 2002.
- Nwoko, M., *Basic World Political Theories*, (Ibadan: Claverium Press Ltd.), 1998.
- Odey, J., *Politics and The Nigeria Dilemma*, (Enugu: Snaap Press Ltd), 1998.
-, *After the Madness called Election 2003*, (Enugu: Snaap Press), 2003.
- Odimegwu, I., *Philosophy, Democracy and Conflicts in Africa, Vol. II*, (Awka: Fab Education Books), 2006.
- Ogbonnaya, O, *Building a Modern Nigeria*. (Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co.), 2005.
- Oguejiofor, J.O. *Philosophy and African Predicament*, (Ibadan: Hope Publications), 2001.
-, *Philosophy, Democracy and Responsible Government in Africa*, (Enugu: Delta Publishers), 2004.
-, *Philosophy, Ideology and Civil Society*, (Owerri: Living Flames Resources), 2009.
- Ojukwu, E.O., *Because I am Involved*, (Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited), 1989.
- Omoregbe, J., *Ethics: A Systematic and Historical Study*. (Lagos: Joja Educational and Research Publications), 1993.

- , *A Simplified History of Western Philosophy*. (Lagos: Joja Educational and Research Publication), 1993.
- Onwuanibe, R.O., Unpublished Lecture on Political Philosophy, (B.M.S. Ikot Ekpene), 1988.
- Onyeocha, I.M., *Power and Authority in Locke*. (Washington: 1987.
- , *Idealism, Politics and Nation-Building: The Nigerian Experience* (Owerri: Assumpta Press), 1994.
-, *What is Religious about Religion*, (Owerri: Claretian Publications), 1992.
- Orend, B., *Human Rights: Concept and Context*. (Peterborough Ont.; Broadview Press), 2002.
- Ozumba, G.O., *A Course Text on Ethics*. (Lagos: O.O.P Limited), 2001.
- Pade B.M, *Imperialism and Ethnic Politics in Nigeria*, (Asmara: Africa World Press), 1998.
- Peschke, H.K., *Christian Ethics, Vol. II*, (Bangalore: Theological Publications in India), 2004.
- Pitkin H.F; *Gender and politics in the Thought of Niccolo Machiavelli*, (Berkley: University of California Press), 1984.
- Raphael, D.D; *Problems Political Philosophy*, (London; Macmillan), 1976.
- Russell B; *A History of Western Philosophy*, (New York: Simon and Schuster), 2007
-, *Political Ideas*, (London: George Allen and Unwin), 1963.
-, *The Problem of Philosophy*, (London: Oxford University Press), 1974.
- Sabine, G, *et al.*, *A History of Political Theory*. (New Delhi: Oxford and IBH Publishing Company PVT. Ltd.), 1973.

Skinner Q; *The Foundation of Modern Political Thought*, (Volume 1 The Renaissance), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 1978.

Strauss, L., *Thought on Machiavelli*, (Illinois: GlenCo. Press), 1958.

Stumpf, S.E, *Philosophy: History and Problems*. (New York: Mc Graw-Hill Book Co.), 1989.

Subrata Mukherjee et al, *A History of Political Thought-Plato to Marx*. (New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India Private Limited), 2007.

Thompson, D., *Political Ideas* (U.S.A. Penguin Books Ltd), 1982.

Udoekpo, M., *The Limits of a Divided Nation* (Enugu: Snaap Press), 1999.

....., *Corruption in Nigerian Culture, The Liberty Mission of the Church*, (Enugu: Snaap Press), 1994.

Uduigwomen, A.F., *Introducing Ethics: Trends, Problems and Perspectives* (2nd Ed.). (Calabar: Jochrisam Publishers), 2001.

Uduma, C.E., *Jeremy Bentham's Utilitarian Justification of Punishment and the Problem of Injustice in Nigeria*. (In Unpublished Seminar Paper), December, 2012.

Walker, L., *The Discourses of Niccolo Machiavelli*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul), 1975.

Walter, B., *Philosophical Dictionary*, (USA: Gonzaga University press), 1971.

William, D., *Encyclopaedia Americana*, Vol.12. (California: University Press), 1976.

Journals

Academia, *A CIP Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 1, No. 1, (Owerri: Claretian Publications), 2003.

Essence, Interdisciplinary-International Journal of Philosophy, in "Politics and Development", Vol. 9, No. 1, (Lagos: Essence Library, Satellite Town), 2012.

Essence, Interdisciplinary-International Journal of Philosophy, in "Godfatherism in Nigeria's Politics", Vol. 1, No.1, (Lagos: Essence Library, Satellite Town), 2004.

Maryland Studies, A CIP International Journal of Philosophy and African Studies, Vol. 2, (Owerri: Claretian Publications), 2005.

Mind: A Quarterly Review of Philosophy, Vol. 121, No. 481, (New York: Oxford University Press), 2012.

Nnamdi Azikiwe Journal of Philosophy, Vol. 5, No. 2, (Department of Philosophy Awka), 2013.

Internet Sources

Abdullahi, A. Sadiq., "Education and Democracy in Nigeria: Vision 2020", <http://www.nigeriansinamerican.com/articles/1465/.I/Education-and-Democracy-in-Nigeria.Html>.

Adujie, T. Paul., 'Religion, Politics & Nigeria's National Unity, <http://www.Nigeriansinamerica.com/articles/1860/1/religion-politics-amp-nigerias-nation...12/9/2009>.

Amadi, Sam., "Politics, Leadership and Development in Nigeria", www.kwenu.com/publications/...amadisambookreview.htm, 2008.

<http://www.scu.edu/ethics/practicus/decision/commongood,1992>.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/civics.html>.

Dike, Victor., "The State of Education in Nigeria",
<http://www.afbis.com/analysis/education10204234737.htm>.

.....,"To Achieve and Sustain the Unity of Nigeria",
<http://www.nigerdeltacongress.com/tarticles/toachieveandsustaintheunity.htm>.

.....,"Education for Good Character and the Moral Life of the Nation",
mailto:vdike@cwnet.com.conv/plaum_e.html.

Giacaglia, A. Lic., Mirta "Rethinking Education",
<http://www.bu.edu/wcp/papers/educ/educgiac.htm>.

Igbuzor, O., "The State of Education in Nigeria",
<http://www.gamji.com/article6000/news6144.htm>.

Katrina, V. Heuvel, "A Politics of the Common Good",
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/commongood,2006>.

Margaret S. Branson, "The Role of Civic Education",
<http://www.civiced.org/papers/articlesrole.html>.

Omo-Ojugo, "An Assessment of Citizenship Education in Nigeria", <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/miqa3673/is1130/ain35650924/html>.