Northern Hegemony versus Southern Aversion: The Politics of Restructuring in Nigeria and its Implications for National Unity

BADMUS, Bidemi Gafar *[1], &**LAFENWA, A. Stephen**[1]

[1]Political Science Department, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

Abstract: The agitation for political restructuring or what has been popularly termed 'true federalism' is not peculiar to Nigeria alone; perhaps, the quest for restructuring has become prodigious in most derailed federal systems where there are prevalence of misrule, unfair sharing of power and resources, ethnic domination/marginalization, mutual distrust among federating units and where there is persistence shift in power configuration towards unitary or centralized system. This study argues that, there are new compelling factors that are currently driving the agitation for restructuring in Nigeria; such as surge of inter/intra-border crimes, incessant banditry activities, wanton killings by insurgents and Boko-haram terrorism, high spate of kidnapping and armed robbery, frequent cult clash within the major cities, outrageous attacks on farmers by herdsmen, and overall palpable fear of general insecurity across the nation which is quite a shift from the previous propelling factors like issues of resource control, power sharing and equitable distribution of national resources and political appointments among others which were at core of the quest for restructuring particularly, by majority of political stakeholders from the Southern parts of the country. This study therefore, concludes that Nigeria may be sitting on the 'gun powder' if the opportunity to renegotiate the future of its federalism and the national coexistence are foreclosed under the pretence of non-negotiable unity of the country.

Keywords: Hegemony, Political Restructuring, Federalism, Politics, Democracy.

INTRODUCTION

The Nigerian federation is contemporary Africa's largest and longest experiment in the use of mechanism of federal institutions to manage diverse cultural-territorial pluralism and other related conflicts associated with the union. However, the failing of most federal system of governments in Africa have propelled the quest for reconfiguration, restructuring or renegotiation of federal system particularly, in Nigeria. It is imperative to note that, the agitations for true federalism or what is now popularly terms political restructuring is not a new phenomenon particularly, in most derailed federal systems: where there is prevailing misrule and mutual distrust among the federating units where there is persistence erosion of power moving from the federating units to the central or federal government. In Nigeria for instance, the debate on political restructuring has predominantly taken the centre space of political discourse as a result of conflicts engender by revenue allocation, power sharing, resource control, lop sidedness in federal appointments, insecurity, minorities question, miss governance, inequitable access to power, exclusion, marginalization, issue of state police establishment, and bargained constitutional reform to effectuate the restructuring of the polity (see Amuwo & Agbaje, 1998; & Momoh &Adejumobi, 2002).

Given the foregoing extrapolation, it is constitutional and legal right for any particular member of a federation union to seek for renegotiation, dialogue, restructure or secession if their membership or constitutional right within the federation union is threaten or eroded. This is true, because federalism as a system of government is adopted as a political arrangements that best suited the nature, context and composition of multi-ethnics, heterogeneous, or ethnic pluralism societies (Babalola, 2016; & Chukwuemeka & Amobi, 2011) for the promotion of collective and mutual benefits and interests.

Undoubtedly, federalism as a mechanism of government should advance ethnic harmony and promote high level of co-operation among the various segments and institutions that made up of a federal state with the hope to achieve the desired end of the good life for all the citizens (Alsamee *et al.,* 2016). Similarly, as argued by Bin (2011) a federation is synonymous with sovereign state characterized by a union of partially self-governing states or regions united of the component states which is constitutionally entrenched and may not be altered by a unilateral decision of the central government. Put differently, the constitutional structure found in a federation is known as federalism in which there exist more than one level of government and each level having its own constitutionally proscribed powers and responsibilities (Henry, 2019).

At the core of recent waves of political restructuring been agitated for, mostly by the Southern

---

part of Nigeria was the perceived blatant neglect and disregard for a pragmatic system of governance that is accommodating, tolerant, dynamic, utilitarian and evolving. Thus, the agitators for political restructuring premised their demand on assumption that a true and self-sufficient federation can only strive on consultation, negotiation, compromise, bargaining and agreement between the federating units or constituent governments. In essence, a successful federalism must be shaped to mirror the existing realities surrounding the concept of a market economy.

Therefore, it is important to provide answers to the following fundamental questions surrounding the issue of political restructuring in Nigeria; what are the motives behind the South's agitation for restructuring in Nigeria?; why has restructuring been perceived as a calculated or premeditated attack on the North?; are there any major constraints to political restructuring in Nigeria? and what are the implications of political restructuring or the absence of restructuring on Nigerian federal system, democracy and national unity?. Consequently, this study seek to provide answers to all the foregoing questions in order proffer alternative explanations and suggestions on how to reposition the Nigerian federal system to become all encompassing that enshrine mutual trust, advance ethnic harmony and development.

The study would be divided into five sections; the introduction, conceptual clarification, federalism and its historical perspectives in Nigeria, politics of political restructuring in Nigeria, lastly, conclusion and way forward

CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATION

Federalism

Historically, federalism has no roots in political theory. It is simply a features of government invented in the United States in 1787 for reasons of expediency. Thus, federalism was crafted for the purpose of allowing the continued existence of American state governments while a strong central government was founded (Onwudiwe & Suberu, 2005). Consequently, in order to protect individual liberty American federalism was designed to promote a system of separation of powers and multi level governance in the expectation that if "power was divided among public official independent of each other and responsive to different constituencies, then actions could not be taken if they impinged upon the interests of any substantial group" as any one political ambition would be made to counteract the other (Zingale, 2003).

According to Diamond (1999), federalism was never designed as an instrument of ethnic conflict management rather federalism has developed into a popular governance mechanism for "holding together" multiple ettnic communities in a single multi-level polity. In essence, federalism offers a perfect formula for democratically maintaining unity in diversity in a deeply divided society. In the same vein, federalism is essentially an approach to governance that seeks to combine unity or shared rule with diversity or self-rule (Kincaid, 1995). In the opinion of Riker (1975), the primary operational feature of federalism is to guaranteed territorial division of political power between the common (central) and constituent (regional or sub-federal) government of a country or political union "in such a way that each kind of government has some activities on which it makes final decision".

A observed by Watts (1999) federalism is the basic notion of involving the combination of shared rule for some purposes and regional self-rule for others within a single political system so that neither is subordinate to the other…He further stressed that,…the function of federalism therefore, is not to eliminate conflict but to manage it in such a way that regional differences are accommodated.

Federalism, in its modern form, has been shaped by the existing realities surrounding the concept of a market economy. Constitutional federalism emerged not only as a mechanism that provided a limited, overarching governmental framework for a shared political market, but also as a basis for preserving significant powers and functions for the political communities that joined the market, defined as federation. This division and sharing of powers (or competencies) between a general union government and the constituent political communities could resolve not only the need to restrain the power of both the federal government and the constituent governments for the sake of freedom but also the cultural and political demands of the constituent political communities for the preservation of their governmental integrity (Eme *et al.,* 2011).

Federalism to Montesquieu is a convention by which several similar states agree to become members of a larger one. The union, either temporary or permanent was based on the need for special common purposes like defence, trade, communications, among other reasons, that would be of benefit to the parties involved. A federal state is nothing but a political contrivance intended to reconcile national unity with the maintenance of state rights" According to K.C Wheare cited in Adedeji & Ezeabasili (2018) federal system is a constitutional arrangement of dividing powers and functions between two levels of government in a coordinate and independent relationship. To Wheare (1946), the federal permutation essentially engendered a legal division of powers and roles among tiers or levels of government anchored on a written constitution guaranteeing, reflecting the permutation and whereby the parts are conscious of retaining a measure of their autonomy.

Political Restructuring

In terms of context and content, political restructuring connotes different meanings to different people both within and across a given political clime. In a nutshell, there is hardly a consensus among people and scholars on what political restructuring really implies. This is due to what Philip Schmitter (2002) called "collapse or growing difficulty" base on his criticism on high hope places on federalism's problem solving potential. Schimtter further argued that, even in such well established democracies like Belgium and Canada, "federalism has led to an increasingly precarious existence. Thus, in line with democratic principles, there is likely going to be those who are dissatisfied with the existing arrangement, hence would press for changes from the political system for a better deal. This is also given the fact that the political system under a federal structure has a lot to offer to geographical contiguity and ethnic differences, especially in countries where development is far from being achieved like Nigeria. It is not even in dispute that in developeddemocracies, there are still demands on the political systems to fine-tune or smoothen the rough edgescreated by federalism.

In Nigeria for instance, in an attempt redress political imbalance and to ensure equal justice, the quest for political restructuring becomes expedient. Political restructuring therefore, in the context of the forgoing, according to Amuwo & Harault (2000) cited in Epelle & Nweke, (2019) is defined as efforts to restructure the existing federation in such a manner that the powers of thefederal government are drastically reduced with a view to giving the component units or federating states and by extension ethnic nationalities the opportunities to participate in their own affairs as obtainable in developed federations.

Going by the definition of federalism above, it is clear that the persistent clam our for political restructuring can only come when there is social injustice in where ordinarily there should be justice. So, when there is injustice in a political system that is structured to achieve not only justice but unity in diversity, there would then be quest for justice with a view to bringing it back to the original ideals for which the union was either formed or made to exist. Therefore, political restructuring, in the context of this paper, connotes sustained clam our for' true federalism' by some federating states and ethnic nationalities in Nigeria. It also entails a radical attempt by certain ethnic nationalities and federating states in Nigeria to question their continuous existence in the political configuration and the entity called 'Nigeria' in which they were forcefully lumped to live among a people with perceived irreconcilable differences by the instrumentality of British imposed federal constitution.

In other words, political restructuring, as being canvassed, is a radical movement by ethic nationalities and states to unbundle the "no-go-areas' in the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999 (As Amended) with the sole aim of devolving powers to the component units comparable to other developed federations globally. While these radical attempts or movements are seen in the light of long years of perceived social injustices, there is hardly any federation in the world over that has no issues bordering on its federal existence. This is why it has often be said that there is no 'ideal federalism' or 'true federalism'. As submitted by Epelle & Nweke (2019)what federal governments across the world usually do, is to consistently adapt and adjust to the existing realities of their societies in order to push for a continuous and harmonious existence in an evidently social, political, economic, geographical, ethnic, cultural, religious, racial and gender inequalities.

Politics

Generally, the word politics is essentially contested concept with many competing definitions. Thus, according to Aristotle, all human are 'political animal'. Simply put, every human being irrespective of their varying professions (whether doctors, drivers, pastors, engineers, imams, lawyers or teachers among other) are directly or indirectly engaging in politics on a daily basis. This is true, because the whole essence of human is political. In simple terms, politics is everything related to man and his existence within a given society. Going further it could be concluded that, politics is ubiquitous due to its influence on a variety of subjects. Thus, politics is primarily a social activity.

For instance, the questions of who should get what?, how should power and other resources be distributed?, how should collective decisions be made?, how should justice be administer? and how much influence should each individual/group wield in a society? among other salient questions are all political. As observed by Aristotle, the foregoing explication suggests that politics is the 'master science': that is, nothing less than the activity through which human beings attempt to improve their lives and create the good society.

In another hand, other scholars like David Easton have argued that politics is synonymous government: thus, to those scholars, to study politics is, in essence, to study government, or, more broadly, to study the exercise of authority. This view is aptly captured by Easton (1953), who defined politics as the 'authoritative allocation of values'. By this, he meant that politics encompasses the various processes through which government responds to pressures from the larger society, in particular by allocating benefits, rewards or penalties. In the opinion of Stoker (2006),'politics is designed to disappoint'; its outcomes are 'often messy, ambiguous and never final.

Undoubtedly, politics, in its broad sense, can be simply sum up as the activities through which people

make, preserve and amend the general rules under which they live. Although, it is widely recognized that, in order to influence the general rules and to ensure that the rules are upheld, people must work with each others. Thus, account for the reason why Hannah Arendt defines political power as 'acting in concert'. This implies that the heart of politics is often portrayed as a process of conflict resolution, in which rival views or competing interests are reconciled with one another.

To a layman on the street, politics is usually considered as a 'dirty' game. To many laymen, politics conjures up images of trouble, disruption, violence, deceit, manipulation, corruption and lies. There is nothing new about such associations. The forgoing assertion was also buttressed by the nineteenth century the US historian Henry Adams who submitted that, politics is 'the systematic organization of hatreds'. In contrary, Leftwich (2004), proclaimed that politics is at the heart of all collective social activity, formal and informal, public and private, in all human groups, institutions and societies'. In this sense, politics takes place at every level of social interaction with both positive and negative consequences. To Leftwich, politics can be found within families and amongst small groups of friends just as much as amongst nations and on the global stage.

Harold Lasswell's book Politics: Who Gets What, When, How? (1936). through this perspective, politics is about diversity and conflict, but the essential ingredient is the existence of scarcity: the simple fact that, while human needs and desires are infinite, the resources available to satisfy them are always limited. Politics can therefore be seen as a struggle over scarce resources, and power can be seen as the means through which this struggle is conducted. This view was summed in Sexual Politics by Millett (1969), in which she defined politics as 'power-structured relationships, arrangements whereby one group of persons is controlled by another'.

Democracy

Like many other concepts in political science, democracy also has no settled definition and this is evidence in competing definitions of democracy offered by multilateral organizations such as 'Freedom House' and the 'Community of Democracies'. For instance, the Freedom House in its definition of democracy supports freedom worldwide: rating countries level of freedom rather than defining or measuring democracy. Freedom House rate countries as free, partly free, or not free via numerical assessment of a country's political rights and civil liberties. Whereas, the Community of Democracies consists of over 100 nations does not define democracy but does establish a list of requirements that countries must meet to become members. (see requirements for the Community of Democracies).

Undoubtedly, democracy has remained one of the highly contested concept among scholars and political stakeholders across the world. Thus, there are rival definitions and models of democracy (see Beetham 1994; & Inkeless, 1991). To every political scientist in particular and all social scientist in general, democracy is of great importance for the governance and management of man because it is assumed to holds great hopes for the salvation of mankind in general and of Africa in particular (Awa, 1992). In a concrete term, democracy connotes an acceptance of the basic equality of men as human and basic responsibility of all adult men and women for their own destiny (Toyo, 1994). He further stressed that it would be difficult to have genuine democracy in a society or country where citizen are grossly unequal in wealth and the poor who are inevitably the majority are dependent on the wealthy. Thus by implications, many African countries that are laying claims to democratic government are not qualified to be refers to as democratic nations given the high level of poverty and unimaginable gap between the few rich and uncountable poor in Africa.

To further corroborate the contending nature of democracy one might want to consider the debate between Liberal and Marxist perspectives on democracy. To the liberal perspective, ―the essence of democracy is that the people have the right to determine who governs them. By interpretation, people should have the freedom to elect the principal governing officials and hold them accountable for their actions. Thus by extension, liberal democracies also impose legal limits on the government's authority by guaranteeing certain rights and freedoms to their citizens‖ (Sodaro, 2004) as cited in Campbell (2008).

The foregoing contending perspectives and definitions of democracy are highly plausible given their contributions to our understanding on democracy. The logical conclusion that could be drawn from the diverse perspectives is the crucial roles of election, rule of law, and political participation by all in a democratic system. This suggests that election, popular participation, rule of law and democracy are inextricably interwoven (that is, one cannot be achieved without the others). In this sense, democracy also refers to both formal and informal institutional arrangements for collective decision making and a wide variety of deliberative decision making processes that incorporate core values of democracy in efforts to build and sustain peace (IDEA, 2006)

Federalism and Its Historical Perspectives in Nigeria

In reference to the doctrine of federalism, as opined by Kincaid (1995), essentially, federalism is the approach to governance that seeks to combine unity or shared rule with diversity of self rule. Thus, the primary operational feature of federalism is to guaranteed regional or sub regional governments of a country or political union in such a way that each kind of

*Corresponding Author:** BADMUS, Bidemi Gafar

government has some activities on which it makes final decision (Riker, 1995). Although, as observed by Onwudiwe & Suberu (2005), federalism has no roots in political theory: it is simply a feature of government invented in the United States in 1787 for reasons of expediency. In particular, it was devised for the purpose of allowing the continued existence of American state governments while a strong central government was founded. Whereas, Nigeria's federal structure, on the other hand, was rooted not in liberal individualism, but in the mobilized communal pluralism and rising ethno-regional nationalism of decolonization era.

Historically, Nigerian present political arrangement was culminate through the 1914 amalgamation of both Southern and Northern protectorates without due consultation with indigenous people of both sides. The colonial intention for amalgamation was generally believed to be primarily guided by economic interest of the British empire in order to boost financial viability of British colonial project through economic unification of the two protectorates. In furtherance to the efforts to strengthen Nigeria federal political structure, three region federal arrangement was introduced the three major ethnic groups; the Muslim Hausa-Fulani of the Northern Region, the Christian Igbo in the southeast of the Eastern Region and the religiously bi-communal Yoruba of the Western Region. The three regions were later increased into four to include Mid-Western Region in 1963. However, the aforementioned efforts to strengthen Nigerian federalism were all resulted in mistrust, marginalization, minority issues and abuse of power among other problem which later led to the collapsed of Nigeria's first republic through military coup in 1966 barely six years after independence in Nigeria.

Undoubtedly, Nigerian federation is the contemporary Africa's largest and longest experiment which was primarily designed to manage cultural-territorial pluralism and ethnic conflict through the use of established federal institutions. Unsurprisingly, the federalism that is purposely design to address the challenges of territorial pluralism and ethnicity leaving behind other vital areas such as economic, political and development is definitely bound to produced mixed and inconsequential results. Thus, the implication of the foregoing has led to series of problems confronting the post independent Nigeria's efforts at ensuring fairness and equitable distribution of power and resources, insecurity and deficit of democratic consolidation in country.

Put differently, the nature, character and efficacy of a federation is the product of its foundational philosophy. Thus, according to Ayoade (2020) in constructing a federation, an underlying philosophy must be established: it is that philosophy that determines the allocation of constitutional power to all tiers of government. Although, as stated earlier, the template of Nigerian federation was derived from the amalgamation and is indicative of a lack of guiding principles of federal philosophy that neither showed a preference for a strong or a weak federal government.

According to Suberu (2004) federation in Africa and elsewhere in Europe and America is historically disaggregate. Thus, by implication this suggests that federalism was formed by the devolution of a previously unitary polity that are sociologically, territorially and ethnically fragmented, economically over centralized, constitutionally symmetrical (with all constituent units enjoying similar legal prerogatives), and unstable democratic structure rather than by coming together of sovereign units.

The Dichotomy and Politics of Political Restructuring in Nigeria

The term re-structuring is a political and administrative connotation, which implies agitation for more formation in the entire component of the existing federalism, as a result of the need to control the center or representation in the political landscape of the country. Similarly, restructuring also connotes the economic redistribution of resource and power among various component units of the federation on the basis of fairness, justice and equality. Therefore, to restructure means to rearrange, reorganize or reposition a system or structure, to correct the structural imbalance and deficits entrenched within with the hope for viable and more effective performance.

More importantly, the quest for restructuring in the current dispensation have been largely politicized and ethnocide largely by politicians for either personal gains or sectional interests. However, this is not attempt to discredit other genuine agitation and demand for true federalism. This is so because the beauty of federalism lies on the ability of state managers and critical stakeholders to renegotiate, compromise, dialogue and re-defining the inter-relationship among all the component units that made up of federation particularly on some of the key issues that determines peaceful co-existence and national existence in such a way that the entire political system perform more efficiently and harmoniously.

As stressed by Henry (2019) there are many dimensions to restructuring; which could include political, economic, educational, social, accounting and administrative among others. In essence, in every political milieu, restructuring is necessary when there are fundamental flaws in the structural arrangement of a political system that bind people together. More importantly, restructuring becomes inevitable when economic resources and power configuration of a country is visibly lopsided in favour of the central government or a particular federating unit to the detriment of other tiers of government and the rest of

other federating units that formed the federal state. In so far, that federalism as a system is meant to promote integration and diversity among territorial and culturally diverse people, hence, it imperative and compulsory that federal government must ensure fairness and equitably distribution of national resources, political appointments, political powers and encourage mutual respect for cultural values and territorial integrity of each federating units.

However, in Nigeria for instances federal governments have openly violated philosophical principle of federalism by indirectly over-centralizing political power and national resources in favour of ethnic cleavages in a unitary manner. It is important to note that, Nigeria is grossly lining toward total ism where there is mix-application or non-application of federal character principles in virtually all core aspects national life. The foregoing explain the reason why the debate on political restructure or true federalism which is consider as 'vague' in nature remains conflictual due to many reasons. For instance, political restructuring to the South-south would simply imply opportunity to resource control; to the Southeast, restructuring would serve well if it can guarantee power shift to the East in terms of controlling presidency; political restricting to the Southwest would connote equitable power sharing and regional autonomy whereas, political restructuring to the North as whole would implies acceptability of negotiating Nigeria unity and paradigm shift in political power control especially from the North to the South. In between agitations for and against political restructuring, there is a political undertone which has been hindering national unity and development and which is likely to threaten Nigeria political existence if consensus and amicable negotiation is not reached. Although, it has been argued that, federalism in the real sense, is congenitally incapable of giving unity because the intrinsic driving force of federalism is the desire for differentiation (Ayoade, 2020). At best therefore, what federalism can offer are accommodation, tolerance, and co-existence. To corroborate the interface of high level of politicization that surrounds restructuring in Nigeria, Ayoade aptly maintained that there are fundamental flaws in typifying Nigeria as "one and indivisible republic". To him such assertion is a false positive and contradicts the reality of unity by division. It is therefore, amounts to national mental illusion to believe in the unity of a country that is divided into thirty-six states each with its own government.

It is broadly conceded that, the feebleness of Nigerian federalism has been long orchestrated by British colonial administration through the politics of 'divide and rule' for economic benefits of the British Empire. For instance, the granting of the demand to conferred political advantages on the Northern region in the newly emerged federation, underlay the problem of Northern domination which was majorly source of country's political problem after the independence. As observed by Osaghae (2002), 50 per cent of the seats in House of Representatives was allocated to the Northern region (it was later increased to 52 per cent) and leaving the entire Suthern region with 48 per cent. Thus, by implication, the Northern region could single handedly obtain the dominant position under the majoritarian system the country inherited at independence.

The oscillation and violation of federal principles and guidelines was finally perfected through the military incursion into Nigerian politics particularly, through the promulgation of decree 21 of 1998: when the military transferred virtually all powers of taxation from states and local governments to the federal government, thereby, making the states and local governments financially handicap and virtually depend on funds from sale of crude oil. The manifestation of British and military politicking to skew the formal tenets of federalism in favour of the North is the strident demands for restructuring in Nigeria. At this juncture, it is important to note that, the resultant effects of unresolved ethnic dominance, political marginalization and widespread insecurity across Nigeria that led to current spate of self determination by major ethnic groups in Nigeria.

CONCLUSION

The structural flaws of Nigerian federalism are embedded in unfair, unjust and lop-sidedness economic and political foundation of the country. No doubt, a federal system that is dominated by the redistribution of centrally collected revenues, the underlying source of the contradictions and tensions would not only vicious among all the federating units to control the centre, but would automatically result in hyper-centralization and inevitable implosion of the federation. This foregoing is true, because of the absence of genuine mechanism to mitigate intra and inter-ethnic conflicts, oil dominated economy, jaundice constitution imposed by military regimes, ack of evenly distributed power (in terms of both elective and appointment political positions) and resources among the states across geo political zones would definitely become unhealthy to national integration and democratic consolidation in Nigeria.

Notwithstanding, the pathologies that have been rocking Nigerian federalism, the truism is that, federalism is not static, in fact, federalism is presume to thrives on constant modifications and frequent adjustments as the circumstances and prevailing socio-economic and political situation demands. This is the reason Ayoade (2020) concludes that, federalism is an ingenious political device for the accommodation of diversity in a single political entity… which does not automatically amounts to unity in diversity as some enthusiasts rush to assume.

Given the diverse nature of different regions in Nigeria in terms of their religion affiliations, cultural values, political orientations, peculiarities of

geographical locations, disposition to educational opportunities, economic mainstreaming and method of indigenous system of governments, it is pertinent for a federal system like Nigeria that is currently almost at verge of collapse to fast-track the process of renegotiation on the best way to manage the nature of coexistence among all the federating units and to genuinely address all the fundamental issues and pathologies that have besieged Nigerian federal structure in terms of power sharing, resource control, security challenges, economic crisis, constitutional amendment, minority issues, corruption, marginalization, insecurity and the problem of insurgency/Boko-haram terrorism.

This could be achieved through devolution of considerable level of political autonomies and economic powers to the states or federating units for them to be able to effectively protect themselves and manage their economic (including natural resources) without undue interference from the central government. In addition, the federal government should facilitate the process and model through which effective mechanisms would be put in place to foster and encourage future negotiation and engagement among all the federating states to discuss issues of common concern and their coexistence without resulting to intimidation and coercion. This study thus, concludes that, failure by the current government in Nigeria to address several issues related to ethnic dominance, political marginalization and widespread insecurity across the country would further weaken the fabric of Nigerian federation and lead to more agitations for self determination far beyond the shore of ethnic majority of Igbo and Yoruba extraction which would worsen the national unity and further destabilized security architecture and democracy in Nigerian.

REFERENCES

1. Adedeji, A. O., & Ezeabasili, I. E. (2018). Restructuring and clamour for „True" federalism in Nigeria: A comparative analysis. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 5(2), 160-168.
2. Alsamee, E. M. B., Abdul-Wahab, H., & Yusof, Y. (2016). "Distribution of powers between federal and local governments in Iraq". *the Social Sciences*, *11*(13), 3385-3390.
3. Amuwo, K., & Agbaje, A. A. B. (Eds.). (1998). *Federalism and Politics of Restructuring in Nigeria*. Ibadan Spectrum Books Limited.
4. Ayoade, J.A.A. (2020). Nigeria: A Nation of States or A State of Nations? Being a Lead Paper Presented at the 3rd *Senator Abiola Ajimobi Round table with the them: "States and the Burden of National Development in Nigeria. International Conference Centre*, University of Ibadan.
5. Babalola, D. (2016). "Fiscal federalism and economic development in Nigeria: The contending issues". *Global Journal of Political Science and Administration, 3*(2), 53-69.
6. Beetham, D. (Ed.). (1994). '*Defining and Measuring Democracy'*. London Sage.
7. Bin, H. (2011). "Distribution of Powers between Central Government and Sub-national Governments". *Committee of Experts on Public Administration*, *11*(2), 1-9.
8. Campbell, D. F. J. (2008). The basic concept for the democracy ranking of the quality of democracy. Vienna, Austria: Democracy Ranking.
9. Chukwuemeka, E. E.O., & Amobi, D.S. C (2011). "The politics of fiscal federalism in Nigeria: Diagnosing the elephantine problem". *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(1), 126-136.
10. Eme, C. I., Onyishi, A. O., & Sam, C. U. (2011). Preserving Federalism, Local Autonomy in a Resource Dependent Rural State: A Case of Nigeria. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review Vol*, *1*.
11. Epelle, A., & Nweke, K. (2019). The challenge of political restructuring in Nigeria's fourth republic: A prognostic analysis. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, *152*(4), 370-383.
12. Henry, N. A. (2019). "The Restructure of Nigerian Federal System: A Task That Need be Done". *Global Journal of Political Science and Administration, 7*(3), 66-88
13. Inkeles, A. (Ed.). (1991). *On measuring democracy: Its consequences and concomitants*. Transaction Publishers.
14. Kincaid, J. (1995). "Values and Value Trade-Offs in Fedralism". *Publiu: Journal of Federalism, 25*(2), *29-44*
15. Leftwich, A. (Ed.). (2004). *What is Politics? The Activity and Its Study*. John Wiley & Sons..
16. Millett, K. (1969) "*Sexual Politics"* Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
17. Momoh, A., & Adejumobi, S. (Eds.). (2002). *The National Question in Nigeria*. Aldershot: Ashgatte
18. Onwudiwe, E., & Suberu, R. (Eds.). (2005). *Nigerian Federalism in Crisis: Critical Perspectives and Political Options*. PEFS: Archers Press, Ibadan.
19. Schmitter, P. C. (2002). In Search of Meta-institutions. *Government and Opposition*, *37*(3), 427-433.
20. Stoker, G. (2006). Explaining Political Disenchantment: finding pathways to democratic renewal. *The Political Quarterly*, *77*(2), 184-194.
21. Suberu, R. T. (2004). Attractions and Limitation of Multi-Ethnic Federalism: The Nigerian Experience": Faculty Lecture delivered at University of Ibadan. *Ibadan: Emmi Press International*.
22. Toyo, E. (1994). '*Crises of Democracy in Nigeria: Comments on the Transition From Babangida Regime*. Ahmadu Bello University Press Ltd: Zaria.
23. Watts, R. L. (1999). Comparing Federal Systems (; Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University).

24. Wheare, K. C. (1953). *Federal Government* (3rd Ed.). London: Oxford University Press.
25. Zingale, N. (2003). Comparative Governance. New York: McGraw-Hill.