

# Globalization and the Struggle for Power by the Nigerian Elites: The Role of Academics

<sup>1</sup>AKINLADE, Marcus Temitayo <sup>2</sup>OYEDEJI, G.O. Kehinde & <sup>3</sup>OSAMWONYI, Bright Osas

<sup>1</sup>Department of Political Science, College of Education, Ikere Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

<sup>2</sup>Department of General Studies, Federal Polytechnic, Ado Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

<sup>3</sup>Department of Political Science, College of Education, Ikere Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Received Sept 13, 2017

Accepted Oct. 15, 2017

## ABSTRACT

*In Nigeria the struggle for power started with the 1914 amalgamation by Sir Federick Lugard, although this power tussle was along ethnic lines. The elective principle that was introduced by the 1922 Clifford constitution and retained by the 1946 Richard constitution actually opened the flood gate of electoral contest and partisan politics in Nigeria with tussle for power and interest protection appearing boldly on the stage. The end of the cold war era that gave rise to a unipolar world system which was led by the United States provided an unhindered spread by globalization and this process of globalization affected the Nigerian elites negatively, thus, making them self centered and greedy. This study adopts historical and content analysis as its methodology and elite theory is used to illuminate the study. The study concluded that in the period of colonial era up to 1966 elite quest for power was aimed at regional development and prevention of domination of a region by persons from other regions but as globalization grows and stretches its tentacles to Nigeria, the idea of individualism grew and focus shifted only to the promotion of selfish interest of the political elites. This study was able to establish the fact that there is a relationship between globalization and the nature of struggle for power by Nigerian elites and academics serving as the panacea.*

**Keywords:** Globalization, power, Nigerian Elites and academics.

## Introduction

The end of the bipolar world which gave rise to the unipolar world system led by the United States provided an unhindered spread of “Americanization” otherwise called globalization (Waltz, 1993) across the globe. The aggressive spread of globalization came with new or the consolidation of old ideas about socio, political and economic affairs in various countries, depending on the side of the divide which a country belongs in the multipolar and bipolar world. Therefore, all countries of the world feel the impact of globalization, either positively or negatively. What is not in contention is that globalization spreads capitalist economic system beyond imaginable proportion at the international system and it also packaged democracy as a model form of government Hence, the acknowledgement of democracy as the best form of government. To this extent, every nation- state laid claim to operating one form of democracy or the other (Akinlade and Igbalajobi, 2012).

Indeed, the centrality of power to governance either in the Western liberal democratic system or an authoritarian regime can in no way be less appreciated. This is much more imperative when one considers the fact that, the holder of power defines and determines the direction of the economy, the nature of trade system- mode of production and economic arrangement, the quality and quantity of infrastructural facilities to be provided in the state, the sophistication of the security system, response to emergency and needs of the people, the colour of the water that people drink, the quality of the health and educational system, the gap between the rich and the poor, unemployment rate, nature of foreign policy among others. In essence, holder of power determines the living situation in a country and the interest to be best protected. Hence, the mad rush for power in every human community.

The struggle for power is expressly permissible in states operating liberal democracy and capitalist economic system. The duo also constitutes the prime drivers of globalization. Ake (2002) has told us how African economies were monetized and integrated into capital economic system. Nigeria is not an exception as she has been at the mercy of some democratic ethos since the days of colonialism principally because she was colonized by Britain, a major protagonist of democracy and capitalism in the world.

The fact, that struggle for power is legalized and elective offices are opened to male adults and later male and female in Nigeria gives an open invitation to interested individuals. Therefore, parties and alliance were formed for the preservation and protection of specific interests in their quest for power. This study therefore seeks to establish the relationship between globalization and the nature of struggle for power

by Nigerian elites and establish the role of academics therein. It ventures into an historical account of struggle for power by Nigerian elites from the colonial era and X-rays the effects of the nature of power struggle on the Nigerian State.

### Concept Clarifications

The key words that are jitted for clarification in this work are globalization, power and democracy. They are briefly explained below:

**Globalization** This concept has tremendous impact on discourse on the international system since the end of cold war. Yet, scholars' prescription of the term is more of consensus. For instance, Ake (1995:23) sees it as the "growing structural differentiation and functional integration in the world economy, it is growing interdependence across the globe". This view is in line with Fafowora (1998:5) argues that it is the "increasing breakdown of trade barriers and the increasing integration of world market". A cursory look at Ake (1995) Fafowora (1998) reveals that, they see globalization in the light of global capitalism in such a way that trade barriers such as import duties and import quota, embargo and preferential tariffs, customs union and import duties are removed in order to allow for free flow of goods and services from one country to the other. Globalization is the highest stage of capitalism as it strives on information communication technological improvement and removal of obstacles to transnational trade. Alli (2006: 335) has informed us that, it is an "historical process that started centuries ago". He further cited Tando (2000) to have noted that, slavery, colonialism, legitimate trade all form part of the process of globalization. Therefore, globalization can be said to be the idea of integration of socio, political and economic affairs of the various countries of the world with the western world led by the United States serving as the model with the aid of information communications technology.

**Democracy** has a barrage of scholarly definitions as each defines it based on his socio, political orientation. For instance, Morgenthau cited by Ajayi (2015:143) sees it as "a government based on peoples mandate whereby representatives are chosen freely to exercise specified authority over a given people for a specified time." Fageyimbo (2000:39) notes that it is "a system of government where supreme power is vested in the people collectively and is administered by themselves or by officers appointed by them" Dahl, cited by Odukoya (1999:36) asserts that, it is "a society in which ordinary citizens exert a relatively high control over leader". What run through the sample of definitions above is the supremacy of the electorates and the administration of the state in their best interest. It is therefore safe to say that democracy is a form of government in which the electorates at specific period elect those who govern the state on their behalf and in the line with the constitution in a free, fair and credible election.

**Power** is central to the study of politics. Therefore, it attracts scholarly attention and definitions, although, the scholars see it in almost the same directions. For instance, Weber cited by Anifowose (1999:109) says it "is the possibility of imposing one's will upon the behavior of other persons". To Lasswell and Kaplan (1950), it is the special case of the exercise of influence. According to Wasby (1972) cited by Gauba (2003: 249), "power is generally thought to involve bringing about of an action by someone against the will or desire of another". Drawing inference from the above, power can be said to be the ability to control the minds and actions of others through the attainment of leadership position of a state. Therefore, the ability of the leader to determine the direction of the state and the enforcement of such through the instrumentalities of the state's means of sanction or violence constitute power. Therefore, elites try to grab power for the preservation of specific interests. These interests are protected through the system of law and mechanism of the state.

### Theoretical Framework

This study adopts Elite theory to illuminate it. In political science and sociology, elite theory is a theory of the state which seeks to describe and explain the power relationships in contemporary society. The theory posits that a small minority, consisting of members of the economic elite and policy-planning networks, holds the most power and that this power is independent of a state's democratic elections process. Through positions in corporations or on corporate boards, and influence over the policy-planning networks through financial support of foundations or positions with think tanks or policy-discussion groups, members of the "elite" are able to exert significant power over the policy decisions of corporations and governments. The basic characteristics of this theory are that power is concentrated, the elites are unified, the non-elites are diverse and powerless, elites interests are unified due to common backgrounds

and positions and the defining characteristic of power is institutional position. The proponents of the classical elite theory includes Vifredo Pareto (1959), Gaetano Mosco (1960), Robert Michels (1962).

Elite theory opposes pluralism, a tradition that assumes that all individuals, or at least the multitude of social groups, have equal power and balance each other out in contributing to democratic political outcomes representing the emergent, aggregate will of society. Elite theory argues either that democracy is a utopian folly, as it is traditionally viewed in the conservative Italian tradition, or that democracy is not realizable within capitalism, as is the view of the more Marxist-compatible contemporary elite theory permutation.

From the aforementioned it is clear that it is basically the elites that struggle for power at the detriment of the masses, this is achieved because of the characteristics that the elites possess which includes the three C's that is coherent, conspiracy, cooperative.

### **Quest for Power by Nigerian Elites: A Brief Historical Exposition**

The Nigerian State was a British creature, following the amalgamation of colony and protectorate of South with the protectorate of North on 1<sup>st</sup> January 1914. Although, it is a widely held opinion that the amalgamation was purely for economic and administrative convenience of the colonial master and no effort was made to unify the different people of the colony (Akinlade and Igbalajobi 2012, Akiboye and Anifowose 1999 and Bamgbose 2000). However, a Nigerian Council of thirty- six members was created for the amalgamated entity. Six of the thirty-six members were Nigerians appointed from the North, West and the region now called south –South. Although, the council had no legislative powers as it only played advisory role to the Governor. It none the less provided a platform through which Nigerians from various regions could discuss the political situations of the country. The mere advisory nature of the council served as the main hindrance of the body as members did not take meetings seriously. The elective principle introduced by the Clifford constitution of 1922 and retained by the Richards constitution of 1946 opened the flood gate of electoral contest and partisan politics in Nigeria with struggle for power and interest protection appearing boldly on the stage. The limitations of elective principle to four by the new constitution not withstanding political parties were formed.

The Egerton Shyngle and Herbert Macaulay led Nigerian National Democratic Party (NNDP) appeared first on the stage. One cannot really pen down the natures of power struggle save for fight against colonial rule during this period. It was the events of the future within the Nigerian Youth Movement (NYM) that showcased some elements of the nature of power struggle in Nigeria, especially the crisis that rocked the NYM following the resignation of Kofoworola Abayomi from the legislative council in 1941. Ernest Ikoli, an Ijaw compatriot and Samuel Akinsanya from Ijebu extraction indicated interest in the vacant position. Chief Obafemi Awolowo supported Ernest Ikoli and most members of the party from the Yoruba ethnic clan formed Ikoli, while Dr Nnandi Azikiwe indicated interest in Samuel Akinsanya of Ijebu extraction. Party members from Ijebu supported him along with those from Eastern Nigeria. This struggle eventually led to the collapse of the party as it became divided along ethnic line and people voted on tribal basis, thereby bringing about the victory of Ikoli. This marked the emergence of sectional or personal interest in the struggle for power among Nigerian nationalist cum politicians. Also, politics began to depict less of human and national face. This also increased the competition between the NYM owned news paper Daily service and Azikiwe's West African pilot.

At the Ibadan constitutional conference of January, 1950 the North through her representatives threatened to secede if they were not granted at least half of the total membership of Nigerians in the house of representatives in the proposed constitution of 1951. The North was eventually granted 68 while the west and East went with 34 representatives each. The drum of regional struggle for power by politicians began to roar. The fact that the Macpherson constitution required the election of members of the House of Representatives through regional houses of assembly further made Nigeria to be vulnerable to regional conscious at the expenses of national unity. For instance, in 1953, the members of Action group in the Western House of Assembly used their majority to deny Azikiwe access to the house of representative, despite being more qualified. In like manner, the Igbo majority in the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroon (NCNC) used their majority in the Eastern House of Assembly to force Azikwe on the minority group from the present day South Southern Nigeria. This development delves an unforgettable blow on the future unity and corporate existence of Nigeria. In fact, writing on the development, in Western House of Assembly, Achebe (1983) observes that,

“No matter how anyone attempts to explain away that event in retrospect, it was the

death of a dream- Nigeria in which a citizen could live and work in a place of his choice anywhere' and pursue any legitimate goal open to his fellows, a Nigerian in which an Easterner might aspire to be premier in the West and a Northerner become Major of Enugu”.

Also, the way and manner in which Northern representatives were lampooned for Ahmadu Bello's replace of Chief Anthony Enahoro's motion of 1<sup>st</sup> April, 1953 for self government of Nigeria by 1956 with the phrase “as soon as practicable” finally entrenched the need for cut throat regional struggle for power and the incitement of people to that effect. Nationalist leaders from the various regions became bent at ensuring strong regional attachment of the people in order to secure their votes and by implication attain and retain power at the cheapest responsibility. They therefore resorted to ungratifying and unguarded statements. They make people lose confidence in the Nigerian project but put their hopes in the region. For instance, Falola, Uhomoibhi, Mahadi and Anyanwu (2007:119) cited the following: In 1947, Awolowo referred to Nigeria as a “mere geographical expression”. Tafawa Balewa was quoted to have in 1948 said:

Many Nigerians deceive themselves by thinking that Nigeria is one... This is wrong. I am sorry to say that this presence of unity is artificial and it ends outside the chamber.

Also in 194, Dr Azikiwe was reported to have said: it would appear that God of Africa has specifically created the Ibo nation to lead the children of Africa from the bondage of the ages... the marital prowess of the Ibo nation at all stages of human history has enabled them not only to conquer others but also to adapt themselves to the role of preserver.

It needs being stated that, that was how things continued till independence. The elites whom during the period were those of the political, educational and economy summarily pushed the people against themselves by a resort to ethnic and religious divide. The same people who were educated elites were also the political elites and to some extent economic elites during colonial era and therefore their interests became much more deeply rooted and protected within their respective regions. Despite the protection of their personal interests, one can also elude that, the elites also provided for the mass of the populace in their respective regions. For instance, the Awolowo led action group introduced free primary education and health care for children and the elderly, while Ahmadu Bello led Northern People's Congress did not only establish Ahmadu Bello University but invested about fifty percent on the regional budget to education while the University Nigeria, Nsukka was established by Azikwe led National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroon in 1960. Indeed, there was competitive regionalism as every region strove for its development while keeping the people apart with its attendant consequence on national patriotism. Yet, they want to govern the country at independence.

At independence, parochial trend of struggle for power had grown to an unimaginable proportion as the regional parties had consolidated their gains in their respective regions. Intolerance and taste for power grew rapidly and some parties and alliances were threatened as evident in the outburst of Action Group in 1962 and the breakdown of NPC and NCNC alliance. In fact, the crises that ensued due to gross electoral misconduct in 1964 and 1965 “paved the way for the ascendancy of the specialists of violence the military” (Ake, 1996:6). The coming of the military in January 1966 and the one sided dimension which the execution by Chukwu Kaduna Nzeogwu led coup d'état took could not but further call attention to desperation of the various sections of the elites to govern the country. The coup plotters were mainly Nigerians of Eastern origin, while casualties were mainly Northern politicians and military chiefs. Writing on the situation of things, Maier, (2000:158) observes that:

With the North still bitter over the killings of its Political leaders and frightened by the disappearance of its autonomy, Northern officers staged a revenge coup in July that was followed by a massacre of Igbos living in the North. Thousands streamed to their home area in the East, and Nigeria lurched toward civil war.

Elites struggle for power on regional basis aptly explains the cause of the thirty months civil war in which thousands died. By 1978 when ban was lifted on political activities, the five political parties also took ethnic colorations closely linked to those of the first republic. For instance, Awolowo led Unity Party of Nigeria (UPN) was in no way different from AG and it had its main supporters from the South West, while Nigeria People's Party (NPP) had Azikwe as its Presidential candidate and hence appeal and followers in the South East with Aminu Kano's peoples Redemption Party (PRP) strongly supported by the peasants in

Kano and Kaduna just like Northern Elements Progressive Union (NEPU) of the first republic. This took effect despite warnings by General Olusegun Obasanjo that parties should not take ethnic colourations. The declaration of Alhaji Shehu Shagari of National Party of Nigeria (NPN) as winner of the presidential election despites the non fulfillment of  $\frac{2}{3}$  of 19 states further treads ethnic suspicious between the North and West. The eventual takeover of government by General Muhammadu Buhari and his alleged selective anticorruption war against the West worsened the situation. However Nigeria has its greatest opportunity to overcome ethnic and religious imbroglio for national consciousness, unity and patriotism in June 1993 when Nigerians from all walks of life voted in defiance of ethnic religious consideration for Muslim –Muslim ticket of Social Democratic Party (SDP) floated by MKO Abiola and Babagana Kingibe against Bashir Tofa of National Republican Convention (NRC). This golden opportunity was squandered, wasted and hope betrayed by elites from both military and civil establishments as the results of the election were not fully announced. The military President of the country General Ibrahim Babangida announced the annulment of the election. Ethnic and religious appeal resumed on an wholesale. Undoubtedly, it had earlier been excellently promoted by protagonist and antagonist of Babangida administration for the entire life of the regime.

It needs being stated that, while Babangida government lasted, the International Monetary fund (IMF) and the World Bank had been encouraged to sell the Washington consensus to the developing countries and the idea contained therein are all sympathetic to naked capitalism. The idea was sold to Africa and Nigeria obediently accepted the policy which was packaged as Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) or Programme for Economic Recovery. This made Nigeria and other African states to Key into the idea of globalization and be at its mercy. The Pillars of SAP include removal of trade restrictions, removal of subsidy on public utilities, reduction of work force, privatization, commercialization devaluation of currency and reduction of investment on public institutions (higher institutions), and the likes. According to Fashina (2001:21)

The major economic and social policies cooked up by the World Bank and the IMF has their agents the ruling class. The ruling class in Nigeria is a collection of individuals from virtually all ethnic groups, various religious persuasions, with both military and civilian history (past or present), who are tied together by common interest in the accumulation of wealth, through contracts, international trade, straight forward looting of the treasury, impoverished people with a strategic elimination of the middle class. Yet, the ruling class wants to retain power. Of course, the masses must be led to a greater confusion as to the cause of their worsening situation. Hence, massive deployment of ethnic – religious propaganda. At best, people of other regions are blamed for their own poverty and professionals, who disguised as mouth piece of the masses, are employed to do the job. It is not surprising that ethnic militias emerged in their multitude.

Another point of note is that after independence, academic elites gradually separate from the political class. Although, they are now employed for Parochial intellectual assignments and four walls of universities become fatal grounds for venting ethnic – religious sentiment. This is so great to the extent that appointment of principal officers is placed on the utter of ethnic consideration. Therefore, as the society increases in age and numerical strength, ethnic bigots became wide spread as tribalism is now dished out of our universities. Hence, ethnic orientationists as much as all the fields of human endeavours. Things continued this way and towards the fourth republic the who is who among Nigerian elites in the People's Democratic Party (PDP) needed a trusted hand who could keep the existing structure for the preservation of mutual interest. This they find in Chief Olusegun Obasanjo. The emergence of Obasanjo as the nation's president could not savage the situation as the elites continue to squander the nation's resources and continued with ethnic blackmail. In 2006, the National Universities Commission discredited courses in the faculty of law of the University of Ibadan and Olabisi Onabanjo University both of whom are in South Western Nigeria. The elites from the Yoruba speaking part of Nigeria (South West) alleged that the discreditation was engineered by Northerners, who want to use the opportunity to pull the South West backward in law, so that the North can catch up with the West. It needs being stated that, as at the time of the discreditation the Executive Secretary of the National Universities Commission (NUC) Professor Peter Okebukola was of South Western origin, while the President of Nigeria – Chief Olusegun Obasanjo is also of the same region. How come that Northerners will use these two eggheads against their very own people?

The above cases did not end the scourage, as the reign of President Goodluck Jonathan, Nigerian of Ijaw, and minority origin splashed all hope of a united Nigeria. The elites in the South particularly his kins

men from Bayelsa State and South-South summarily resorted to ethnic and religious canvass in order to make him betray the very “gentleman” agreement of two terms par zone within his Party – PDP and contested the 2011 Presidential election, which further divided Nigerians along ethno-religious line and consumed hundreds of lives after the declaration of result which saw him as the winner. The post 2011 presidential election crisis occurred mainly in the North where people felt badly cheated. The decision to contest the election was obviously to the detriment of national interest.

Also, following the wanton looting of the nation’s resources, insecurity and near breakdown of governance under Jonathan’s administration, the main opposition parties of Action Congress of Nigeria (ACN) Congress for Progressive Change (CPC), the All Nigeria Peoples Party (ANPP) and a splitter group form the All progressive Grand Alliance (APGA). The threat posed to PDP by the increasing popularity of the APC led to a somewhat war and inciting campaign by the PDP. The PDP threw decency into oblivion and claimed that a presidential hopeful within the APC General Muhammadu Buhari was one of the sponsors of the deadly terrorist group called Boko Haram. It also painted the APC as an Islamic Jihadist party with Boko Haram being its violent wing. The wife of President Goodluck Jonathan went ahead to say that who so ever mentioned the slogan of the APC which is “Change” should be stoned. Of course this was an open invitation to anarchy. Apart from the alleged outright, careless and unbridled allegation of looting by the President and his cronies towards the presidential election, the campaign of calumny spearheaded by the PDP against the Presidential candidate of the APC-Muhammadu Buhari was at best meant to create a complete atmosphere of breakdown of law and order in the country, if not for the patience and maturity of Nigerians. Apart from that, it also aimed at eroding legitimacy on General Buhari, should in case he wins the election. This is also a case of gross affront and threat to future peace, unity, prosperity and development of the country, all in the name of power and protection of selfish interests. All these are at variance with national interest.

### **Effects of Elites Quest for Power in Nigeria**

The unhealthy drive of Nigerian elites for political power in the country produces some effects on the Nigerian state and they include the institutionalization of violence.

The quest by elites for power in Nigeria precipitated the Kano riot of 1953, The Action Group crisis of 1962, the military coup of January 1966 and that of July 1966 and the subsequent thirty months civil war in the country. Apart from that, the various ethno religious crises that rocked the country when globalization oriented policies start to take its toll of the country under Babangida is also a result of the struggle for and retention of power. Ake (1996) informed that, the government had to resort to ethnic blackmail due to its dwindling legitimacy in a desperate bid to retain power, thereby pushing the people against themselves.

Also, it is regrettable that the ethno-religious division foisted on the people has deprived them of the power and ability to compel leaders to be accountable for their conduct in office. The leaders cover-up their failure with ethnic sentiment. Therefore, when disposition of leaders is less than honourable and governance carried out with utmost irresponsibility, the mass of the populace find it difficult to come together irrespective of ethno religious differences to checkmate the leaders and jointly demand accountability and good governance. At best, the poor masses are canvassed to call for the freedom of obviously irresponsible leaders from their region. The usual slogan becomes “is he the only one involved?” “Why do they arrest him alone?” The case of former Governor Depriye Alamesiyah of Bayelsa state, who was given a rousing welcome by his people in Bayelsa state after jumping bail from the United Kingdom where he was on trial for money laundry, readily comes to mind. Also, the allegation of looting and wastage leveled against Stella Odua as Minister of Aviation did not prevent her emergence as a senator. Rather than being castigated, she was celebrated by her people.

In like manner, wanton quest for power by the elites in the country has further led to disunity among the people and by extension loss of confidence in the Nigerian project. Today, Nigerians from the various ethnic nationalities summarily call for the liquidation of the country into smaller sovereign states along regional lines. Nigerians expressly enunciate that other regions are responsible for their woes. They fail to appreciate the benefits they derive from one another and the corporate existence of the country.

Equally, the situation has promoted corruption up to an unimaginable proportion in the country with leaders and followers heavily involved. Immoral acts and indiscipline now occupy the length and breadth of the country. Today, nobody thinks of the implication of his/ her conduct on the system. In fact the level

of official corruption in public places is better imagined as officers on all cadres from those in the auxiliary to the administrative class are deeply involved. The fact that, ethno religious and other primordial sentiments promoted by leaders are co-opted into the service make most public servants at the federal, state and local government level to see themselves as representatives of the respective communities and not the country at large. This has great consequence on the quality of service delivery, loyalty and discipline among government workers. Also, recruitment into the service is also along the line of patronage and ethnic consideration technically called federal character. In fact, individuals found guilty of various offences sometimes run to their traditional rulers for intervention in order to prevent/ circumvent justice. It is therefore not surprising that the public sector is dysfunctional with its attendant lawlessness and almost malfunctioning of the private sector. The private sector is affected because the public sector regulates the conduct of the private sector. This badly affects the spirit of patriotism among the people with the attendant implication being the waning of the social system.

The above scene portends a great danger for the country as virtually everything from health, to security, agriculture, education, power, petrol chemicals and even religion is malfunctioning. The wrong orientation foisted on the people by the elites in their quest for power vibrates and roars. However, as effects of the internationalization of capitalism otherwise called globalization bites harder on the country, the elites become more sophisticated in manipulating the people. At the same time, the academia become much more confined to the four walls of the University and are merely contracted by the political elites for adhoc assignment either as ministers, commissioners, special advisers/assistants or as propagandists. Incidentally they owe the key with which the county can be rescued.

### Conclusion

It is clear from the above that the struggle for power in Nigeria is like a period when storm is experienced in a bucket of water and the Nigerian elites are not interested in power for the benefit of the generality of the populace but for the selfish interest of the elites. They therefore resort to cut throat competition in a bid to attain power.

It is equally of great note that in the period of colonial rule up to 1966 elites quest for power was aimed at regional development and prevention of domination of a region by persons from other regions but as globalization grows and stretches its tentacles to Nigeria, the idea of individualism grew and focus shifted only to the promotion of selfish interest of the political elites and all forms of unorthodox, separatist and dignifying methods were employed.

Hence, ethno religious infiltration of politics which leads to the worsening of the socio economic plight of the masses and a loss of confidence in the Nigerian project. It therefore implies that the country is doomed to collapse if the uncharitable quest for power by the elites continues. The academics have a major role to play in order to prevent the imminent collapse of the county through:

- The provision of intellectual framework for the economic liberation of Nigeria and Africa at large in order to reduce negative effects of globalization on Nigeria.
- The refusal to dance to divisive tendencies of the political and economic elites especially when they are employed by politician for propaganda.
- The regular holding of public lecture /seminars /symposium etc on matters of national concern, in order to properly orientate the people on the need for unity
- The forming of coalition by the various unions of the academics, such as the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) Academic Staff Union of Polytechnics (ASUP) and Colleges of Education Academic Staff Union (COEASU) with other civil society groups in order to expose the political and economic elites and liberate the minds of the people.

### References

1. Achebe, C. (1983). *The Trouble with Nigeria*. Enugu, Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd.
2. Ajayi, T. (2005). The Growth and Depending of the Meaning of Democracy over the Years. *Olosuta Ikere Journal of Humanity*. 1(2), 15-23.
3. Alli, W.O. (2008). *The impact of Globalization on conflict in and conflict studies*. Ibadan. Spectrum Books Ltd. Africa. In. Best, S. G. (ed) Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies. Ibadan. Spectrum Books Ltd.
4. Ake,(2002). *A Political Economy of Africa*. New York. Longman Group Limited.
5. Ake C. (1995) . *Democracy and Development in Africa*. Ibadan. Spectrum Books Limited

6. Akinboye, S.O. and Anifowose, R. (1999). Nigeria Government and Politics In. Anifosowe, R. and Enemu, F (ed). Elements of Politics Lagos Malthouse Press Ltd.
7. Akinlade, M. T. & Igbalajobi, M. (2012). Old Brigades and Nigerian's Nascent Democracy. In. *Nigerian Journal of Policy & Development*. 7 (8), 25-31.
8. Akinlade, M. T. & Igbalajobi M.(2012). Good Governance : A veritable Tool for Nation in Nigeria. In. *International Journal of Advanced Legal Studies and Governance*. 13(1), 34-50.
9. Anifowose, R., (1999). *Power, Influence and Authority*. In Anifowose, R and Enemu, F. (ed) Elements of Politics Lagos . Malthous press Ltd.
10. Bamgbose, J. A. (2000). *Fundamentals of Nigeria Politics*. Ejigbo. Ijede Commercial Enterprises Ltd.
11. Fafowora, O. O. (1998). Management Imperatives of Globalization Management in Nigeria. *Journal of the Nigerian Institute of Management*. 34 (2-4).
12. Fageyinbo, M. O.(2000). Sustaining Democracy in Nigeria beyond Year2000. The Role of viable citizenship Education. *Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*.1(2).
13. Falola, T; Uhomoibhu, M; Mahadi, A; and Anyanwu, U. (2007). *History of Nigeria 3: Nigeria in the Twentieth Century*. Ikeja. Longman Nigeria PLC.
14. Fashina, D. (2001). Nigerian Tertiary Education System : What future? A keynotes Address. In. Jegede, S; Ale, A; and Akinsola, E. Ikeja Committee for the Defense of Human Rights.
15. Gauba, O.P (2007). Introduction to Political theory New Delh. Macmillan India Ltd. <https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elite-theory>.
16. Lasswell, H. and Kaplan, A. (1950). Power and Society. New Haven. Yale University Press.
17. Maier, K. (2000). This House Has Fallen: Nigeria in Crisis. Britain Pengium Press.
18. Odukoya, D. (1999). The Nigerian Democracy and Local Government Administration. In *Nigeria Social Science Review*. 4(1).
19. Waltz, K.N (1993). The Emerging Structure of International Politics in. International Security. Retrieved online September 12, 2014 from <http://www.jstor.or/journalsmilpress.htm>.

**A leader has the vision and conviction that a dream can be achieved.  
He inspires the power and energy to get it done.**

**~ Ralph Nader**