



POLITICAL SCIENCE

Review

Vol. 9 No.1, 2018



Published by:
Department of Political Science,
Faculty of Social Sciences,
University of Ilorin, Ilorin Nigeria.

POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW

VOLUME 9 NUMBER 1, 2018

**A PUBLICATION OF DEPARTMENT OF
POLITICAL SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF ILORIN,
ILORIN, NIGERIA.**

ISSN: 1996 - 4124

Disclaimer: The views and styles expressed in the articles in this publication are those of the individual authors and are not shared by the reviewers, the editors, the editorial consulting board, the Department of Political Science or the University of Ilorin.

All Correspondence to: psr@unilorin.edu.ng

Department of Political Science, University of Ilorin

For a complete list of articles in this issue, please refer to the table of contents.

Dr. (Mrs) A. I. Omede, University of Ilorin

Dr. E. O. Ojo, University of Ilorin

Professor Alex Gborge, University of Ilorin

Professor Alex Gborge, University of Ilorin

Professor A. A. Omede, University of Ilorin

Managing Editor: Dr. A. A. Omede, University of Ilorin

Editorial Policy and Guidelines for Contributors

Dr. A. A. Omede, University of Ilorin

Dr. A. A. Omede, University of Ilorin

Dr. A. A. Omede, University of Ilorin

Dr. A. A. Omede, University of Ilorin

Dr. A. A. Omede, University of Ilorin

Dr. A. A. Omede, University of Ilorin

Dr. A. A. Omede, University of Ilorin

Dr. A. A. Omede, University of Ilorin

Dr. A. A. Omede, University of Ilorin

Dr. A. A. Omede, University of Ilorin

Dr. A. A. Omede, University of Ilorin

Dr. A. A. Omede, University of Ilorin

Dr. A. A. Omede, University of Ilorin

Dr. A. A. Omede, University of Ilorin

Dr. A. A. Omede, University of Ilorin

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief

Professor H. A. Saliu

Editor

Dr. L. Saka

Associate Editors

Dr. F. A. Aremu

Dr. J. O. Olaniyi

Dr. A. A. Muhammad

Managing Editor

Dr. A. R. Bakare

Editorial Advisers

Professor Alaba Ogunsanwo, University of Lagos

Professor Alex Gboyega, University of Ibadan

Professor Lere Amusan, North-West University, South Africa

Dr. E. O. Ojo, University of Ilorin

Dr. (Mrs.) A. J. Omede, University of Ilorin

© Department of Political Science, University of Ilorin

All Correspondence to: psrunilorin@gmail.com

Disclaimer: The views and styles expressed in the articles in this publication are those of the individual authors and are not shared by the reviewers, the editors, the editorial consulting board, the Department of Political Science, or the University.

CALL FOR PAPERS

POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW (PSR)

PSR is a peer-reviewed journal published twice in a year by the Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ilorin, Nigeria in June and December. The journal publishes articles, book reviews, commentary, briefings and debates on political issues, processes in Nigeria, Africa and the entire globe.

The journal seeks to publish original empirical and theoretical research on policy-relevant issues. Comparative Studies are equally welcome. The journal is intended to satisfy the academic needs of students, academic specialists, policy makers and general readers with focus on Nigeria and Africa within the context of sub-national, national, regional and international discourse. It seeks to expand the frontiers of knowledge and foster intellectual interaction among academics as well as policy makers.

EDITORIAL POLICY AND GUIDELINES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

The Editorial Board has no preference for any socio-political ideology or viewpoint. Authors are allowed to freely share their viewpoints as long as such views contribute to the understanding of political developments in Nigeria, Africa and the world. Copyright of contributions in the journal is automatically transferred to the Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ilorin, on acceptance for publication. However, the views expressed in the published contributions belong solely to the author(s) and not the Journal or Editorial Board.

Contributions submitted for consideration must not have been published previously or currently under consideration for possible publication elsewhere. Conference papers are welcome but the conference detail where such paper was presented must be duly acknowledged as footnote on the front page.

Contributions are invited from all over the world (in English language only). For the June edition, manuscripts must have been submitted not later than March 31st, while for the December edition, manuscripts must have been submitted not later than October 31st. Manuscripts should be submitted to:

The Editor

Political Science Review (PSR)

Department of Political Science

Faculty of Social Sciences

University of Ilorin

P.M.B. 1515, Ilorin, Nigeria

Soft copy should be sent as attachment in MS Word format to: psr.unilorin@gmail.com

PROCEDURAL STAGES AND CONDITIONS OF PUBLICATIONS

Contributions for publication shall pass through three stages. Upon submission, the manuscript will be subjected to in-house assessment by the Editorial Board for compliance with PSR policy and house style. Authors whose papers are considered worthy for external blind review will be required to pay a non-refundable fee of N5,000.00 (or equivalent in US\$). The reports of the two reviews will be sent to the author(s) for corrections (if any). Authors of publishable manuscripts that attract positive decision from the reviewers will be required to pay a final publication fee of N15,000.00 (or equivalent in US\$). Author(s) of successful papers are entitled to a complimentary copy of the journal version where their papers appear.

CONTRIBUTION LENGTH

Articles should not exceed 8,000 words including references with an abstract of approximately 250 words with five keywords. Book reviews should be between 800 and 2,500 words, and must be accompanied with front cover scan of the reviewed book, scan of title page having the author(s), publisher, place of publication, date of publication, and ISBN.

Commentaries, Briefings and Debates on issues of development interests or critical explanation or policy analysis should be between 1,500 and 3,000 words.

PRESENTATION AND REFERENCE STYLES

Acronyms and Abbreviations should be written in full for the first time with acronyms and abbreviations in brackets. Quotations longer than three lines should be indented on both sides with no quotation marks. Double quotations marks should be used when quotations are less than three lines. Non-English words should be italicized. Referencing should strictly conform to APA style, 6th edition.

For further information, contact: **The Editor**, PSR, Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ilorin. +2348077078242

OR: **The Managing Editor** +2348055803641, +2347066925865

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Abubakar Abdulrahman lectures in the Department of Political Science, University of Ilorin, Nigeria.

Abubakar Gidado is with the Registry, Federal University Kashere, Gombe State, Nigeria.

Abubakar Umar Alhaji lectures in the Department of Political Science, Federal University Kashere, Gombe State, Nigeria.

Agada John Elachi Ph.D. is a practicing lawyer and trained mediator. He is based in Abuja, Nigeria.

Agaku Emmanuel Ayila is with the Centre for Peace and Strategic Studies, University of Ilorin, Nigeria.

Ahmed Wali Ph.D. teaches in the Department of Political Science, Federal University Kashere, Gombe State, Nigeria.

Bakare Adebola Rafiu Ph.D. lectures in the Department of Political Science, University of Ilorin, Nigeria.

Bello Temitope Yetunde is with the Institute for Peace and Strategic Studies (IPSS), University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

Brown Odigie Ph.D. is the Program Officer, Capacity Building, Mediation, Directorate of Political Affairs, ECOWAS Commission, Abuja, Nigeria.

Chiedo Nwankwor is an Adjunct Professor, School of Advanced International Service, John Hopkins University, United States.

Gbadeyan Olawale James teaches in the Department of Criminology and Security Studies, Achievers University, Owo, Ondo State, Nigeria.

Hassan A. Saliu, Ph.D. is a Professor of International Relations in the Department of Political Science, University of Ilorin, Nigeria.

Joseph Yinka Fashagba, Ph.D. lectures in the Department of Political Science, Federal University, Lokoja, Nigeria.

Muritala Babatunde Hassan teaches in the Department of Political Science, Federal University Dutse, Jigawa State, Nigeria.

Raji Adesina Abdulfattah Ph.D. is with the Department of Political Science, Fountain University, Osogbo, Nigeria.

Samuel Fola Caleb is with the Centre for Peace and Strategic Studies, University of Ilorin, Nigeria.

Segun Oshewolo, is with the Department of Political Science and International Relations, Landmark University, Omu-Aran, Kwara State, Nigeria.

Tahir Adekunle Ijaiya is NYSC Corp Member, Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research (NISER), Ibadan, Nigeria.

Uchenna Nzeako lectures in the Department of Political Science, Federal University, Dutsin-ma, Katsina State, Nigeria.

Umaru Ibrahim Yakubu teaches in the Department of Political Science, Federal University Dutse, Jigawa State, Nigeria.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Ugly at Home and Abroad: An Account of Contemporary Nigerian Foreign Policy Hassan A. Saliu, Ph.D. Segun Oshewolo	1-25
Constituency Diversity and Legislative Elections in Nigeria: A Case Study of the Nigerian Senate Joseph Yinka Fashagba, Ph.D. Chiedo Nwankwor	26-48
Democracy, Foreign Direct Investment and Socio-Economic Development in Nigeria: An Analysis of the Nexus (1999 - 2014)⁷ Muritala Babatunde HASSAN	49-73
Crucial Variables that will Shape the 2019 General Elections in Nigeria Hassan A. Saliu, Ph.D.	74-82
Nigeria Criminal Justice System: An Examination of Mob Justice within the context of Human Security Bello Temitope Yetunde	83-99
Africa and the Tragedy of Underdevelopment: Issues, Challenges and Prospects BAKARE, Adebola Rafiu, Ph.D.	100-126
Causes and Dynamics of Conflict in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Discourse RAJI, Adesina Abdulfattah Ph.D.	127-149
Implications of Small Arms and Light Weapons Proliferations for Human Security in Barkin-Ladi LGA of Plateau State, Nigeria GBADEYAN Olawale James AGAKU, Emmanuel Ayila SAMUEL, Fola Caleb	150-167
Farmers-Herdsmen Conflicts in Nigeria: An Analysis of State Response Umaru Ibrahim Yakubu	168-184
Different Wine, Same Bottle: A Study of Lamidi Adedibu and Olusola Saraki's Leadership Styles in Nigerian Politics ABUBAKAR, Abdulrahman	185-202
Assessment of Women Political Participation in Gombe State, Nigeria Dr. Ahmed Wali, Abubakar Umar Alhaji Abubakar Gidado	203-215
Governance and Food Security in Nigeria and some Selected Countries in Africa And Asia Tahir Adekunle, IJAIYA	216-231
Redesigning Nigeria's Peace Architecture: A Case for Peace Building Agada John Elachi Ph.D.	232-250
The Search for Solution to the Challenge of Indigeneity and Promotion of Inclusive Citizenship in Nigeria Brown Odigie, PhD Uchenna, NZEAKO	251-270

DIFFERENT WINE, SAME BOTTLE: A STUDY OF LAMIDI ADEDIBU AND OLUSOLA SARAOKI'S LEADERSHIP STYLES IN NIGERIAN POLITICS

ABUBAKAR, Abdulrahman

Department of Political Science,

University of Ilorin

07036120503, 08055848815

Email: abdulrahman.unilorin@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The enormous influence wielded by political godfathers especially in determining electoral outcomes in Nigerian politics is raising issue among practitioners, analysts and scholars. However, the consequence of the phenomenon is the patron-client relation been witnessed in the politics and governance of the country. This has made elected public officers to have more loyalty to the godfathers at the expense of being responsive to people's needs. It is against this backdrop that this paper attempts to examine how the leadership styles of godfathers influence the governance in the country. The paper uses Kwara and Oyo States under the control of Olusola Saraki and Lamidi Adedibu respectively as point of reference. Using qualitative method, the paper will establish the level of influence of the godfathers, the challenges facing the elected officials who came to power under their influence and underscore the threat which this phenomenon poses to good governance in Nigeria. It will make recommendations on how the issue can be addressed to the advantage of the citizens.

Introduction

Democracy is becoming the most acceptable and popular form of government since the end of the Second World War. Countries in the world had embraced democratization as the form of government for transforming their political system. The end of the cold war in 1989 coupled with the collapse of the USSR in 1991 contributed immensely to the spread of democracy in all parts of the world.

Apparently, since the third wave of the democratization process began across the Africa continent, happenings in the countries have been discouraging based on the prevalence of the sit-tight syndrome of the Africa leaders, military interventions, electoral flaws, often recycled rulers, activities of godfathers or big-man politics (Moses, 2007 and Debiel, 2002 cited in Animasawun, 2013). Nevertheless politics is generally regarded as the struggle for power among actors

who pursue conflicting desires on public issues. The paramount objectives of the contenders are to acquire political power, not only to provide materials needs, safety and security for themselves but also to dominate others (Davies, 2011).

In the works of Plato, Aristotle, Tacitus and other classical political philosophers, they largely focused on the concentration of power in the hands of a few. Thinkers such as Vilfredo Pareto, Gaetano Mosca, Robert Michell and Marx devoted their political analyses on how power is used and misused by the political elites in different political environs (Albert, 2005). However, the concentration of power and wealth of politicians explains the struggle for the control of the institutions and structures of political system by those big-man or godfathers either by elective or appointive (Osakede, and Ijimakinwa, (2016). Meanwhile, Nigeria's democracy has been characterized by conflict and violence since its inception. Also, party politics, tribal and religious politics, money bag politics, do-or-do die and activities of godfathers remain factors weakening Nigeria's democratic institutions. However, the activities of godfathers become more intense immediately Nigeria returned to democratic rule in 1999(fourth republic).

Essentially, it is not overtly bad to have a good-hearted individual or group of people at the helm of absolute power, that is, godfathers to distribute power in accordance to the will of the masses. However, the system has taken a contrary dimension across the globe. In developing countries, it has become a central point of political gangsterism (Azeez, 2014).

The term Godfatherism depicts patron-client relationship in which the patron (godfather) bestows gifts from private or public resources on followers to get and strengthen the loyalty of clients (godson) who in return give loyalty in exchange for what was received (Weber, 1980 cited in Animasawun, 2016). The term connotes the relationship between the godfather and godson. Godfathers are individuals who determine when and how, power and resources is share in a society. They are the set of people sponsoring politicians in an election. They manipulate election results to favour their godsons and in return receive protection and contract awards from their political godson (Ojo and Lawal, 2011).

Experience, has however, shown that the phenomenon of godfatherism is not new in Nigerian politics. Godfatherism can be traced to pre-independence and post independence politics of 1958 and 1960. It began to gain prominence in 1979 but the military that took over in the 1980s crushed its activities it later reappeared and reached its climax in 1999, when the country returned to civil rule (Akinola, 2009). The builders of Nigeria's Federalism and the likes of Chief Obafemi Awolowo, Dr. Nnamdi Azikwe and Ahmadu Bello became godfathers after independence and till today they are accorded respect (Fawole 2001). Political

king-makers cut across party lines and even though it was more celebrated in some states in Nigeria such as Oyo, Anambra, Enugu, Kogi, Kwara and lately Lagos, it has been undermining the effectiveness of the political system and the wishes of the masses (Champion, June 8th, 2003). The influence of political godfathers has become a rallying point among politicians.

Since 1950s, the conduct of elections in Nigeria has always been characterized by pessimism, uncertainty and fear for the safety of lives and property. Almost all the elections conducted in Nigeria were conflict ridden (Abbass, 2008). Issues surrounding electioneering process in Nigeria since independence has been related to violence and infringement on the rights of the citizens. The issue of overbearing influence of godfathers has also continued to threaten the democratic survival of the country. The scenario has resulted into poor performance by their clients (godson). The dominant stand of godfathers in Nigerian politics has weakened the democratic institutions and encouraged corruption in the electoral process.

In any democratic setting, leadership plays vital roles. Thus, it is important to have a better understanding of the activities of godfathers and their leadership style in their respective states especially in Kwara and Oyo state as a way to discover new ideas and dimensions of Nigeria's democracy. The objectives of the paper are to: identify the leadership style of Olusola Saraki and Lamidi Adedibu in Kwara and Oyo State respectively; draw out how the activities of political godfathers become injurious to democratic governance in Kwara and Oyo State; and recommend strategies and measures or checkmate or curb the phenomenon in Nigerian politics.

Understanding Godfatherism in Nigeria Political Context

The concept of godfatherism is a topical subject of debate among scholars. This explains the multiplicity of definitions. Godfatherism is a term used to describe the relationship between a godfather and godson (Akinola, 2009). The relationship between the godfathers and their godsons is both contractual and transactional in nature. Godfathers are seen in the Nigeria context as big men who have wealth, political power and are influential individuals who determine individuals or candidates to be nominated to contest election and become successful in such elections. Other scholars are of the opinion that godfathers are people of questionable wealth and influence who rob political parties of their conventional and legitimate functions of presenting clear and coherent programs on the basis of which the candidates presented by them are chosen by the electorates (Audu, 2006).

Godfatherism depicts patron-client relationship as an asymmetric relationship in which the patron bestows gifts from private or public resources on followers to get and strengthen the loyalty on the clients, who in turn, give their loyalty in exchange for what is received (Weber 1980 cited in Animasawun, 2016). Godfathers use their dominant position to appoint individuals to positions of authority in exchange for the appointees' loyalty which translate into the transfer resources to godfathers.

The relationship between godfather and godson in any form depicts Master/Servant relations. The Master acts in the capacity of a dictator to their client (godson) who is at the corridor of power. The godfather exercises control that is premised on the contractual agreement between them. This indicates that not all aspirants seeking political office can rise on their own. They require substantial resources to compete in the political system especially if they do not enjoy over public resources to begin with (Human right watch, 2007). Most successful candidates rely on sponsorship of their political godfathers to emerge victorious.

The term godfather is popularly known in Hausa language as Maigida (Master or Head of house hold) obviously the word goes beyond the literal meaning. In Yoruba language godfathers are referred to as Baba Kekere (Small gfather) or "Baba Isale" (the father of underworld) or Baba Nigbejo (a great helper in the time of trouble). In Igbo tradition it is called "Nnam" (My Master) (Audu, et'al, 2014).

Meanwhile, political godfathers under the Fourth Republic in Nigeria were categorized into five types: the first category is geo-political or ethnic organization that arrogates themselves or decides who represents their jurisdiction in government. Examples are Afenifere Forum (Yoruba Socio-cultural organization) Arewa Consultative Forum (representing the Northern (Hausa) and Ohaneze (the Pan-Igbo cultural group).

The second category involves some prominent individuals within the organization. These set of people had laid legacies in their various region and states and were highly respected. In fact their words were more respected than the Constitution and laws of the country. Amongst them were, Sir Amadu Bello, Tafawa Balewa, Dr. Nnamdi Azikwe, Chief Obafemi Awolowo, Chief Bola Ige and others. They were well known, highly respected and supported at the grassroots.

Third category of godfathers includes politicians who go round looking for candidates to invest in. They ensure success or victory of their clients in an election and they use every means at their disposal such as money, violence, electoral fraud etc. An example is Chris Uba (patron) and Chris Nigege (client).

Fourth set of godfathers are those who deal with rich clients. They are also known as Political Entrepreneurs. The contractual relationship between the patron and his client is that the client provides the money and the godfather delivers the votes. They are well established and knowledgeable in the tricks, ideas, and strategies for winning elections. They know the constituencies where these evils could be perpetrated in order to ensure the victory of their clients in an election. Examples are the Late Lamidi Ariyibi Adedibu and the late Olusola Saraki among others.

The fifth set of godfathers consists of the rich patrons who are willing to support poor candidates with all necessary requirements (money and logistics) to ensure the client wins in election. They fund campaigns and contribute immense fund to their clients' political party (Albert, 2005).

Albert (2005) submits that godfathers seek to put in power and establish the war-machines or foot-soldiers that will facilitate the transactional relationship with godsons. They ensure electoral victory of the godsons and in a situation where there is fallout between the patron and client, war-machines become factionalised. A faction aligns itself with the camp of godson and the other with the godfather. The two camps engage in bloody encounter.

A candidate is adopted as godson by a godfather only when an agreement or covenant is reached between them on what will be invested and what will be returned. Some godfathers insist on oath-taking at the stage and put in place all extra-structure for ensuring that the godson does not betray them.

Paradoxically, it has become a norm that for an individual to hold political office either appointive or elective, the candidates must patronize a godfather because of their security connections, enormous financial weight and local links or support. To be sure, they single handily determine who becomes a flag bearer or who gets the nod of party to run for a political office among the contenders. Meanwhile because of their overbearing influence, the godfathers rob their godsons of their independence; thus, they became surrogates and are conditioned in such a way that they become totally subservient to their godfathers (Ishaku, Jatau and Badung, 2014). However, despite the fact that the positions of the godfathers are unstable, some of them maintain the status quo for years in their states. They deploy their knowledge, wealth, power and influence to hold their supporters together. These strategies enable some of these godfathers to remain prominent and well recognized in their states. For example, the likes of the late Olusola Saraki of Kwara and the late Lamidi Adedibu of Oyo maintained their leadership throughout their live time in their states.

Essentially, one would agree with the argument of Omobolaji (2008) that, for godfathers to ensure their continued existence, they must engage in acts which flout the electoral laws in Nigeria. Such acts include; making a pronouncement that his supporters should support one candidate while the other contestant should step down, deploying violence through thugs and security personnel against candidates who oppose their candidates, bribe officials and induces voters to support a particular candidate, engage in zoning and other procedures that excludes unwanted candidates among others. Jolly Nyame the former Taraba state Governor asserted that, one thing in politics is that you must believe in godfatherism, "whether you like it or not, as a godfather you will not be a Governor, you will not be a President, but you can make a Governor, you can make a President". He added that, "I am the greatest godfather in Nigeria because this is the first time an individual single-handedly put in position every politician in the State" (Ibrahim, 2006 cited in Omobolaji, 2008). The argument portrays the importance of godfatherism in Nigerian politics and the roles they play.

Conceptualising Democracy and Election

Democracy as a concept is a nebulous term that does not lead itself to easy definition. Meanwhile it is not the case of defining democracy that is problematic, but providing a universally acceptable meaning (Oni, 2014). Democracy exists where the principal leaders of a political system are selected in a competitive election in which the bulk of the population has the opportunity to participate (Huntington, 1970). This assertion was further underscored by the observation of Duruji and Segun (2014) as a system that allows selection of the most powerful collective decision makers, through fair honest and periodic election involving candidates that freely compete for votes of the population. Democracy can be seen as a system of government in which adult citizens are constitutionally empowered to express their views and opinion or choose the leaders that would represent their interest through periodic elections.

Implicit in the definitions above is that in any democratic system, the electorates choose among the competing candidates, those whom they feel are capable and competent to govern them. They repose confidence on them and if they betray the trust of the people they change them through the same process of periodic elections.

Election as a concept has generated serious debate among scholars as there is no agreed definition for the concept. Meanwhile, Tremblay, et al cited in Ejumudo, (2012) submits that election is a procedure recognized by the rule of an organization, be it a state a club, a voluntary organizations, where all or some of the members chose smaller number of persons to hold offices of authority within that

organization. In other words, election is a device or mechanism for electing or choosing among many that are competing for a post into most essential public office and organizations.

Adeniyi (2011) sees election as a process under democracy through which people or citizens exercise their freedom and inalienable rights to organize their life and to choose those whom they delegate their rights as representatives.

The arguments posed by above these definitions depict the concept of election as a process of selecting people to occupy or fill some elective post or public offices. However an election can be seen as a process under democracy through which the citizens participate in the process of choosing leaders to whom they delegate their rights. Besides, people participate fully in exercise of their civic rights or throw their support behind a government if they enjoy the dividend of democracy or if the electoral promises were fulfilled to a large extent.

It is important to conclude that despite the awareness that only, free, fair, credible and transparent elections can consolidate democracy in Nigeria, the country has been unable to conduct peaceful, free and fair open elections, whose result are widely accepted and respected across the country (Igbuzor, 2010, Osumah and Aghemeto, 2010, Eweremadu, 2011).

Theoretical Framework

The paper adopted Elite Theory. The central argument of this theory is that every society is ruled by a microscopic minority. In every society there is bound to be a minority who take decisions on behalf of the majority as every member is not equally capable of participating in the running of the affairs of the state. Harold Lasswell conceptualises political elites as power-holders of a body politics. He regarded them as the holders of high position in a given society. They ensure that their decision is binding and their words are stronger than the laws of their societies.

The theory focuses on the acquisition, use, misuse and consolidation of power. It assures that political power is concentrated in the hands of a few who possess certain qualities in the society (Omotola, 2007). Indeed, power is therefore the corner stone of politics.

Olusola Saraki's Leadership Style in Kwara Politics

Dr. Olusola Saraki was a trained medical doctor who later made his foray into politics. He started his career as a politician in Kwara state when he contested for the House of Representatives against the late Alhaji Babatunde Alanamu who despite his recognition as a philanthropist in Ilorin lost the election. In 1978 Dr. Olusola Saraki became a full time politician so recognized to the extent that Chief

Olusegun Obasanjo nominated him to the Constituent Assembly. Olusola Saraki became one of the founders of the National Party of Nigeria (NPN).

In 1979 he contested for the presidential ticket under the platform of NPN and lost. In 1983 he was elected as the senator from Kwara Central, and later became the senate leader. Olusola Saraki, the man at the helm of the Saraki dynasty was the strong man and kingmaker of Kwara state politics who rose to the throne of Kwara godfather in a manner considered by many as classical and uncharacteristic for contemporary godfathers (Ikenna, n.d).

Saraki embarked on his philanthropic mission through provision of free medical care to the people of Ilorin, provision of employment through his bakery, repair of bad roads, supply of water, provision of foodstuffs and money to all and sundry within Ilorin and later to all part of Kwara state, Kogi and beyond. Akogun (2015) adds plates of Eba for the hungry, funeral bills for the dead and gifts of clothes and handbags for estranged house wives. According to Saraki, "I took after my father, I don't want people to suffer in any way. How can I have so much among people who have so little and not be worried? It was concern for the people that often led to crisis between me and those I assured into political office". He reiterated that, if a man has excess it is expected that he shares it with those who don't have. We can always share what we have those who don't have. This explains that his philanthropy is not just to the people of Ilorin alone.

Indeed, the late Olusola Saraki was adjudged to be a unique politician. One aspect of his politicking that have marvelled people including those in the academia was how he was able to keep his political group intact given the intermittent incursion into politics by the military (Saliu, 2010).

All these among others accounted and contributed to the strong foundation of Saraki's dynasty in Kwara state politics. Essentially, he became an oracle to the extent that any politician aspiring or desirous of winning an election in Kwara state must patronize and seek his nod and approval. He dictated the terms upon which he would wish to donate Kwara state to a platform of his choice and fancy (Akogun, 2015).

It is germane to note, that since the inception of the 2nd republic in 1979 to the 4th republic in 2011, Olusola Saraki succeeded in installing five Governors, Senators, House of Rep Members, House of Assembly Members, Commissioners and other political office holders within the state and even to federal appointments i.e. Ministers and Special Advisers just to mention a few. In 1979, with his support Alhaji Adamu Attah became the first civilian governor of Kwara state. He fell out with Adamu Attah, on the grounds that Adamu Attah sought for 2nd term in office in 1983. Saraki withdrew his support for Chief C.O Adebayo. He was instrumental

to Chief C.O Adebayo's electoral victory under the Unity Party of Nigeria (UPN) in 1983. With the support of Saraki Alhaji Mohammed Shaaba Lafiagi became the Governor of Kwara State in 1993. The late Saraki was also instrumental to Mohammed Alabi Lawal's electoral success in 1999. However, when his son Bukola Saraki met the constitutional age requirement in 2003 he swept away the incumbent governor Mohammed Alabi Lawal who turned out to be a political ingrate (Ojo and Lawal, 2011).

Essentially, Saraki denied the allegation that he masterminded the Bukola's governorship election in 2003. He stated that "I never wished for Bukola to become a politician but circumstance constrained me. In fact it wasn't an easy decision agreeing with Bukola to enter into politics. It was some of my trusted loyalist who told me at the meeting that your eminence, you have but food in one man's mouth and in the mouth of several people, when are you going to put in the mouth of your son?" (Abubakar, 2013). This was contrary to the perception of Saraki's political opponents who said he purposely brought his Bukola into politics because he said Kwara was his fiefdom. It is an incontrovertible fact that political authority without experience, skills or expertise creates a situation of power holding without the substance of control, such power holders may be on top but must be at the constant mercy of a man experienced and skilled in the art of politics (Akogun, 2015).

Essentially, a politician in the actual sense of it is he who studies the pains of his people and proffers credible solutions to their problems. Olusola Saraki positioned himself nationally, he understood the science attached to spending money. Olusola Saraki in his argument lamented that "I have never rigged any election since I joined politics about forty-seven years ago, since then I have been using my money to contest for elective offices and to support people" (The Nation, 2011). One would concur with Davies assertion (2014) that money itself has become a dominant factor, not only in all economic sphere but also in deciding issues in political and social arena. He stressed further that money seems to have taken the centre stage in the political process in most countries and in Nigerian politics it even appears to be so dominant in the electoral process to such an extent that money has crept into the country's political lexicon.

However, as part of Olusola Saraki's major role in the political leadership of Kwara state, he provided funds to run the political party's activities. After recommendations by his team of advisers, he gave out nomination forms and even settles the financial expenses attached to nominations (Saliu, 2015).

Any political party supported by Olusola Saraki always triumphed in elections. His withdrawal from a party always brought the party to its knees. By

extension, he was liked and had a flourishing legacy. His people accorded him so many praises because of the politics of the stomach which he had institutionalized. The late Saraki was adjudged to be a multi-state politician to the extent that during his presidential aspiration, he would wear Olusola Saraki in Yorubaland with Yoruba gown; he would wear Sola Saraki in the East with his Suit and English dress and in the North; he would wear Abubakar Saraki with Northern gown to match (Ayo, Opadokun, 2012).

What is uniquely different with Saraki as the Strongman of Kwara politics compared to the late Adedibu, is the irrefutable fact that he solidified his dynasty. Saraki relied on people's mandate. He displayed a good level of respect to faith-based structures and notable individuals and cleric in the state (Saliu, 2010). This is contrary to Chief Adedibu's style of operation. Adedibu relied on youth especially the foot soldiers. He believed in the use of youth in local politics which implied violence (Animasawun, 2013). These youths were sustained through financial support and other forms of assistance because they are always available for him during elections. According to Ayoade (2006) Late Adedibu presumed that the voters are those who benefit from his peculiar styles of benevolence described as "deceptive benevolence". This is popularly described as Amala and Gbegiri politics. This is a system set up to meet the needs of those in the lower strata of the society by feeding them with Amala and Gbegiri being the staple food in Ibadan and holding court with them (Omobowale, 2007 cited in Animasawun 2013).

By extension, little respect was accorded the traditional rulers in Oyo state by Adedibu. One would recall that the late Olubadan, Oba Samuel Odulana Odugade attempted to sanction Adedibu, insisting on a clear line of demarcation between traditional institution and politics in the state. The late Oba banned all Ibadan chiefs including Adedibu from participating in politics (Omotola, 2007). Following this line, Late Adedibu proclaimed;

I am the controller of politics in Oyo State, I dominate the political affairs of Oyo State. All the governors that won never did so without my contribution and influence. If you must win election, you must come here. By the will of God, wherever I am people must definitely win. Even though people have different opinion about me, wherever I stand, God is always there, it is a known fact and it has always been so before now that if you pass through me, you would do anything you want in politics. So if I say I dominate politics, I do (Adeyemo, 2007 cited in Omotola, 2007.)

Indeed, both godfather's styles of leadership were characterized by violence. However, the degree or level and management of violence in each state differ. For instance in Kwara state, the most serious violence that claimed many lives and property in the state was that of 2003 gubernatorial elections between late Mohammed Alabi Lawal and Saraki the godfather. In the violence a lot of people were assassinated and properties worth of millions of naira were destroyed. This is contrary to what was obtained under the leadership of Adedibu. Oyo was known to be warfare state during election periods. Though all is now history in Oyo State.

Adedibu's Leadership Style in Oyo Politics

The late Lamidi Adedibu the strongman and political overlord of Oyo politics started his career as a motor park activist. In the 1950s, Adedibu went into politics. He began as a political errand boy to the likes of Chief Obafemi Awolowo, Mr. Samuel, O. Lanlehin and the late Chief Akinloye (Musa, 2006 cited in Animasawun, 2013). In second Republic, he became a popular politician and assumed the leadership of Ibadan politics. He was known for both peaceful and violent instructions of his patrons depending on his own discretion.

Alao Akala a former governor noted in an interview with Human Right Watch (2007) that "Adedibu has been in politics since it began in Nigeria, if you go to his house, you will see pictures of all the past leaders he has worked with. Adedibu belongs to the old School of Thought".

However, in the Fourth Republic, godfatherism as a phenomenon in Nigeria's politics became rose to its peak. The Oyo state experience was unique in view of the domineering influence of Adedibu in the politics of Oyo state. Despite the high level of educated elites in Ibadan and its environs, Adedibu single-handedly determines the direction of politics in Oyo state. From 1999 to 2011, Adedibu succeeded in installing three Governors, members of National Assembly and members of House of Assembly in Oyo state.

In 1999, Adedibu agreed to throw his weight behind Lam Adeshina. The late Adedibu employed all it took to ensure the success of Adeshina in the state's gubernatorial election. Adeshina contested under the umbrella of Alliance for Democracy (AD), and within a few months of assumption of office trouble erupted between him and his godfather. The dispute was quite irreconcilable, as it arose from the inability of Alh. Lam Adeshina to abide by the oath or bond signed between him and his godfather.

Lam Adeshina, with his power of incumbency and state resources managed to complete his four years in office. Although he was interested in running for a second term, his estranged godfather deployed all machineries to thwart such an ambition. In a bid to succeed Lam Adeshina in 2003, the late

Adedibu adopted Senator Rasheed Ladoja as the governorship candidate under the platform of Peoples Democracy Party (PDP). A few months after Ladoja's assumption of office, catastrophe erupted again between Adedibu and his political godson, Ladoja. The differences were tied to Adedibu's demand for 15 million naira of the 50 million monthly security vote for the state. This money was to oil and service his political machinery which he deployed to ensure Ladoja's victory (Omotola, 2007). The irreconcilable dispute led to the impeachment of Ladoja, and his Deputy, Alao Akala, became the Governor. Omotola (2007) opined that the politics in Oyo state had become more deinstitutionalized and privatized than it was in the Second Republic.

Adedibu became overlord in Oyo politics to the extent that the then Olubadan, Oba Samuel, Odulana Odugade was unable to sanction Adedibu when he insisted on a clear line of demarcation between the traditional institution and politics in the state.

Adedibu's political influence primarily came from his ability to moralize violence and money in ensuring the victory of his candidates in elections. Chief Olusegun Obasanjo, the former President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria pleaded with the people of Oyo state to tolerate Adedibu's excesses since the man was a "dry fish that could not be bent anymore" (Daily trust, 2006, cited in Omodia, and Egwemi, 2011).

Meanwhile, to understand the Modus Operandi of godfatherism, it is relevant to know that thugs and voters constitute a set of clients to the godfather. The godfathers relate with them in different dimensions, using different strategies. In the case of Adedibu, the voters were those who benefited from his peculiar style of benevolence described as deceptive benevolence (Ayoade, 2006, cited in Animasawun, 2013). The method was described as "Amala and Gbegiri politics" and was adopted in order to meet the yearnings of the less privileged and the poor. Adedibu sustained his leadership of Oyo politics by nurturing and maintaining grass root support. As a leader, he catered to his people's common good, by providing employment and infrastructural facilities to both urban and rural areas, allocation of contracts and protection of his foot-salaries from the law in case of any eventualities (Animasawun, 2013). Adedibu attached importance to the youths; he supported them financially and morally whenever the need arose.

Comparative Analyses of Olusola Saraki's and Lamidi Adedibu's Style of Political Leadership

Politics in Nigeria since the inception of the Fourth Republic in some parts of the country has become an investment where the investors bankroll would-be politicians in return for expected profits. Prominent among the warlords were late

the Olusola Saraki in Kwara State and the late Lamidi Adedibu in Oyo State. These two strongmen maintained their status quo as godfathers in their respective states throughout their life times.

Indeed, political parties and politicians seeking for political offices usually had to seek the approval of the two godfathers. Any party supported by Olusola Saraki and Lamidi Adedibu triumphed in elections. Both Adedibu and Saraki became oracles that needed to be consulted before contesting for any electoral post in both the federal and local government levels.

Experience shows that both Saraki and Adedibu were philanthropists, even though the level of humanitarianism differs. Saraki embarked on his philanthropic mission through the provision of free medical care to the people of Ilorin and its environs, and the establishment of bakery as part of his provision of job for the people even before he joined politics. He purchased forms for candidates that had been nominated to contest for political posts. There is no household in Ilorin, the capital of Kwara State, who could boast openly that they had not benefitted from Olusola Saraki's largesse. It was on this premise that when he sneezed, the state caught cold (Ojo and Lawal, 2011).

Adedibu also touched the lives of the people in Ibadan, especially the youths and the beggars. He supported his supporters both financially and materially. However, the difference between Olusola Saraki and Lamidi Adedibu is the irrefutable fact that Olusola Saraki solidified his dynasty. Saraki relied on the people's mandate during elections. He so much believed in that ideology to the extent that he usually mobilized and encouraged people to participate in political activities in Kwara State and beyond. On the other hand, his counterpart from Oyo State (Adedibu) believed in the use of thugs or political militia for him to triumph in an election. For Adedibu, in order to be nominated for elective posts, such a person must be an errand boy or guard who had the capacity to harass political opponents. Besides this, the size and strength of followers determined the extent of one's position in late Adedibu's camp. A resulting effect was the formation of violent groups under the guise of Youth for Change in Ibadan (Animasawun, 2013). It was observed that late Adedibu's power thrived through his tremendous ability to mobilize violence and money in support of his candidates. Many residents of Oyo preferred to use harsher terminologies. He threatened people from whom he needed votes with all dangerous weapons, including machetes, axes, both local and foreign-made guns charms and chemicals (Human Rights Watch, 2007).

It is germane to note that both Saraki and Adedibu's leadership style were characterized by violence, but the degree and the level of managing violence varies in each case. Another line of demarcation between the two godfathers is that the

former displayed a good level of respect for faith-based structures, notably individuals and clergies. Little respect and importance was attached to traditional rulers in Oyo State by Late Adedibu. This was attributed to the federal support he enjoyed especially during President Obasanjo's era in 1999 -2007. Thus, he boasted: "It is not that Obasanjo is supporting me blindly. He has reasons to support me. He has waded into the crisis several times. There was a time when Obasanjo prostrated for me about six times" (Ogu Chi, 2005 cited in Ayoade, 2009).

Another strategy adopted by Adedibu to sustain his leadership in Oyo politics was "Amala and Gbegiri politics" which was linked to the high level of hunger and poverty in the country. As Yoruba adage says, "If hunger can be assuaged, poverty has been taken care of to a large extent (Animasawun, 2013). Though Saraki adopted a similar plan, the only line of demarcation between them was, while Adedibu adopted the Amala and Gbegiri politics which was the staple of the Yorubas is the West, Late Saraki adopted Eba and cash of Fifty naira politics for his teaming supporters. They both adopted the strategy to secure the votes of the people in elections.

Implications of Godfatherism on Nigeria's Democratic Survival

Indeed, the founders of Nigeria's federalism, the likes of Chief Obafemi Awolowo, Ahmadu Bello, Nnamdi Azikiwe, were political godfathers in their various regions after Nigeria's independence in 1960. They were highly respected. Their style of leadership was seen as positive and as beneficial to their godsons and the entire regions and the country as a whole. Meanwhile, since the inception of the fourth republic in Nigeria, godfatherism has taken another dimension and has become driven by selfishness and greed (Nwachukwu, 2005). It is unfortunate that the most disturbing and disheartening aspect of contemporary godfatherism is that most godfathers are themselves sponsored and also lack the basic understanding of the fundamental concepts of governance. To them, government is to be hijacked for their own political gains and aggrandizement.

It is imperative to unravel the threat posed by godfatherism to the survival of Nigeria's democracy. Godfatherism constitutes impediment and scourge to genuine democracy. It obstructs the election of candidates and genuine executives, forcing down on the people their incompetent clients (godsons). Ayoade (2009) adds that nominees are often forced down the throat of their godsons. Thus, elections cannot be free and fair nor can governance be transparent or people-friendly, when the godfathers, who are meant to be gatekeepers, use their influence to block the chances of the citizens in participating in elections or in exercising their civic rights. This kind of practice promotes mediocrity and financial

corruption, as incumbent godsons are always at pains to satisfy the whims and caprices of their godfathers, among other competing demands on the scarce resources of the government (Albert, 2005). For avoidance of doubt, the godfathers have a lot of resources which they use to influence the citizen's will. It is thus proclaimed that their supporters must vote for a certain candidate and the other aspirant would be compelled to withdraw. In election proper, with the influence of electoral umpires, they intimidate both INEC staff and their casual workers (returning officers, presiding officers, polling clerks and even the opposition polling agents) by declaring their clients as winners and the original winners as losers.

Another serious implication is electoral malpractices. Godfathers adopt all tricks at their disposal to ensure the victory of their candidates in elections. Undoubtedly, Albert (2005) opines that in Nigeria, elections are usually a contest of power between godfathers. They come out with all the tricks that could help to give their candidates victory. The tricks include multiple voting, exchanging of official ballot boxes with unofficial ones already filled with thumb printed voting papers, stealing ballot boxes, among others. The act of godfatherism is inimical to democracy and liberty of the citizenry. Here, the state resources that are meant to provide infrastructural facilities for the citizenry are diverted.

In addition, fallout between godson and their godfathers unleash terror on the innocent citizens, killing and wounding the political opponents. This has led to destruction of many lives and property, both public and private. This also encouraged the military to take over power in Nigeria and adopt the sit-tight syndrome. Politicians so much attached importance protecting their stay in office and their godfathers, thereby depriving them from carrying out their responsibility for which they were voted and thus, debar good governance (Akingbade 2011). Inability to achieve democratic desirable goals can become abuse of rule of law, due process and lack of transparency in the management of public affairs at all levels of governance in Nigeria.

Recommendations and conclusion

The analysis of our findings established that the democratic institution in Nigeria has been crippled by the phenomenon of godfatherism. Self-centeredness of godfathers has continued to threaten democratic sustenance in Nigeria. The syndrome is antithetical to the extent that the electorate are not only deprived of their rights but blocked from full participation in the electoral process, because of their criminal politics (do-or-die) during electioneering in Nigeria. Indeed, godfatherism is an impediment and a scourge to genuine democracy in Nigeria, since. The phenomenon has become so entrenched in our electoral process. Though

there is nothing bad in having godfathers it is imperative to godfathers who are desirous of leading the country to the promised land of good governance that the citizenry expect. This research therefore proffers the following recommendations, as a useful suggestion that will stem the tide.

The idea of re-emergence of godfatherism in Oyo State should be prevented. Godfathers in Kwara State and other parts of the country should be implored to have the passion of godfathers in the First Republic. State resources that are supposed to be used for infrastructural development are committed to the use of godfathers by protégé. Security vote should be out-rightly cancelled or revised. Political parties should always play the game according to the rules and regulations that established them.

REFERENCES

- Adeniyi, A. S (2011). Conducting Credible, Peaceful, Free & Fair Election in Nigeria in 2011: The Role of INEC, being paper presented at the National Conference on 2011 Organization by Department Political science University of Abuja.
- Akinola, O. A (2009). Godfatherism and the future of Nigeria Democracy. *Africa Journal of Political Science & Administration* 4(1) 41-88.
- Akogun, I. O (2015). Letters To The Emir: A Vision for A Heterogeneous Kwara State: Integrity Publications.
- Albert, I O (2005). Explaining godfatherism in Nigerian politics, *African Sociological Review* 9, No 2.
- Animasawun, G. A (2013). Godfatherism in Nigeria's Fourth Republic: The Pyramid of Violence and Political Insecurity in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria, IFRA – Nigeria E- Papers Series, No. 27.
- Attah, A. Audu, J. & Haruna, P. (2004). Godfatherism, Party Politics & Democracy in Nigeria: Issues & Challenges. *Journal of good governance & sustainable development in Africa*. 2(2) 86-93.
- Ayoade, A. A. (2009). Godfather Politics in Nigeria in Adetula, V.O (ed) Money And politics in Nigeria. IFES: DFID.
- Azeez, K. (2014). Electoral Violence And Nigeria's Journal of Africa Election. 6(2) 112-121.
- Davies, A. E (2014). Money Politics In The Nigerian Electoral Process in Rotimi A. & Joseph, O. F (eds). Understanding Government & Politics in Nigeria; Omu-Aran Department of Political Science and International Relations.
- Duruji, M. M and Segun, J (2017). Election and Electoral Administration in Nigeria, in Rotimi, A and Joseph, O. F(eds) Understanding Government and Politics in Nigeria, Ilorin: Yesterday Krow Consult.
- Edigin, L. U (2010). Political Conflicts And godfatherism in Nigeria; A Focus on The Fourth Republic An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal, Ethiopia, 4(4) 174-186.
- Eweremadu, I. (2011) "2011 General Elections: A Critical Review" This day, 16 (5876) 23.
- Fawole, A (2001). Godfatherism: Menace to Democracy. *Journal of Policy & Administration*. 10(6) 113-128.
- Gambo, A.N (2006). Godfatherism and Electoral Politics in Nigeria. Published by IFES: DFID.
- Human Right Watch (2007). Violence "Godfathers" And Corruption In Nigeria. 19 (16) 52-65.

- Ibrahim, J. (2006). The Rise of Nigeria's godfathers. IFED: DFID.
- Igbuzor, O. (2010). "Strengthening & Defending Democracy: Option for CSO Engagement and Capacity needs for Effectiveness" a paper presented at the Centre for Democracy & Development (CDD) Open Society Initiative for West Africa (OSIWA) Joint Forum on Resolving the Political Impasses in Nigeria: 15-16(1).
- Ishako, B, Jatau, V.S and Badunga, J. N (2014). Godfatherism in the Politics of Nigeria; An expose; International Journal of Arts and Humanities Bahir Dar, Ethiopia. 3(2) 30-45.
- Moses, T. A (2007). The Travails of an Emerging Democracy. The turbulent 2007 General Elections In Nigeria in Journal of Democratic Studies. Mambayya House 1(1) 24-25.
- Nwachukwu, A, MD (2004). Our Culture, our Future Godfatherism. Being a paper Presented On behalf of Enyimba, N.A, a Pan-Igbo think – tank, during the Convention of Anambra State Association, USA.
- Ojo, E.O and Lawal E. E (2011). Godfather Politics: The collapse of Saraki Dynasty in Kwara Politics in Ayoade, A.A(ed) Nigeria's Critical Election USA: Lexington books.
- Omobolaji, O. O (2008). Godfathers, Political Parties and Electoral Corruption in Nigeria; Africa Journal of Political Science and International Relations. 2 (4) 66-73.
- Omodia, S. M (2011). Party Politics And The Challenges of Political Representation In Nigeria, International Journal of Business And Social Sciences 2(22) 270-275.
- Omotola, J. S (2007). Godfathers and the 2007, Nigeria General Elections. 2006 Laureate of the CODESRIA Democratic Institute, Dakar.
- Osakede, K. O and Tjinmakinwa, S. O (2016) Political Godfatherism and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria: Empirical Evidence from Oyo State and Kwara State. Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review. 5 (8) 1-12.
- Osuah and Aghemeto (2010). Election In Nigeria Since The End of Military Rule, Journal of Africa 4(4) 9-35.
- Saliu, H. A (2010) "personality and Political Mobilization: A Case Study of Dr. Abubakar Olusola Saraki", being a paper presented at RATTAWU's Organized Public Lecture in Honour of Dr. Abubakar Olusola of his 77th Birthday held at banquet Hall, Ilorin.
- Schmpeter, J. (1976). Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy. London: Allen & Unwin