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ABSTRACT
This paper on Leadership, Democracy and Federalism in Nigeria corroborates Chinua Achebe’s viewpoint that the trouble with Nigeria is simply and squarely a failure of leadership. It argues that if the 1993 presidential elections were not annulled by former military Head of State Ibrahim Badamosi Babangida, and Chief Mashood Abiola was allowed to take over the mantle of leadership through the General Presidential Elections which Abiola won, Nigeria would have since then become a better, safer and cleaner country to live, work, do business/trade and study. The paper also contends that Chief Mashood Abiola demonstrated excellent qualities of leadership, democracy, federalism and courage which are in short supply among the ruling elites in Nigeria today and in fact, since independence in 1960. The paper discussed the qualities of a good leader which have eluded Nigeria and laments that up till today the perpetrators of 1993 presidential election annulment have not been brought to book through the constitutional means either nationally or internationally. The paper concludes by examining the relevance of effective leadership to democracy and federalism, highlights the lessons of June 12 in Nigeria’s political history and makes recommendations on how best to resolve Nigeria’s bad leadership question, democracy, federalism and the general National Question on the survival of Nigerian nation that is currently deeply divided along ethnic, religious, tribal, regional, political, economic, sectarian, insecurity, and inequalities – lines.

INTRODUCTION
“The trouble with Nigeria is simply and squarely a failure of leadership. There is nothing with the Nigerian land or climate or water or air or anything else. The Nigerian problem is the unwillingness or inability of its leaders to rise to the responsibility, to the challenge of personal example which are the hallmarks of true leadership”. (Achebe, 1985).

In his slim but powerful classic, The Trouble with Nigeria, Africa’s foremost novelist, Professor Chinua Achebe, identified the country’s problem as being “simply and squarely a failure of leadership”. Utilizing an imagery borrowed from the game of football, he lamented a situation whereby an immensely blessed country like Nigeria always “opts for mediocrity and compromise, to pick a third and fourth eleven to play for us” stressing that we can never make the world league that way. His illustrious compatriot and Nobel literature laureate, Professor Wole Soyinka, certainly had the country’s leadership conundrum in mind when, on the occasion of his 50th birthday over two decades, ago, he described his generation as a wasted one. An otherwise highly gifted generation lay prostrate and impotent as the country
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rolled relentlessly down the slope of underdevelopment under the watch of a succession of inept, greedy and visionless leaders. Several years later during one of the darkest periods of brutal military dictatorship in Nigeria, Professor Soyinka was to publish an article with the intriguing title, ‘When Is a Nation’? In it he lamented the evident failure of Nigeria to successfully transit from mere statehood to genuine nationhood over three (now five) decades after independence. That was a time when state failure, characterized by deepening economic crisis, worsening poverty, unconscionable corruption, gross abuse of human rights and the international isolation of the country, brought Nigeria once again to the very brink of disintegration. All these are still happening today 2012. Major component parts of the country openly agitated to break away claiming they were marginalized in a defective Nigerian federation. The situation that exists in much of the Niger Delta region of Nigeria today, where kidnapping and sundry criminalities reign supreme, is surely a challenge to the quality, creativity and competence of Nigeria’s contemporary leadership at all levels. Worse things are happening in Northern Nigeria with the Boko Haram campaigns. Indeed a slightly different question from that of Professor Soyinka but one which it is equally pertinent to ask, is ‘Why is a Nation’?. In other words, what is the purpose for which a nation exists? Every human being is born into one nation or the other. None of us has a choice as to the place or time of our birth, the race or faith we are born into. What obligations then does the state into which we are born owe us as individuals and as component collectivities of the nation? A leadership with a clear idea of the purpose of a nation is more likely to be better attuned to fulfilling its responsibilities to those who find themselves as citizens within its territorial jurisdiction. The purpose of a nation is to actualize and optimize the potentials of those who are born into and will spend this brief gift of life that man has been given within its jurisdiction. It is to create the enabling environment and empower those born as citizens within its boundaries to live useful lives, add value to their society and pass on a worthy legacy to future generation (Fashola, 2009).

Any nation that is organized and run in such a way as to constitute an obstacle to the peace, happiness, freedom and prosperity of the individuals and groups that inhibit it is likely to experience revolt, instability and disintegration in the long run. That is a recurring lesson of history, which Nigeria’s leadership class must always keep in mind. The sad fact is that much of the poverty, instability and crisis that arrested development in most parts of post-colonial Africa are indeed leader-driven as the following damning verdict by Dr. M.H. Khalil Timamy shows:

“Generally,, Leadership in Africa has hardly been inspiring. It has mostly brought hunger and pain in many countries. In several dozen countries, the leadership has been criminally destructive of people’s livelihoods and their welfare. From the horrendous results of the problems they have presided over, African leaders have never been short of menacing charisma, in actual fact they, they seem to possess as exemplified by Amin, Mengistu, Taylor, and the list is long – nothing but criminally disposed mindsets. Their legacies are nothing to write home about. Of course, there are exceptions, but for all intents and purposes, such cases are
few and far between. It would not be far-fetched to argue that the incubus of
impoverishment has largely been leader-given” (Timamy, 2007).
Indeed, reading today a lecture delivered at the University of Jos in 1986 by one time
Secretary to the Federal Government in the seventies, Mr. Allison A Ayida, you would think
he was talking of the situation in the Nigeria of 2012.
“It is not the fall of petroleum price in the world market as such that has brought
the untold hardship and sadness. It is the ineptitude and inability of our
management team to adjust to the challenges of modern times. Most, if not all,
of our institutions are on the verge of collapse – the public service are
demoralized, disoriented and disorganized, the universities are anemic and in a
state of disrepair, epitomizing the educational crises facing the nation. Things will
not be the same for the next generation if the rapid decline in education and
health services is not arrested. The economy is in shambles. In our present
predicament, if the price of oil were to rise to US$40 per barrel overnight, we will
fritter away all the foreign exchange resources with the assistance of the IMF
and World Bank and showers of praises from the leading statesmen of Europe
and the United States. Let us pray and hope that we can get our acts together
and get a viable management team in place to assume the leadership of the
nation before the petro-naira begins to flow again in the 1990s.” (Ayida, 1990).
These words were uttered 26 years ago but they have proven to be disturbingly prophetic.
Since then the oil indeed flowed again and we witnessed considerable oil
booms during the gulf war of the late 1980s and lately the unprecedented oil revenues which accrued to the
country between 1999 and 2012 when the price of crude oil rose to as high as $147 per
barrel. Yet, we did not seize the opportunity to invest massively as a country in critical
infrastructure that can enable us diversify our economy and break the over dependence on
oil revenues. This is unlike such oil producing countries as Dubai, Qatar and Saudi Arabia, for
instance, which consistently utilized their oil proceeds to develop other sectors that have
since overtaken oil as the dominant revenue earner. The following have been repeatedly
declared since 1970 as Nigeria’s development goals and objectives: a just and egalitarian
society; a united, strong and self-reliant nation; a great and dynamic economy, a land of
bright and full opportunities for all citizens; a free and democratic society, reduction of
inequalities in inter-personal incomes, correction of defects in existing social relations in
various spheres of production, distribution and exchange, minimization of existing inequalities
in wealth, income and consumption standards; equitable spreading of the benefits of
economic development; reduction in the level of unemployment and under-employment;
increased participation by citizens in the ownership and management of productive
enterprise, and balanced development between urban and rural areas; among a host of
If we examine the extent to which these democratic elements and development goals have
been achieved, we would see ‘that Nigeria still has a long way to go as far as economic
development and democracy are concerned. There are still the issues of abymal poverty of
the overwhelming majority of the Nigerian citizens, the highly lopsided income distribution in
favour of the few rich, high level of unemployment and under-employment of both the educated and the un-educated, the mono-cultural nature of the economy with oil generating most revenue, gross neglect of agriculture over the years aggravated by drought and desertification, continued general over-dependence on foreign capital and manpower, and an acute dearth of reliable and up-to-date statistics. All these are the evil effects of bad leadership. Nigerians are concerned about a stable political order ‘democracy of the stomach’, people need food, jobs, education, housing, health-care, security, water, electricity, efficient communication and transportation systems and yet, these necessities of life continue to elude them. An hungry man, you will agree with me, is an angry man. These shortcomings result in social chaos, pandemonium, hullabaloo, national demonstrations, strikes, civil disobedience and general violent political disagreements.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM
Nigeria is currently adrift and obviously, a reactionary leadership is incapable of halting the drift. The country has lost his glory and consequently its cherished influence in the international community. Ordinary Nigerians have become woefully impoverished, traumatized and helpless in the face of unprecedented abuse by the consecutive reactionary governments. Ethnic and religious considerations have replaced the traditional patriotic consideration in the governance of the country. Pervasive corruption has eaten deep into the fabric of the nation. The country’s hitherto vibrant, economy has collapsed as the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) and other selfish ones continue to wreak untold hardship on ordinary Nigerians. This hopeless situation was brought about by lack of good and planned leadership. The only time to make the right change was 1993 when Chief Abiola won the presidential elections but was denied the peoples, mandate to rule by Ibrahim Babangida. How did Nigeria get into this rot? Have Nigerians got the leadership they deserve? As the country continues its democratic experiment, what role can the ordinary Nigerian, particularly those inside and outside the country, play in ensuring that the country get a qualified hand to manage its affairs? One of the ways we believe we can play that role effectively is to stand up and be counted in the struggle for democracy that is to organize politically and make our voice heard. It is only through genuine democracy that the country can definitely move forward. These are some of the problems of leadership, democracy and federalism this paper sets out to address.

LEADERSHIP: THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL PERSPECTIVES
- What is leadership?
- What are the qualities of a good leader?
- What are the types of leaders or leaderships?
- What is quality leadership
- Quality versus quantity leadership
- Examples of quality leadership 1960-2012
- Leadership is the state or position of being a leader;
- Leadership is the ability to be a leader or the qualities a good leader should have;
- A group of leaders of a particular organization (Hornby, 2005).
- A leader is a person who leads a group of people, especially the head of a country, or an organization etc.
- A leader is also a person or thing that is the best, or in first place in a race, business etc.

According to Anifowose, (1999) literally, to lead means to direct by going in front. It implies, also, the direction of the affairs of those led towards a definite goal. As Onoge (1995:44) noted, there are two broad tendencies in the usage of the term leadership. One tendency, is to regard as leader the individual who occupies the formal office. Thus, the person who occupies the office of national president is the leader of the nation. The other usage of the term identified by Onoge is based on the degree of influence which an individual exerts in his group. Thus group members who "outstandingly influence" the rest are called leaders. In line with these formulations, the Nigerian leadership consists not only of government but also persons of influence in other sectors of the nation, civil society and economy, such as industry, the professions, religious orders, traditional hierarchies, the academia, etc. Our focus in this paper is on political leadership whose deficiencies have infected other domains and are perhaps the most injurious on the Nigerian-body politic.

By accountability we mean the existence of checks on public officials, to ensure that they act responsibly. This is ensured through three principal means. First, is the process of institutional accountability by which agencies of the state are expected to check and balance one another. For instance, the court is empowered to invalidate any act of the executive which it deems unconstitutional while the executive is expected to play a role in appointing members of the bench. Elections provide another avenue for ensuring accountability. This is of course in democracies where the sanctity of the electoral process is guaranteed. The expectation is that because they must periodically return to their constituencies to seek re-election, political leaders would not become irresponsible or unresponsive. The values and attitudes of leaders are also expected to incline them towards standards of accountability. Political elites in all political systems are placed in a leadership capacity. The effectiveness of governance is largely dependent upon the quality of political leadership. Within the bounds set by public opinion, political leaders are given the responsibility of charting the course of governmental policy capable of rejecting leadership aspirants who fail to inspire confidence in their leadership qualities. Accordingly, to be effective, a political leader must possess and demonstrate certain leadership qualities - decisiveness, firmness, vigour, intelligence, energy and dedication (Ralph Stodgill, 1948:35 - 71; Gouldner, 1950; Seligman, 1950: 904 - 915).

**Democratic Leadership**

Democratic leadership is located in a social situation or environment in which the principles of governance or government are based on the encouragement and the allowance of rights of
citizenship: such as freedom of speech, religion, opinion and association, the supremacy of the rule of law and majority rule. An acknowledged democratic leader does not only practice the essentials of democracy with other citizens but facilitate the smooth operation of the democratic government in the form of paying no or little attention to class divisions based on birth or wealth. Usually, political leadership which has much to do with the administration or the management of public affairs in general is associated with democratic leadership. However, military leadership, another form of political leadership is rarely linked with democratic leadership. Democratic leadership is most common in the Western world while political leadership in one form or the other is ubiquitous in most developing nations such as Nigeria.

Bureaucratic Leadership
Bureaucratic leadership is a product of complex, large scale organization and society. Most modern organizations if not all, produce leaders. Since bureaucratic organizations are characterized by specialization, hierarchical authority, systematized rules, impersonality and a secure and meritocratic career structure, leaders in such organizations are expected to be selected based on their meeting formal, universally known requirements. Their power flows from top down. At each level, super-ordinates can give commands or directives to subordinates but not vice-versa. The behaviour of members, including leaders of bureaucratic organization, is governed by rules that persist regardless of the incumbent in the position. Bureaucratic leaders derive their power from the office not in particular individuals. Leaders in such organization ensure the routization and coordination of organizational functions and activities through the employment of written rules and records.

Charismatic Leadership
A noted type of non-bureaucratic hierarchy is the organization built around charismatic leadership. Such leader is believed to have extra-ordinary powers. Power is concentrated at the top. Unlike the bureaucratic leadership, power is not based on offices, rules and formal entrance requirements. Rather, power flows out of the charismatic leader. Close constant by members with the leader confers power on an inner circle. The inner circle in turn bestows it on successive layers of the faithful. Authority from a charismatic leader rests on magic. Many of the religious and political leaders fall into category of charismatic leadership.

Clandestine Leadership
Another noted type of leadership is clandestine leadership. Clandestine organizations and leadership take care through their secret activities that they remain unrecognized despite the fact that such organization and its leadership is thought of as an entity. Leaders of clandestine organization work for, and play prominent roles in, various organizations and state affairs. They are present in both developed and developing societies. They can be located in social associations/clubs and state intelligence services.
Prowess Leadership
Prowess leaders possess the characteristics of exceptional skills, bravery or courage and valour in the pursuit of organizational or societal goal or objectives. Instances are nationalist leaders associated with the struggles for political and economic freedom.

Transformative Leadership
Transformative leadership is the effective leader who can move organizations from current to future states, create visions of potential opportunities for organizations and the society instill within organizational members to change and instill new cultures and strategies in organizations and social structure that mobilize and focus energy and resources. They assume responsibilities for reshaping organizational practices to adapt to environmental changes. They have the basic power capacity to translate intention into reality and sustain it. They are generally regarded as the thinkers and doers. They are intellectual and pragmatist leaders as they enthrone idea and successfully practicalise them. This is the type of Abiola, such leaders are hard to come by in societies and organization. If they are able to function, they perform wonders. They are easily labeled: genie or supernatural beings but unfortunately they are often frustrated by organizational and societal constraints. This was how Chief Mashood Abiola was frustrated by Babangida. Having identified a number of typologies on leadership, we shall now briefly discuss leadership practices in the Nigerian social system. Leadership as practiced in the Nigerian situation can be broadly divided into three categories: traditional leadership, spiritual leadership and temporal leadership. Their characteristics are not mutually exclusive. In fact, they do overlap one another.

Traditional Leadership
Traditional leadership is essentially based on traditional beliefs and values. The acceptance of custom is a most common feature of this category of leadership. Traditional authority is legitimated by the sanctity of tradition because members of the society concerned believed that the social order was created by God, and that it is man's duty to conform. This is the basis of the divine right of kings, or natural rulers: such as Obis, Obas, Emirs and Obongs and other traditional leadership because of the preexisting traditional norms and ethos and that traditional leaders rule because they possess the right to rule by virtue of birth or class. However, one noticeable feature of the traditional leadership in Nigeria environment is the decline in power and prestige formerly enjoyed by this class of citizens. Social change undermines traditional authority because members of the society are breaking away from the tradition. Most traditional leaders, today, retire to the background to influence policies and activities of government, business and social life.

Spiritual Leadership
Spiritual leaders are thought to be endowed with extraordinary, sometimes magical powers. A spiritual leader like Charismatic leader elicits obedience out of awe. He is also associated with a certain quality unusual of an individual personality. He is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, super human or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. Such qualities are believed not to be accessible to the ordinary persons. They are regarded as of divine origin or exemplary and that on the basis of them the
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individual concerned is treated as a leader. In modern time, many spiritual leaders have emerged or are emerging in the Nigerian social system through various religious organizations. It is interesting to note that a considerable number of traditional rulers or natural rulers are also regarded as spiritual leaders, because of their functions and activities within the society.

Temporal Leadership
Temporal leaders are involved in the governance or administration of the state. Such leaders hold bureaucratic offices of the state. Other societal positions leading business men and women are members of temporal leadership structure because they preside or take active part in the option of secular or worldly possessions. Judges of law courts are members of this category of leadership. In the traditional setting most, if not all of our traditional rulers perform the functions of temporal leadership as they manage the affairs of their local communities. However, this practice is considerably giving way to the modern system of governance as the affairs of the state are being led by the military hierarchy and/or democratic leadership. It is also pertinent to note that a number of traditional rulers can still be regarded as traditional leaders as well as temporal leaders because of the presence of a great number of traditional rulers in the political leadership structure.

Self-imposed Leadership
Self-imposed leadership type of leadership usually occurs as a result of an impending threat of disaster or catastrophe or in a crisis situation. A risk-taking person takes charge without opposition or regardless of opposition as the person who claims or has answers to arrest the situation and not necessarily able to provide desired answers or solutions to the problem. Initially, a self-imposed leader tends to enjoy instinctive obedience and loyalty from the led. Assumption of leadership can be through collective imposition of a person on others. Such assumption of leadership has an element of force because it is devoid of constitutional powers or peoples mandate. Such a leader seeks legitimacy after taking over the reign of government. He may not have sterling qualities of a leader but he is installed by the will and wishes of a small group of people. He is more or less an entrepreneur or a risk-taker. Examples of self-imposed leadership abound in the third world: A most common one is Military Coup d’etat. Nigerians are very familiar with this concept (Ademisokun Turton, 1987, Yukl, 1981, Oluleye, 1985, Olayiwola, 2012).

The theories of leadership offer different ways of thinking about good leadership or what it is to be a good leader, which are essentially two namely. Transformational or Transforming Leadership and Servant or Caring Leadership. Given the concern in this Paper and in its next part, the discussion of the theories will tilt towards servant leadership. The theory of transforming or transformational leadership rests on a set of assumptions about the relationship between leaders and followers. The theory of transforming or transformational leadership rests on a set of assumptions about the relationship between leaders and followers. Burns (1978-42-43) and Ciulla (1978) argued that leaders have to operate at higher need and value levels than the followers and that a leader’s roles is “to exploit tension and conflict within peoples value systems and play the role of raising people’s
consciousness”. Transforming leaders are reputed for their strong value and moral ideals which they do not water down by consensus but elevate people by using conflict to engage followers and help them reassert their own values and needs. Transactional leadership is concerned about liberty, justice, and equality and transforming leader raise their followers up through stages of morality and need. Like servant leaders they turn their followers into leaders and the leader become a moral agent.

Relating to transformational leadership is charismatic leaders which to Jay Conger (1989: 17), to some extent, facilitate transformational processes within organizations, because the charismatic leaders have “powerful emotional and moral impact” on followers. Charismatic leaders are, however, not predictably the best, they can be the worst. The second servant or caring leadership is a model of leadership that has not been highly popularized like transformational leadership. It is a simple but radical shift in emphasis. Like transformational leaders, servant leaders elevate the people, but there is much more as it involves the leaders serving followers instead of followers serving leaders. Robert K. Greenleaf (1977) in his servant Leadership: A Journey into the nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness, brought to fore the concept and its distinguishing or defining characteristics as a variant of leadership, and has been popularized by others like Larry C. Spears (1995) and James A Autry (2001), and others. In his seminal essay titled. ‘The Servant as leader’ he emphasizes that servant leadership is an emerging approach to leadership in the service of others. It is an important part of the emerging leadership and management paradigm for the 21st century that has influenced many people and organizations both in the public and private sectors.

According to Larry Spears (1998) the model is a move away from the “traditional autocratic and hierarchical modes of leadership and toward a model based on teamwork and community, one that seeks to involve others in decision making; one that is strongly based on ethical and caring behaviour; and one that is attempting to enhance the personal growth of workers while at the same time improving the caring and quality of our many institutions”.

It is regarded as an approach to leadership which is the key for “building a better and more caring society” (Autry, 2001: 336), and “a unique and humanistic philosophy of leadership” (Spears 1995:283), a management model which is obviously antithetical to the popular management and leadership thoughts which are based on old concepts of power. It is a fairly established concept, but not so popular in usage.

The qualities or Trait Approach
According to Adair, (1984), this approach which is the earliest on leadership stipulates that leaders in all human societies possess certain innate qualities such as initiative, courage, intelligence, and humor among others, which taken together predestine a man or woman to be a leader.

The Situational Approach
Flowing from the inadequacies of the trait analysis of leadership, some social scientists soon began to examine the importance of the “situation” in determining who becomes the leader
in a given group. Thus, this approach to leadership posits that leadership is a function of a social situation, rather than a derivative of such things as intelligence, dependability or socio-economic status. (Agbonifo, 1987), Gouldner, 1950, Stogdill, 1948).

The Functional or Group Approach
The functional approach to leadership stresses that leadership is essentially an interaction between the leader, group members or subordinates, and the situation. Thus, according to Gibb, any comprehensive theory of leadership must incorporate and integrate all the major variables which are known to be involved, namely;

(i) the personality of the leader
(ii) the followers with their attitudes, needs and problems.
(iii) the group itself, and
(iv) the situation as determined by physical setting, nature of task etc.

Kelly (1974) on his part states that the functional or group approach takes the wider view that leadership is the performance of acts which assist the group in achieving certain ends. The novelty of this approach is that it sees leadership as a quantitative variable, and not as something which is found in some people and not in others. Finally, it holds that leadership in a group depends on the group members, the task before them and of course, the group ideology, (Gibb, 1954, Kelly, 1974). Finally, on the theoretical conceptualization and conceptual clarification on types of leaders and leaderships, it is pertinent to say that leadership is the ultimate determinant of the success and/or failure of any organized society. The role of political leadership is threefold: (1) to consolidate or reform society; to generate/reinforce such behaviour patterns as are appropriate to that objective; and, thus, (3) to act as the link between the present and the future status of society. Leadership types can be divided into innovative, consolidative and meditative. In Nigeria as in Africa, five leadership styles can be identified; (1) intimidatory leader, (2) patriarchal leader, (3) leader of reconciliation (4) the mobilizational leader, and (5) the bureaucratic leader. The intimidatory leader relies primarily on fear and on instruments of coercion to assert his authority and he specializes in the use and/or threat of use of force to extract compliance from his fellow country men, and patriarchal leader, on the other hand, is basically one who commands neo-filial reverence, a near-father figure. The leader of reconciliation relies for his effectiveness on qualities of tactical accommodation and capacity to discover areas of compromise between otherwise antagonistic viewpoints. He remains in control as long as he is successful in polities of compromise and synthesis. The reconciliation is quite often between antagonistic political interest groups. But in the present day Nigeria and Africa, the reconciliation leader may have to perfect also the art of reconciling the military with the civilian sectors of authority. The fourth type of leader is the mobilizational leader whose main drive is ideology, with an undercurrent of charismatic qualities which buttress his ability to mobilize the populace for a particular kind of social action. And the fifth kind of leader, the bureaucratic leader is the low-key type who relies on efficiency rather than evocation, procedure rather than passion (Elaigwu, 1986).
Nigeria needs a good leader who combines the qualities of innovative, consolidative, mediative, bureaucratic, patriarchal, reconciliation and mobilizational leadership styles. There is no gainsaying the fact that the only effective leader who could have saved Nigeria from economic collapse and chronic political instability and immobilism is a reputable leader of men, a renowned national, continental and international businessman, philanthropist and politician, a tested democrats, publishing baron, sports lover and promoter, a seasoned, determined, kind, honest, indefatigable, considerate genuine, magnanimous and successful accountant, qualified and tested person with an amiable personality, reliability, responsibility, responsiveness and cool-headedness, BASHORUN MASHOOD KASHIMAWO OLAWALE ABIOLA. Bashorun Abiola was a reputable leader of men, a renowned international businessman and politician, a tested democrat, a successful accountant, with an amiable personality. Bashorun Abiola was born into a very poor family, but through determination, unequalled shrewdness, a non parent taste for excellence, and remarkable sagacity he banished poverty, not only in his immediate and extended family, but also in the families of numerous Nigerians, home and abroad and with his proven abilities and with the special grace of God, he could have banished poverty in Nigeria and regained for the country its lost GLORY.

DEMOCRACY, LEADERSHIP AND FEDERALISM IN NIGERIA: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUNE 12 DEMOCRACY DAY AND HOLIDAY CELEBRATIONS

June 12 1993, the Peoples’ genuine Democracy Day is celebrated every year in Nigeria and public holidays are declared by Lagos, Oyo, Ogun, Osun and Ekiti States among a host of other states in the federation. This is to honour our past hero, Chief Mashood K.O. Abiola and acknowledge his contributions to Nigeria. Permit us distinguished eminent readers, personalities in government, academia, private businesses, civil society, the press and from all works of life to observe a minute silence in remembrance of Chief M.K.O. Abiola and others who lost their lives as a result of resistance against Babangida’s annulment of the June 12, 1993 Presidential elections in which President Abiola won but was denied the millions of Nigerians’ mandate for him to rule as President. May their soul rest in peace. May it bring judgement to those who spilled the blood of the innocents. And may the goodness of June 12 bring milk and honey back to the Nigerians who are poor and weak, the wretched of the earth, who live on less than 1 pound/1$/#250 a day, amen.

In the words of Governor Fashola: of Lagos State, 2012:

“June 12 produced a platform for the expression of the need for change, a better life, true democracy and responsible governance by millions of Nigerians“.

True Democracy

True democracy is a system of government which is representative of all peoples and interests within a state. True democracy meets at least three essential conditions:

1. Meaningful and extensive competition among individuals and organised groups for the major positions of government power;
2. A highly inclusive level of political participation in the selection of leaders and policies and
Chief Abiola’s position has ultimately benefited Nigeria’s democratic consolidation and political development.
First, Chief Abiola’s quality of courage has led to some positive democratic changes in Nigeria because changes do not occur in countries where courage is in short supply. Second, the brutal and wicked denial of Abiola’s right to assume office encouraged the proliferation of pro-democracy groups and other organization’s of civil society who, despite repression, bravely harassed the military dictatorship. Third, the increased determination of the mass media, the Newspaper Press and Journalists with their professional journalistic ethics of objectivity, impartiality balancing and social responsibility to educate, inform the people and fight back amidst the threat of torture and murder contributed in no small measure to democratic consolidation in Nigeria. Fourth, unrelenting and unprecedented domestic and international hostility against the military regime that finally led to its expiration can be traced directly to Abiola’s decision never to surrender his June 12 mandate at any price. Chief Abiola said,
“I cannot surrender unless the people so demand, and it is by virtue of this mandate that I say that the decision of the federal military government to cancel the results (of the elections June 12, 1993) is unpatriotic and capable of causing undue and unnecessary confusion in the country”. (Abiola, 1993).
Fifth, that Chief Abiola never betrayed this promise points to many other admirable qualities that are in short supply among our ruling elites today: consistency perseverance, honesty, sincerity of purpose and bravery. Sixth, June 12 signified the determination of Nigerians to subordinate all other differences among them for the sake of National Unity and Progress. Seventh, June 12 also signified the efforts of Nigerians to hold a free and fair election and elect a leader they believe can lead them to achieve progress and Chief Abiola was that person. Eight, June 12, 1993 election marked a watershed event in the political life of Nigeria because it was the first time that a southern candidate won the Chief Executive Office of the country in a democratic process, and yet that candidate, Moshood K.O. Abiola, did so by capturing extensive support in the north, including the home state (Kano) of the opposing candidate.
- The annulled election was about democratic principles and the rule of law.
- On June 12, 1993, millions of Nigerians voted in the best election ever conducted in the history of Nigeria.
- Reports/records have it that as the results were being announced, the prices of goods and services were dropping. Bashir Tofa, Abiola’s opponent was said to have sent Abiola congratulatory messages in the spirit of politics without bitterness.
- Abiola was asked by the people to give them hope, but a few hopeless and selfish persons, some of whom unfortunately are still around the corridors of power decided otherwise.
The annulment was resisted by many true democrats, some were killed and many went into exile. Some people chickened out and were back in subsequent government because they were simply thieves and opportunists originally.

(a) June 12 emphasizes the importance of a democratic political party system with ideologies and programmes.

(b) Elections can still be won with the right message to the electorate e.g. Abiola and Social Democratic Party (SDP) sent the right message to the electorate through slogans such as action, progress, better tomorrow, etc.

(c) Grassroots matter a lot in winning elections

(d) Polarizing individuals never win elections

(e) Be ready to defend the right course, even if it means death.

The vital force of true democracy is the accountability of rulers to their subjects. Democracy stirs and wakens from the deepest slumber whenever the principle of accountability is asserted by members of a community or conceded by those who rule. Democracy cannot be destroyed by a coup d’etat, it will survive every legal assault upon political liberty. The true executioner of democracy has neither sword nor scepter, but a baneful idea. Ironically the deadly agent is an idea about freedom. In Nigeria today, freedom from want is a universal goal. Millions of lives are blighted by the effects of poverty, unemployment, malnutrition, untended illness, inadequate education and insecurity. In Nigeria, political leaders dedicate themselves to the cause of economic and social development. Most leaders also claim to respect the principle of accountability to the people. However the imperatives of development are far more demanding than the claims of democracy. June 12, remains a problematic watershed for the socio-political evolution of the nation. Short-sighted political opportunists have sought to reduce the significance of this landmark event. It is such a morally loaded event that even the strategy of ignoring it does not diminish it.

In the words of Governor Aregbesola of Osun State, 2012:

"The achievement of a true federalism where justice, equality and fairness prevail would be a service to the memory of the Late Chief Moshood Abiola, who died fighting for democratic values. The bane of the country’s development was the hurdle placed in the way of an ideal federation. Nigerians should re-dedicate themselves to the pursuit of true federal structure”.

June 12 and Leadership in Nigeria

In the remarks of another Nigerian State Governor,

“Hope in the power inherent in being passionate about the country and the determination of those in authority to initiate and complete the right course of action that would banish extreme poverty remain two unforgettable lessons of June 12.

More than the rituals of annual celebration, the initiation of the right programmes by government across the tiers that would restore the hope of the people in the country and forge greater unity among the people would further
ingrain the lessons of the aborted election for Nigeria and Nigerians”. (MImiko, 2012).

In a paper on leadership, followership, good governance and development in Nigeria, his Excellency Governor Fashola said and I quote:

“While Nigeria has had her fair share of bad leaders, she has equally had some eminently outstanding leaders too. A very good example I readily cite is that of that great Avatar, the inimitable Chief Obafemi Awolowo who, from this ancient city of Ibadan ran one of the most efficient, visionary, audacious and productive administrations on the African continent as Premier of Western Nigeria in the first republic. This was an administration that over five decades ago gave us the 20-storey Cocoa House, the Liberty Stadium, the Obafemi Awolowo University, hundreds of kilometres of tarred roads, the first Television Station in Africa, the first comprehensive free education programmed in Africa, the Western House and other choice property in Lagos to cite a few examples”. (Fashola, 2009).

But what happened subsequently? Successive leaderships did not think and plan proactively for the inevitable rise in the population of prospective students seeking higher education leading to the precipitous collapse in standards from which the tertiary institutions are yet to recover today. At the macro-economic level, the discovery of oil led to the abandonment of agriculture and other revenue sources while the collapse of democracy in the first and second republics as well as the attendant erosion of competitive federalism led to deleterious decline of leadership standards and performance. More than ever before, at this historic juncture in Nigeria, we need our best minds to steer the ship of state at all levels from the Federal to the Local Government Council. We need leaders who will be audacious in their dreams, unlimited in their vision and who possess the capacity to motivate the people to bring out the best in themselves; leaders with unshakeable faith in the inherent goodness of the Nigerian people and who can tap their limitless resilience industry, enthusiasm, creativity, faith, courage and hope to achieve national objectives. This will entail strengthening the democratic system, particularly the integrity, credibility and transparency of electoral institutions and processes to ensure that the will of the people count in free and fair elections.

In a paper I presented on “Economic Development and Democracy in Nigeria” an address to the people attending the campaign rally for democracy in Nigeria, organised by the Abiola for President International Movement, held at the Brixton Academy, 211 Stockwell Road, London SW9 9SL, on Saturday 22nd May 1993, I said: Great Nigerian Democrats, Permit me to begin this address by commending the efforts of the organisers of this rally and the great wisdom that attended the choice of this topic: “Economic Development and Democracy in Nigeria.” By this attempt, the organisers are contributing immensely to the needed realisation of radical changes in the socio-politico-economic structures of Nigeria with a view to meeting the people’s present needs and demands as well as their future yearnings, aspirations and expectations. In fact, it is a form of political participation, which, in traditional democratic theory is regarded as a virtue, a civic duty, an indicator of the health of democratic political.
system, the best method of ensuring that the interests of various groups are not neglected and as a sine-qua-non of democracy. Your primary concern as political spectators and well-meaning democrats is to ensure, among other lofty objectives, the election of the right presidential candidate with the required sterling leadership qualities. Democracy is an indispensable precondition for rapid economic development. Your goal of political education through the organisation of campaign rallies like this, is the attainment of a national democratic society where the masses are conscious, vigilant and organised and in which societal injustice, poverty and foreign domination of our economy is totally eliminated. This implies the creation of a new national political culture which would facilitate the establishment and consolidation of an integrated, enduring and viable democratic political order in the Nigerian society (Olayiwola, 1993).

June 12 and Federalism in Nigeria

Nigeria, Africa’s most populous country and one of the world’s most deeply divided societies, has trodden a complex turbulent and contradictory political trajectory since gaining independence from Britain in 1960. In five decades of independent statehood, Nigeria has fashioned many separate federal constitutions, witnessed the rise and replacement of many different national administrations, and straddled the political poles between democratic pluralism and military authoritarianism, between pseudo-federalism and institutionally balanced federalism between Westminster – style parliamentary government and American – type Presidentialism and between inter ethnic reconciliation and fierce often violent ethnic conflicts. Nigerian system of federalism has been characterized variously as ‘peculiar’, ‘bizarre,’ ‘irregular,’ ‘misleading,’ ‘purely distributive’ or ‘failed’, and as representing a ‘hollow federation,’ or ‘a unitary state in federal guise’. (Olayiwola, 2011, 2012, Mackintosh 1962: 233, Diamond 1988: 155, Bach 1997: 346). These characterizations point to certain specificities and pathologies in the evolution and operation of the Nigerian Federation. Much of the euphoria that accompanied the inauguration of civilian rule in Nigeria in May 1999 reflected the popular expectation that the restoration of democratic governance would end, and perhaps reverse, the systematic vandalisation and desecration of federal structures and processes by the military.

Yet, the new post military dispensation is challenged by at least two fundamental obstacles to genuine federalism;

1. The first is Nigeria’s array of structurally and fiscally weak sub-federal administrations, which depend, on the average, on the federation account and other external sources of revenue for some 70 percent of their expenditures.

2. The second onerous challenge of post-military federalism involves the division of powers in the 1999 constitution, as amended which has restored the highly centralized and contentious construction of the 1979 constitution.

In essence, under the new constitution, there ‘are few’, if any areas in which state governments can act independently of the Federal Government (Joye and Igweike, 1982: 94). Nigeria has demonstrated a capacity creatively to nurture “unity in diversity”. It has also betrayed a vulnerability to disintegrative sectarian conflicts. The Nigerian experience shows that the instauration of a vertically and horizon tally balanced system of Federalism, and the
implementation of both formal and informal strategies for national integration and ethnic accommodation, can help to contain the threats to institutional stability inherent in a multiethnic developing state. The same experience instructs that the distortion or decline of federalism, the transgression or abortion of basic democratic processes, and the general underdevelopment of institutions of political restraint could inflame the fissures of a plural society and precipitate the disintegration of an otherwise reasonably manageable multi-ethnic state.

FEDERALISM IN NIGERIA: THEORY AND PRACTICE
Theoretical Conceptualization and Conceptual Clarifications
It is no exaggeration to assert that in discussing the theory and practice of federalism generally and federalism in Nigeria, theory and practice in particular, many analysts usually begin with the published views of Professor K.C. Wheare, F.B.A., former Rector of Exceter College, Oxford and Gladstone Professor of Government and Public Administration in the University of Oxford, as issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, Britain. (Wheare, 1963). Being federal is tantamount to having a system of government in which the individual states of a country have control over their own affairs, but are controlled by a central government for national decisions. Generally, regarded as the doyen of contemporary federal theories, Wheare defines federalism as “the delimited and co-ordinate division of government functions.” He added, federalism or federal government is “… the method of dividing power so that general and regional governments are each within a sphere co-ordinate and equal.” Wheare’s idea of what federal government is, was determined by the United States of America. He made a distinction between the federal principle, the federal constitutions and the federal governments. Also, Wheare prescribes how a federal government should be organized, how it works and what prerequisites a federal government should possess.

Many writers on the theory and practice of federalism have demonstrated that Wheare’s model is parochial, anecdotal, static, Eurocentric, legalistic and rigid. For this reason, it may not be applicable to describe federalism in non-western societies especially those developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America (Ayoade, 1978). In his own contribution, Ayoade conceptualized federalism as “a conditional alliance characterised by considerable tolerance of competing centres of power.” (Ayoade, 1988). To him, many federalists expect from federalism what it is not designed to give with experience showing that federalism is incapable of proving to be a good device for integrating plural societies into a single political system. Professor Dudley suggested a typology for recognizing and identifying a federal government viz:

(a) A federal constitution with federal practice,
(b) A non-federal constitution but federal practice;
(c) A federal constitution but non-federal practice;
(d) A non-federal constitution and non-federal practice.

(Dudley, 1963).
A federal state is a state with a written constitution which apportions the sovereign power between a central or “federal” legislature on the one hand, and a system of local legislatures on the other, in such a way that each is sovereign within its prescribed sphere. The purpose is to hold minor communities together, or to reconcile national unity and power with the maintenance of state rights; there is union without unity.

The Practice of Federalism in Nigeria
Writing on the Nigerian Federal experience, Ayoade states that Nigeria was put together giving the impression of an aggregative federation. (Ayoade, 1978). He noted that the Nigerian federation was a design error or it is an error by design. To him, the conditions of Nigerian federalism in practice squandered “common charismatic hopes of a federation.” (Ayoade, 1997).

Ayoade concluded:
Federalism is the building of an empire on an anti-imperial philosophy. That philosophical foundation encapsulates the goal of a federation. It is aimed at unity without uniformity and order without freedom.

In another work, Ayoade describes Federalism in Nigeria as the worship of an unknown God. He discusses the viability of federalism under four headings:

1. The Federal Instinct.
3. The Federal Character.
4. The Federal Dialectics.

(Ayoade, 1982).

The choice of federalism for Nigeria since 1954 when the country was still under colonial rule, subjugation and imperialism, has been described as automatic. But on each occasion it was clear that the choice was based on a wrong premise. Federalism was adopted as a form of territorial democracy. Nigeria represents a polity with a federal constitution to some extent but non-federal practice. This is perhaps the greatest bane of Nigerian federalism. The British left a legacy of federalism in Nigeria not as an act of faith but as an act of convenience to a nation which Napoleon correctly dubbed a nation of shop-keepers (Ayoade, 2010). Since 1954 when the foundation of classical federation for Nigeria was laid, the system is still far from being problem-free. The story is one of both political and governmental instability. (Ake, 1988). To the consternation of observers, political scientists, historians and researchers, Nigeria’s federalism has remained fragile, almost impossible (Ojo, 2009; Ayoade, 1996, Onyeoziri, 2005; Mazrui, 1971 and Adebisi, 1989). It must be emphasized that if one is looking for a good example of federalism in practice, it is not sufficient to look at constitutions only. What matters just as much is the practice of government.

Emergency Powers
The Nigerian constitution of 1960 purports to establish a federation and it clearly bears many of the characteristics of that system. However, emergency powers are given to the
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parliament of Nigeria which, when invoked, suspend the division of legislative powers between the general and regional governments. As exercised in 1961, for example, they led to the suspension of the government of the Western Region and its direct administration under the general government. In practice, Nigeria has not provided a good example of federal government. In its history as illustrated since 1954 to independence in 1960 to all the military regimes 1966, 1975, 1983, 1985, and the intermittent democratic rules 1979, 1989, 1999, 2003, 2007 and 2011, the strength of the emergency provisions has been depicted more than the strength of federalism. Under Section 305(1) Part II – miscellaneous provisions of the constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999, as amended in 2011, the President may issue a proclamation of a state of emergency in the Federation or any pat thereof. These emergency powers were used in January 2012 by President Jonathan to declare a State of Emergency in some parts of Northern Nigeria. Nigerian federalism suffers from an uncritical faith by Nigerians that it is the panacea for Nigeria’s problems. Nigerian political leaders believe more or less that Federalism was a divine gift for Nigeria. The Constitutions being produced are always haunted by Nigeria’s turbulent past. They have neither cured past ills nor prevented future ones. According to Ayoade, perhaps the error is a strategic one of whether the past should determine what the constitution should be or whether what we desire to be should determine the constitution. Consequently the operation of the Constitution reflects several contradictions. Federalism is incapable of guaranteeing unity in a society that is moved to adopt a federal system because of disunity. The effect has been that the states assume a sovereign status which makes nonsense of federalism. Any attempt to halt this trend by the states has been resisted at every stage to an extent that the Nigerian political system is now somewhere between a federation and confederation i.e a federative republic.

Solutions to Problems of Nigerian Federalism in Practice

It is not easy to stem this development of uneasy calm. But one sure solution offered by Ayoade is a progression from territorially-based to community-based federation. The purpose of this development that is advocated is to kill the states and liberate the individual in order to foster civic solidarity. But, in the meantime and before this ideology takes root, Nigerians must accept the fact that federalism requires, above all things, a sense of restraint on the, part of power holders. Indeed the more power that is held exclusively, the greater the restraint that must be exercised. The scope and frequency of subtle federal executive infiltration into state spheres must be limited. Furthermore the privileged position of the Federal Government, as the only goose that can lay golden eggs must not be abused because in the ultimate analysis, it is Nigerian citizens that suffer. The rank order of the several governments should not be fixed such that each level of government should be master in its own field. In place of the present theistic view of the Federal Government as the god-centre of the Universe, we should substitute the humanistic view which sees the individual as primary. It is on the individual that all governmental activities converge and unless such governments make sense at the point of convergence federalism will deny the individual of his legitimate expectations from government.
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CONCLUSION
It is the submission of this paper that June 12 has contributed immensely to true democracy, effective leadership, true federalism and National integration in Nigeria.
Ali Mazrui (1972) identified five interrelated aspects of national integration thus:
(1) The fusion of norms and cultures (including the sharing of values, mode of expression, life and a common language);
(2) The promotion of economic interdependence;
(3) The narrowing of the gap between the elites and the masses, the urban and the rural areas, rich and poor, etc social integration;
(4) the resolution of emergent conflicts; and
(5) The sharing of mutual experiences so that people can discover that they have undergone some important experiences together.

National integration is a positive aspect. It reduces socio-cultural and economic differences or inequalities and strengthens national unity and solidarity, which is not imposed by any authority. People share ideas, values and emotional bonds. It is feeling of unity within diversity. National identify is supreme. Cultural unity, constitution territorial continuity, common economic problems, arts, literature, national festivals, national flag, national anthem and national emblem etc promote national integration. National integration is a very broad statement. To achieve national integration, the country has to pool resources, viz human, cultural, religious, scientific, natural etc to achieve oneness in all spheres of life of the citizens of the country, so that progress can be achieved. With the progress, the citizens can enjoy fruits of prosperity and happiness, living in harmony irrespective of the politics, creed, language, religion, ethnicity and cultural leanings professed by each one for them as individual. National integration is the awareness of a common identify amongst the citizens of a country. It means that though we belong to different political parties, religions and regions, ethnic groups and speak different languages, we recognize the fact that we are all one. This kind of integration is very important in the building of a strong and prosperous nation.

National Integration in Nigeria
The problem with national integration in Nigeria is that people are made to feel like strangers in their fatherland; whereas chapter II paragraph 15(2) of the 1999 Constitution of Nigeria as amended states that:
“Accordingly, national integration shall be actively encouraged, while discrimination on the grounds of place of origin, sex, religion, status, ethnic or linguistic association or ties shall be prohibited”.

Chapter II, paragraph 15(3) of the same constitution also states, interalia, that “for the purpose of promoting national integration, it shall be the duty of the state to provide adequate facilities for and encourage free mobility of people, goods and services throughout the federation, (b) secure full residence rights for every citizen in all parts of the federation and; (c) encourage intermarriage among persons from different places of origin or of
different religious, ethnic or linguistic ties. Many ordinary Nigerians have become woefully impoverished, traumatized and helpless in the face of unprecedented abuse by the consecutive reactionary governments and political leaders. Ethnic and religious considerations have replaced the traditional patriotic consideration in the governance of the country; pervasive corruption has eaten deep into the fabric of the nation. Nigerian leaders have failed to address the very real concerns of Nigerian masses. The leaders have lost touch with the Nigerian people and communities. Leaders lack the commitment and political will to serve the people. Nigerians get a rough deal from their leaders. Re-branding Nigeria is an exercise in futility. The government should first expedite action in addressing developmental, political, social, economic and security problems confronting the nation. The issue goes beyond noise-making or propaganda. The government needs to dissipate its energy on energy, address the problem of epileptic supply of electricity, fix deplorable death trap roads, channel resources to combat insecurity problems, armed robbery, kidnapping, Boko haram, bombing and improve primary health care, education, accommodation, communication, medication, transport etc.

The following needs need to be satisfied for any Nigerian to function as a healthy person to have a healthy nation. Maslow (1954), in a theory of human needs enumerates the following:

i. **Physiological Needs** - That is, hunger, Sleepless, sexual desire, clothing and shelter.

ii. **Safety Needs** - That is, freedom from bodily and psychological threats deriving from physical assaults, disease and natural catastrophe.

iii. **Esteem Needs** - That is the desire for strength, respect from other people, recognition, orientation and appreciation.

iv. **Self Actualization** - Which involves the desire for self fulfillment or the desire to realize one's potentialities.

v. Love needs, that is belongingness, friendship and love affair.

In the same vein, there is an urgent need to address rural development in particular. Sartaj (1978) lists the following as preconditions for a successful rural development:

(a) An equitable distribution of land and other rural resources in order to give an opportunity to the poorest segment of the rural population to meet their basic needs.

(b) The organization of farming and order related activities including land and water development on a collective or cooperative basis in other to ensure a fuller utilization of available distribution of income. In other words, collectivization would ensure the mobilization of surplus labour force, pool savings and investable resources, promote uniform share of knowledge and technology on one hand and specialization and better management on the other hand.

(c) The capacity of the rural population to diversify its activities. In essence the economy of the rural areas must include small scale and medium scale agricultural industries to provide additional employment opportunities and income which could improve the pattern of rural life. Diversification can also provide a greater sense of participation and fulfillment for the rural dwellers. The theory states that the size of the rural
setting and the success achieved in increasing agricultural production would solve the problems of resources, skills and markets needed for the diversification of the country.

(d) A gradual promotion of an active policy of social development through the expansion of social services and the improvement of social relationships. The components of this element include the expansion of education and health facilities, an improvement on the available employment opportunities, income distribution and the encouragement of harmony in social relationships among the rural dwellers.

(e) The political and administrative capacity to link the rural community with outside interest and resolve the conflict which will inevitably arise between different interest groups in the rural setting.

(f) Sartaj's Theory lacks one element. That element is that the management and organization of rural development programmes must incorporate participatory input from the people in the rural setting for whom the programmes are designed.

In addition, if Nigerian is to achieve any significant development in the future, the under listed factors have to be taken into consideration by its leaders. These include:

**Self –Sufficiency in Food Production**
The attainment of self-sufficiency in food for all should be the concern of any good leadership. It is for this reason that various governments in this country engage themselves directly in food production. Unfortunately, our experience in this direction is one of regret. Consequently, to attain self-sufficiency in food production and hence eliminate hunger in this country, government has to refrain from direct participation in the agricultural sector. All governments should do is provide the necessary infrastructures, incentives and guidelines to the private sector and rural peasants to enable them product food for all.

**Provision of Adequate Shelter**
Shelter is one of the basic necessities of life hence the need for shelter for all cannot be over-emphasized in the years ahead in this country. To achieve this objective, our leaders must fashion out a sound policy that will encourage individuals to own their house. The construction of low-cost houses by government definitely is not the best solution.

**Health for All**
There has been so much talk on health for all by the year 2000 (eleven years ago) in Nigeria. But unfortunately, not enough is being done by our present leadership in this direction. More money need to be expanded on the health of our citizens. The present trend of acute shortage of drugs and facilities in our public hospitals is counterproductive. Besides this point, there is the urgent need to shift emphasis from curative to preventive aspects of our health care, by emphasizing such things as good sanitation, provision of portable drinking water and sewerage systems for our urban and rural societies. Also, both the traditional and orthodox aspects of our Medicare should be optimally utilized.
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Mass Literacy
Mass literacy is sine qua non for development anywhere, for all countries that have developed in the worlds have a high level of literacy. To achieve mass literacy in Nigeria, we suggest that all levels of the educational system be made tuition free, with primary education made compulsory, while adult literacy should be taken to our citizens in the rural areas.

Employment generation
This is one social need our leaders cannot afford to ignore in all future development planning.

A social security system for all citizens
The provision of sound social security system for all citizens is long overdue in this country. It is necessary to provide for the social needs of the aged, the unemployed and destitute - who as citizens of this country should be guaranteed at least a minimum standard of living.

Protection of fundamental rights to all citizens irrespective of one's social status
This can only be achieved if our leaders emphasize the rule of law, and equality before the law.

Importance and Functions of the Mass Media
In a democratizing society like Nigeria, it is describe and necessary that the mass media should perform the following functions as far as development, political issue and social dimensions are concerned;
1. Enlightenment
2. Making people responsive to the needs of a dynamic society,
3. Monitoring the reactions of the public to government policies and actions,
4. Facilitating feed back between the Government and the people,
5. Mobilizing the populace for meaningful self-sustaining development,
6. Projecting the correct image of the country,
7. Upholding the fundamental objective of the constitution and the responsibility and accountability of the government to the people.

In the preceding section of this paper, we have been able to demonstrate that inspite of the fact that Nigeria has been blessed with abundant human and material resources, her leaders, whether democratically elected or seized power by force, have failed to provide Nigerian citizens with any meaningful development and democracy. The result of this ineffective leadership is a situation where only a handful of Nigerians have more than enough to make themselves and their families comfortable, while the majority are unprotected against such social malaise like abject poverty, hunger, ill-literacy, joblessness and all forms of insecurities. It is therefore, our conclusion that effective leadership is the panacea for any reasonable level of development, true democracy and federalism in Nigeria.
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