

Democracy and Leadership in Nigeria: Towards National Integration

Emeam Innocent Izuchukwu (Rev. Fr.)

Department of Educational Foundations & Administration, Faculty of Education, Alvan Ikoku University of Education,
Imo State, Nigeria

Abstract: Democracy is an ambiguous concept. It means different things to different people. This is why different nations think it right to work out their own brand of democracy. A democracy that is indigenous to their culture and which relives the political worldview of their people. On the other hand, international community tends to have one ideal concept of democracy: a democracy of two or three party systems, rooted in the rule of law and due process, grants human freedom and respects human dignity. Indigenous democracy upholds communitarianism, cultural values, respect for custom and tradition, dialogue and negotiation for conflict resolution. This is the paradigm which Afro-asiatic nations recline towards; while ideal democracy, if it truly exists, is the paradigm which the west is putting forward as the political ideal for all nations of the world to adopt. The oldest paradigm is that of conception of democracy as “house rule”. What we can deduce from these paradigms are:

1. The indigenous democracy and western democracy are all paradigm shift from the oldest paradigm concept of democracy as “house rule”.
2. Both indigenous democracy and western democracy are not pure democracies but representational democracies.
3. Representational democracy is another name for injustice, marginalization, and underdevelopment.

Leadership, on the other hand, refers to the plans and policies which are meant to influence the citizens and direct them towards the realization of set common goals. Leadership in a democratic setting employs democracy as a structure to deliver good governance. As a structure, the leader can as well ignore the structure and operate with other private structures or pseudo-structures in order to realize not common goals but group or selfish goals. This is the travail of Nigeria in the midst of debate between democracy and leadership in Nigeria.

Keywords: Democracy, leadership, Nigeria, and national integration.

1. INTRODUCTION

Leadership is at the core of success of every human endeavor. It is a strong index and even coordinates other indices in relation to development. The style of leadership determines if democracy ideals in a democratic state will or will not be respected. The leadership policies determine to a large extent whatever development is achieved in every sector of societal life. While democracy has its inherent problems especially in its indigenous paradigm as practiced in Nigeria, leadership remains the determinant factor of good governance and its attendant development. Inside Africa, the interface between democracy and leadership is that of woe and shame. Most supposedly democratic African nations are at one time or the other at war. The case of Liberia, Sudan, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone, and Central African Republic lays credence to this thesis. Most other African states that are supposedly democratic nations who are not at war are not even at peace. In this case Nigeria is one of the pathetic cases at hand. Democratic African nations as Nigeria reject two party systems in democracy and opt for bazaar party system, install toothless rule of law and run a democracy by arrangement. When the structures and superstructures of a system are weak, the leader capitalizes on the loophole to unleash exploitation, corruption and bad governance on the nation. Experience has shown that at best bazaar party system degenerates to “we-

government". In this paper, we shall examine critically the concepts of democracy, leadership and integration within Nigerian experience.

2. EXPLICATION OF CONCEPT

The oxford advanced learners dictionary explains that democracy is: 1. government in which all adult citizens share through their elected representatives, 2. government which allows rights of citizenship such as freedom of speech, religion, opinion, association, the assertion of rule of law, majority rule, accompanied by respect for rights of minorities, 3. Treatment of each other by citizens as equals and with absence of class feeling. (Hornby,Cowie, Gimson, 1974,229). In this explication, what is explained is representative democracy. The flaws of democracy are exposed at first glance. There is a wide gap between the citizens and their elected representatives as in Nigeria. The question of evenness of representation poses problems. The conception of democracy as government that allows rights of the citizens raises problems of concept of rights as inalienable and natural and bestowed by the state. In conception of democracy there is always a divide between majority and minority. This dichotomy breeds injustice and promote tyranny of the majority. A bill is right if the majority supports it though it may be dangerous to the society and people. Yet, what the generality of people claim to be the case may not necessarily be the truth. In democracy, citizens are supposed to be equal before the law and class feelings eradicated. In real life, there is no real equality between the citizens. Some are more equal than others. The society is organized in hierarchical structure. The hospitals have special rooms for special people. The prisons have special accommodation for some dignitaries. Public places for functions special seats are provided for special people. Socio-economic status determines a lot. It determines who one knows, and the possibility of getting whatever one desires to get as job, position in government, school etc. Democracy therefore is a utopia conception which appears to be an imposition from without and not from within. Democracy has been conceived as government of the people, for the people and by the people. This understanding of democracy appears to be an inclusive one. The dichotomy between leadership and people is erased. The leader is part and parcel of the people. Thus, democratic government is the people's government. It cannot lord itself over and against the people. The people are supreme. They elect their leaders from among themselves and remove their leaders when the leaders are found wanting. The word democracy is derived from the Greek word 'demokratia' meaning "the rule of the people" or "the rule by the people". Plato in his book "The Republic", written in a dialogue style between Socrates and Glaucon Plato discussed forms of government. He saw democracy as government of "tyranny of the majority". He placed the ideal state lead by a philosopher king as best form of government. Plato's criticisms of democracy are based on a number of reasons. Democracy forms the breeding ground for tyranny. It is most disposed to turn a leader a tyrant. And it is equally most disposed for protest and revolt of the people. Democracy leads to unbridled quest for wealth and lust of pleasure due to its emphasis on unrestrained human freedom. It allows the majority to lord it over the minority. Above all, democracy does not grantee justice; since it was under democracy of the Greece that the Athenian parliament condemned an innocent man Socrates. (www. Internet classic archive by Daniel c. Stevenson, 1994-2000). Aristotle defines democracy as "the rule of the many for the good of the poor". This definition of democracy by Aristotle is in opposition to Oligarchy which is the rule of the few for the good of the wealthy". (Odimegwu, 2008, p. 12). Aristotle hated Oligarchy and saw it as bad form of government. The word democracy is a lofty concept which is open to many shades of meaning and nuances. John Stuart Mill, a proponent of utilitarianism, held that democracy is "**the government of the whole people by the whole people equally represented**"- **as against the general misconception that democracy is "the government of the whole people by a mere majority of people, exclusively represented"**. It must be noted that Mill's contention is that in a true democracy the minority should be represented as the majority otherwise it becomes an injustice against the minority. This contention is a call for balance of power between the majority and minority in a democratic nation. (Nwoko, 1988, p. 173). Karl Max, a German philosopher, who is a proponent of dialectical materialism, gave a communist definition of democracy. He wrote that "**true democracy**" is **communism**. It is a society without private property, without classes; where the state has withered away. The people now possess their own sovereignty and are able to create their own constitution. The people create the constitution, the constitution do not create the people." In this communist definition of democracy, there are imbedded misconceptions. Democracy is bereaved of freedom of the people. The rule of law is bracketed. The dictatorship of the leader is sloughed over. The reason for diving into these shades of meaning in defining the concept democracy is to expose some ideological truces which hide under some of conceptions of democracy. (Nwoko, 1988, P. 181). Jennings (1963, P. 33) observed that democracy is like a pill hidden in jam for smooth swallow. Democracy hides the reality of power exercised by some person or group of persons trying to maintain him or themselves in power. When the word democracy is paired with some

'pleasure-giving' words as peoples' democracy, peace-loving democracy, it is certain that the government is communist dictatorship. When the words 'true democracy' or "controlled democracy" are used some form of military dictatorship is implied. In addition, in relation to Africa in general and Nigeria in particular, when the expression "**indigenous democracy**", "**home-grown democracy**" or "**multi-ethnic democracy**" is used certainly some form of bureaucratic dictatorship or selective leadership is implied. Jennings, however, warned that British democracy should not be copied because it is a democracy borne out of long experience of the British people. Evidently, it is a harmonization of British monarchy and presidential system of government. The life-situation in Africa especially Nigeria is different.

The concept leadership has its Latin equivalent as "dux". It occurs in verbal form as duco, ducere, duxi, ductum. In Latin, the verb is used in many senses. It means:

- "To draw along from place to place". In this sense, there is inherent in the concept of leadership some element of force in order to draw the followers and show them the right way.
- "To lead on as in match pass or command in war front". In this sense, the concept embodies the idea of guidance, direct, control, and order. It also indicates that the follower is called to obey and follow the leader.
- "To calculate, to count, and to reckon". (Simpson, 1968,203). In this sense, the leader is one who plans for the realization of the common good. The leader calculates the effect of population on existing infrastructure. The leader has facts and figure of the nation, state or local government of his or her jurisdiction by heart and is in the position to make predictions in any sector of the society. The leader is one who knows the history of the group he or she administers.

In Greek language, the richness of the word "**Eisago**" gives the meaning of the word in two nuances: I lead in and I bring in. The mind of a people is known through their language. The Greeks are known for subtle distinctions which in other cultures may not count, but which the Greeks attach much importance to. The sense of usage here means that a leader leads the people in for good future, for greener pastures, for growth and prosperity. It appears abominable for a leader to lead people in for pain, difficulty, and retrogression. The sense of lead meaning "I bring in" indicates that a leader brings the people to peace and security. To bring means that the leader exercises some effort to carry out his or her activities. The sense that the word lead means to "lead in" implies that the work of leadership is a co-responsibility of both the leader and the lead; in which case, the lead corporate by following the leader. In French language, the word lead is translated as "conduit" which means "to lead in a direction". (Douglas, 1968, p. 471). The sense of usage is that a leader conducts the people in a right direction. The richness of this French word is enormous. A leader conducts the affairs of the nation as a facilitator, moderator, or overseer. The nation or state does not belong to the leader as a piece of property.

Stogdill and Mann (1848) as cited by Emenike Obi (2003) defined Leadership as: "The process of influencing others towards goal setting and the realization of the common goal". In this definition the word **process** is emphasized. Leadership as process means that it is a step- by- step approach. This reality is true of the art of governance. It is in terms of power. Each person in power at one point or another cedes power to another person who must continue with the process of governance. It is also true in execution of projects. This is evident in project planning, project implementation, project evaluation and project maintaince. Leadership as process implies continuity of efforts in the right direction to serve the people. It abhors being a clog on the wheels of the process, diverting the process, short-circuiting the process or stopping the process altogether. There is no one who is end- all and be- all in the understanding of leadership as a process. Leadership as a process means also that leadership is a science. It implores methodic approach to governance. An approach that can be tested, proofed, validated and repeated. Nothing is done in secret. It is open governance. Leadership has also been conceived as a way of **influencing other people**. What is at stake here is a leaders' interaction with the people. The relationship between the leader and the people is not one of subject-object relationship. It is not that between slave-master, sovereign- despot, or Overlord- vassal relationship. The real relationship is that of healthy interaction in which the leader must influence the people to participate in setting goals of governance and for the achievement of the set goals. The goals, however, must reflect the true will of the people. There are many leadership styles. These are:

- ❖ Authoritarian style
- ❖ Permissive style
- ❖ Democratic style
- ❖ Charismatic style

❖ Lasses affaire style.

Each of these leadership styles has their “pros” and “cons”. It is not the interest of this paper to dive into a discussion of the nature, operation and outcomes of each of these styles. The interest of this paper is on democratic leadership style as it is practiced in Nigeria’s political life.

Having seen the concept of democracy and leadership, it is only worthwhile that we examine the concept of integration. New Webster Dictionary (1981, p. 500) define integration as “the act of combining into integral whole; unification of diverse elements into a complex whole or harmonious relation; harmonization, behavior, as of the individual, in harmony with the environment; the act of making equally available, as organizations, services or places of business, to members of all race, religions and ethnic groups.” In this description of the concept of integration, we note the essential elements of integration: it must make available equally the benefits of belonging to the state to all the members without any prejudice based on color, race, tribe, religion, etc. It is by doing these that the state makes itself relevant for its constituent parts to be proud of their state. Within this horizon of understanding, integration becomes a concept at the core of democracy and leadership. Thus, there can be no true democracy and leadership without the goal of integration as a paradigmatic principle. The argument of the whole and its parts has become a cliché. The emphasis is no long whether the whole is greater or equal to the sum of its parts or whether the sum of the parts are equal or greater than the whole and / or whether the parts are equal or greater than each other. The argument today is the possibility of the whole and the parts dwelling together without spillover effects of hatred and rancor. Integration is possible when we emphasis the things that unity us and de-emphasis the things that separate us. The word integration connotes the idea of mainstreaming, inclusivity, and openness. It paints a picture of all parts of the body being part of the whole and exercising their individual roles for the whole health and function of the body. Within the Nigerian nation, Integration means that openness and acceptability which the nation owe to all its constituent parts. Integration means to be all-embracing without any prejudice and unconditional relationship of the whole with the parts and of the parts with the whole and with every other part of the whole. The leader is the person who using the principles of democracy integrates all the parts of the nation in an atmosphere of sincerity and trust. There is the need to appreciate the problems inherent in this discussion.

3. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

1. There are enormous problems which the mind encounters when thinking critically on democracy and leadership in Nigeria. The first of this problem is the ambiguous nature of the concept democracy. Amidst the various conceptions of democracy and the variables which characterize democracy which concept and set of variables can be applied to Nigeria?
2. In the fifty-two years of her independence as a nation, Nigeria has been under military rule for thirty-six years. The consciousness of military rule still hovers over Nigeria. Thus, it is not an overstatement to say that the thinking, language and conduct of presumed democratically elected leaders are not really different from military practice.
3. To call a sped by name, a democracy run by a former military head of state under democratic dispensation is nothing other than military-democracy. In essence, Nigeria has not enjoyed up to a decade of democratic rule and these years of democratic rule have military stamp all over.
4. In the midst of her democracy, there is still fear and misgivings that military is not really back to barrack. There is fear of revote that may warrant a state of emergency which may occasion another era of military rule in Nigeria.
5. The in-fighting of ethnic majority: the Igbo, the Yoruba and the Hausa. The rebel groups or troubleshooters of these groups: the bakassi, the Odua People’s congress (O.P.C) and the Islamist fundamentalist of the North.
6. There is problem of internal struggle for justice by too numerous minority ethnic groups. An unforgettable example of the struggle of the minority groups is the case of Odi community. This heightened the Niger delta revolt. How far can the Niger delta commission go in mainstreaming the people of Niger Delta into full participation in the democratic process?
7. There is the problem of bazaar political party. In a democracy, there must be at least more than two parties, three parties to encourage strong opposition and create room for alliance but not up to fifty parties. The very concept of Nigerian bazaar party without strong adherents to tenets and manifestos is the undoing of Nigeria democracy.
8. The problem of corruption is an endemic index in the undoing of democracy in Nigeria. Corruption mare democratic elections. There is visible lobbying through bribery; sharing of food, material goods and promise of positions should the election be won.

9. There is problem of political violence. Politicians fight each other using the young men royal to them. These young men carry ballot boxes for their candidates.
10. There is problem of uneven representation of the people. When one region has more local governments, more number of constituencies and therefore more political wards. It is clear that such region will have more representation in the house and senate. At the state level, a zone with more local governments and more wards will have more members in house of assembly and even more councilors. As it is in Nigeria now. Many regions and zones at federal and state levels are grossly under represented. This scenario begets inequality and injustice. It casts doubt on Nigerian democracy.
11. The truth must be told. Nigeria was forced by the international community to embrace democracy after many years of military rule. Democracy is still a stranger in our thinking processes. Democracy is still an experiment.
12. The major problem is how a fitting democracy can be worked out in Nigeria's case.

4. DEMOCRACY AND LEADERSHIP IN NIGERIA

Democracy and leadership in Nigeria are distant cousins. The reason is because the old war among the ethnic groups which used to be physical through coup plot and shading of blood has changed into psychological warfare. The war now is more subtle than ever. It is a war of who gets the weak point of the other in order to strike mercilessly by occupying the position of the first citizen and taking all. It is a politics of winner takes all. Party system which is supposed to unify the nation has torn the nation further apart. Assuming three parties were recognized: conservatives, liberals and labor party, this will help people from various ethnic group to come together under one ideological position. There is, however, legitimate fear that the three big majority groups will each hijack one of the parties as their own ethnic group's sole party. On the contrary, bazaar party is the worst expression of political diversity or ethnic diversity in Nigeria. It makes democratic political elections too expensive for the nation. It could be argued that bazaar party system is an indicator to increasing political consciousness among Nigerians. The reply is no. The same people fronting the parties are the people who change party once an appointment is given to him by the winning party. More often than not the members of the major party who changed party to contest for election comes back to his parent party if he or she did not win. The possibility that some of the political parties are sponsored by some parent party to play a detractor role may not be ruled out. The ensuing government after elections turns to "we- rule". Every effort is made to high jack and collapse every possible opposition. The effect of this is to get rid of scrutiny and accountability of leadership to the people.

Many scholars who reflect on the political terrain in Nigeria wonder why Democracy is not working for Nigeria. Is the problem of Nigeria in her brand of democracy or in her leaders? Achebe Chinua (1983, P.1) blame the sorry- situation of Nigeria on corrupt leadership:

The trouble with Nigeria is simply and squarely of failure of leadership. There is nothing basically wrong with the Nigerian land, or climate or water or air or anything else. The Nigerian problem is the unwillingness or inability of its leaders to rise to the responsibility, to the challenge of personal example, which is the hallmark of true leadership.

At the time of writing of Achebe's book titled "The trouble with Nigeria" in 1983, Nigeria was still under military rule. With the advent of democracy, can we reasonably attribute the Nigerian question to failure of leadership? The few years of Nigeria's experimentation with democracy has shown that if Nigeria continues on the path of democracy, with time Nigeria will become our dream nation: one of great world powers and a force to reckon with in Africa. The realities of the present cast a shadow of doubt for the future. On the part of leadership, there is a notorious display of colonial mentality. Our leaders see themselves as the new colonial masters and pass bills which enable a big chunk of annual budget to be spent on their upkeep. Nigerian leaders opt for housing allowance even though he or she leaves in his or private house, wardrobe allowance, security allowance, tea grant, car allowance and other fringe benefits as rice, milk, and cement at subsidized rates. At the end of the month, their take home calls for a downward review of salary of politicians. The argument that maintaining of politicians salary is among the factors impoverishing Nigeria has been a topical issue. Politicians often respond that political office is an appointment and not a civil service. This response imply that within the four years or more of political appointment, the leader should amass what he or she can without mercy on the financial position of the nation. Within the so-called years of democracy, leadership has privatized a number of public utilities. This does not mean that privatization as a policy is bad, but it is bad when privatization worsens the condition of the nation it was meant to alleviate her financial burden. It is bad when the same leaders who privatize public utilities now turn around

to be highest shareholders or sole owner of the public utility. In the name of democracy, financial waste pipes have been installed in the nation's treasury. Senatorial grants are one of such waste pipes; a grant that is supposed to be used to carry out a developmental project in the constituency of a senator. This policy is well thought of in order to hasten development, but rarely does one see a commensurate project to match the grant. In some instances, no project is carried out at all. It is begging the question to say that such grant was used for scholarship. How do we account for what was spent on scholarship? This shows that there is no laid down policy on what senatorial grants should be spent on. It appears to be at the disposal of the whims and caprices of the senator and therefore can be used on pet projects. Leadership in our nascent democracy has displayed gross squander mania syndrome. The wealth amassed is spent around on shopping spree, and to buy expired houses abroad. Without sound all negative, we must concede to the point that not all Nigerian leaders are bad. Some became bad by reason of occupying a leadership position; while others who wanted to get things right were frustrated out of office by the so-called Nigerian factor. Onyeocha Izu (1994, P.57) observed:

There are some leaders who, given a little more time and patience, might have been able to bring about some creative idea that could help in the operation of a democratic process. Instead, most such leaders have been stampeded into a tight corner and pressurized either To quit prematurely, or give up their ideas, or else stay on under grave risks to their life and their reputation. Out of desperation, many who took the third option have had to adopt draconian measures in order to save their own skin or protect their programmes.

One of the essential qualities of a leader Nigeria must possess is resilient spirit. This is because the structure and environment also affect leaders so much that leadership becomes an uphill task.

The failure of Nigeria as a nation cannot be attributed to democracy per se. It is true that democracy appears to nurture the grounds on which tyrannical leaders ply their trade without being held for accountability. The failure of leadership is partly due to paradigm shift in democratic model. Nigerian democracy is at impasse between western democracy and indigenous democracy. From military handover to civilian government the argument for democracy was in favor of indigenous democracy. This brand of democracy reinstated military in politics; such a retired military head of state can vie for political seat and can be elected into position of power. The outcome was a doctoring of the constitution in favor of indigenous democracy. Western democracy postulates democratic ideas of Britain, America and Europe. Nigeria has experimented on British democracy and now she is testing out American democracy with all its cost implications. We can find some reasons on which to exonerate Nigerian democracy of blames. Nigerian democracy is still at its teething age. The necessary ingredients for efficient democracy are yet to be put in place. There can be no sound democracy without a sound constitution. Nigeria is still on constitutional impasse between the 1979 constitution and 1999 constitution. This is why constitutional reform has become imperative. The judicial system is the soul of every democracy. The principle of equality rests on equality before the law. On the main, Nigerian judiciary is in chains by leadership. Freedom and independence of the judiciary is a *conducio-sine-qua-non* for efficient democracy. Mention must also be made of self-inflicted injury of corruption by judiciary; a situation that has watered down its professional dignity among Nigerians. Justice is a matter of cash and carry. Transparent policies and institutions are the structures and superstructures on the bases of which democracy can thrive. When institutions operate under red carpetism installed through clauses in policies by leadership then democracy of such nation becomes a crippled democracy. In essence, democracy is a name given to a globally accepted form of government. It is another question to raise, if all the nations of the globe gave their ascent to run a democratic government or are under duress to run a democratic government. When a nation's leaders run a democracy because of pressure from international community, the result of such democracy is obvious: democracy of dictatorship. The problem of Nigeria is not democracy. Democracy cannot operate itself. The problem of Nigeria is leadership and followership. Gullible followers get deceptive leadership to manipulate them at will. Nigerian citizens are gullible and easily given to manipulative tendencies of leaders. When the price of fuel is being manipulated by leadership, the citizens keep quiet. When the price of cement goes up, no one raises eye brow. When the price of rice, beans, and other edibles go up traders unions applaud it because it is an opportunity to make more money.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NATIONAL INTEGRATION

1. There is need for bottom-top approach to the problem of democracy and leadership in Nigeria. This approach is a paradigm shift from indigenous and western concept of democracy to a community model democracy that brings out the original meaning of democracy as "house rule". Communitarian democracy which our ancestors practiced need to be revived. It was a direct form of democracy seen in the gathering of the Eze, Oba or Emir with all village chiefs and village

heads. Such democracy was primarily discussion and dialogue until there is a consensus. The communities should be revived. In places where government merged people in such a way as to counter their culture and tradition, there should be a reverse. This is to enable such people to regain their sense of community. The community should be the bases of representation and candidacy for any political position. This is against the background of obtaining mandate from Abuja against the will and wishes of the people.

2. Intercommunity dialogues and debates should be the ground to nurture candidates for house of assembly and senate. Nigerians understand well the language of sharing.
3. The bottom-top approach will make the community the center of political activity as well as the hob of developmental projects. In this way, development can begin from community to catch with already developed urban areas. Urban migration can reverse to community homecoming.
4. There should be constitution review and the judicial should be allowed to be free and independent. This will deliver the rule of law to the people. The impact of democracy can become visible.
5. The nation structures and superstructures as institutions and policies should be set up legitimately and well fortified to lay sound foundation for democracy. All clauses that promote red carpetism and undue centralization of power which make government slow should be removed.
6. The practice of mentoring leaders should be imbibed by Nigeria. It is counterproductive for a leader to spend four years or eight years in office without mentoring someone who can if given opportunity take up the mantle of leadership and do well. Mentoring leaders can be done at the individual level, at the community level, and at state levels.
7. Democracy is leadership by consultation and dialogue. Leadership should consult more widely especially when sensitive issues are at stake before taken decisions. This means that when government takes decision on an issue, it is the decision of the people. In this way, leadership can carry the people along the path of democracy.
8. The greatest enemy of democracy which is corruption need to be addressed. This invariably cannot be done by a corrupt leadership for that would tantamount to stab oneself at the foot. Thus, it is only disciplined and impeccable leaders who can stamp out corruption in Nigeria. The question for leadership is who will bell the cat. The nation can run to technology for a way out. Electronic gadgets can be installed to monitor crime, corrupt practices in public offices and in the streets.
9. Part of dividends of democracy is creation of wealth and employment opportunities. Leadership should build industries, world class markets, put enabling environment for markets in intellectual properties, develop mechanized farms where youths can work and accelerate prompt payment of workers.

6. CONCLUSION

Every disputation begins with clarification of concepts. The concepts of democracy and leadership were clarified. The problems involved in the discussion were stated. The debate between democracy and leadership in Nigeria is a hot contest. Democracy is the structure within which leadership exercises authority. Leadership can hide under the structure to undo the system by promoting self-interest or group interest over and against the common good. Democracy is, therefore, at the mercy of leadership. The failure of Nigeria so far is the failure of leadership to a large extent and of followership to some extent. Corruption is at the root of this failure. And this corruption is a structural evil in the system. The blame for its presence and power in the polite goes to both leadership and followership. The way out is a return to the right direction of entrenching democratic structures and policies in the national system and to employ the modern technology in monitoring corruption and crime.

REFERENCES

- [1] Achebe, C. (1983). *The Trouble with Nigeria*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.
- [2] Douglas, J. H., et al, *Cassell's French & English, Dictionary*. London: Continuum.
- [3] Emeam. I. I. (2009). *Advanced studies in Christian religious knowledge*. Owerri: Joe Mankpa Publishers.

- [4] Hornby, A. S., Cowie, A. P., Gimson, A. C. (1974). Oxford advance learners dictionary. Oxford: oxford university Press.
- [5] Jennings, W. I. (1963). Democracy in Africa. Cambridge: University Press.
- [6] Kellerman, D.F. (ed). (1981). New Webster Dictionary. U.S.A.: the Delair Publishing company.
- [7] Nwoko, M. I. (1988). Basic World Political Theories. Owerri: Claretian Institute of Philosophy.
- [8] Odimegwu, I. (ed). (2008). Nigerian Democracy and Global Democracy. Awka: Fab educational book.
- [9] Onyeocha, I.M. (1994). Idealism, Politics and Nation-building: The Nigerian Experience. Washington: The council for research in Values and Philosophy.
- [10] Plato, The Republic, (1994-2000).Retrieved from: The Internet Classics Archive by Daniel C. Stevenson, Web Atomics.
- [11] Stogdill & Mann (1848) in Emenike Obi (2003). Educational Management: Theory and Practice. Enugu: Jamoe Enterprises.
- [12] Simpson, D. P. (1968). Cassell's New Latin Dictionary. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.