IS BAD GOVERNANCE/CORRUPTION THE MAJOR SOURCE OF CONFLICT IN NIGERIA?

*Usman I.,[1]Kyari G.A., [2]Hajja A.M.S. and [3]Goni U.A.

[*&2]Department of Liberal and Languages Studies, Ramat Polytechnic Maiduguri, Borno State
[1]Dept of Political Science, University of Maiduguri, Borno State, Nigeria
[3]Dept of Sharia Law, University of Maiduguri
Email: usmansherifam@gmail.com.

Abstract: *Today, Africa, and Nigeria in particular is seen as one of the richest and at the same time among the poorest countries of the world-with its economy far-fetched from making any headways. Rapid population growth, coupled with high rate of poverty, illiteracy, conflict, diseases, and worst of all-bad leadership and corruption exacerbated this endemic problems. While this factors are prominent, this study argues that corruption and bad leadership are byproduct of colonialism-which laid the basis for ethno religious and political conflict that has threatened the unity of Nigeria.*

Keywords: Governance, Corruptions, Conflict, Nigeria

INTRODUCTION
Today, Africa is seen as the most backward continent, with its economy far-fetched from doing well. Rapid population growth, coupled with high rate of poverty, illiteracy, conflict, diseases, external debt, corruption and bad leadership exacerbated this problem. Thus at the eve of the twenty first century which many observers described as the era of hope, Africa's life is at the low ebb. In a study conducted by Ghani et al., (2008:22) reveals that "In the past twenty years, for example US$300 billion has been spent in Africa alone (in aid), yet the continent is still rife with weak and collapsed regimes-two million people a year die of AIDS, three thousand children die every day of malaria, and forty million received no schooling at all." In a similar assertion, Bekoe (2002:232) argues that "each passing year reinforces Africa's grim statistics of a continent in which many state are overtaken by poverty and conflict. In 2001, to cite just one statistics, 75% of the countries in Africa (39 of 54) were classified as low income-meaning that GNI was below US$745 annually. Equally dismal conflict and instability in all the sub-regions continue to spread refugees. The UNHCR reports that 6.3 million refugees, asylum seekers, internally displaced people, returnees and

other vulnerable groups, out of a total of 22.3 million globally existed in Africa." It is noteworthy that, the endemic problems have been that of bad governance and corruption which has produce autocratic rule, economic decadence and underdevelopment. Narrowing the discourse on Nigeria, the country has gone through series of perilous crisis-ranging from ethno religious conflict to post election violence, infrastructural failure, Unemployment, youth restiveness, pandemic diseases, human rights abuses, high way robbery, terrorism etc. Despite the flare of optimism as evidently demonstrated by its leaders and policy makers to flicker the hopes of Nigerians, their social condition is worsening on daily basis. This is well captured by Kyari, that:

> *"Nigeria was a pearl state, beacon of hopes and aspirations*
> *for its people on independence in 1960, but now in ruins....*
> *is due to leadership failure. By their actions and inactions*
> *the Nigerian leaders/elites have now completely reduced Nig-*
> *eria to a failed state, despite the screaming self-serving rhe-*
> *torics to the contrary.(Kyari,2008:137)"*

Paradoxically, Nigeria is seen by the rest of the world as one of the richest countries in terms of natural resources, and at the same time among the most backward countries of the world. While it is not an overstatement to contend that Nigeria is a failed state-as the subject of debate has always been a "failed state" or a "failing state", with its population acrimoniously divided along ethnic, religious and regional lines. As Ogundiya (2010) argued that the failure of governance in Nigeria is a function of the nature and character of the political elites. Ironically the problem is both a symptom and consequence of bad governance. From the forgoing, the objective of this monograph is to ascertain the state of bad governance and corruption vis-à-vis its nexus to conflict in Nigeria. This does not explicitly suggest that bad governance/corruption on the one hand and conflict on the other, are very closely intertwined. Conflicts do occur even where there are transparent and credible governance, for example, there were pockets of countries in the developed. World where segments of the society have a strong conviction about their identity and look upon others as inferior, that in itself may lead to a conflict. Without digressing from the main theme of this paper, I intend to argue that where poverty and frustration reached a certain peak as a result of lack of economic opportunities and service delivery by the government, and where extravagance and ostentation by the political elites is palpable especially in a heterogeneous society-where suspicion and tendency of one group dominating the other is most likely, oppressed and marginalized groups may resort to conflict.

This paper is followed by examining the historical background of the Nigerian state; then review of literature on the key concepts: bad governance, corruption and conflict; then analyze the nexus between bad governance and corruption and how they lead to conflict in

*Usman Ismaila, ¹Kyari Goni Ali; ²Hajja Aisha Modu Sheriff and ³Goni Usman Ansar

Nigeria, and through this linkages, the paper will highlight on how ethno religious sentiment, competition for power and the resources of the state, and the impact of poverty play a dominant role in the conflict; and, finally, the concluding part will prognosticate into the probability of conflict in Nigeria taking a different dimension if a dogged, firm and drastic transformation is not adopted by the government.

THE NIGERIAN STATE

Nigeria as a geographical entity was first discovered by the British when they took over the port of Lagos in 1861 and declared that area as a crown colony. The Berlin conference of 1884-85 extended the mandate of the British and hence the discovery of the Niger-Delta area. By 1893, Northern Nigeria was administered separately by a British Company called the Niger Royal Company (NRC). By 1900 the British had direct control over the north and the south, where it was structured into northern and southern protectorates. The amalgamation of the two protectorates in 1914 produced what is today known as Nigeria. Sir Fredrick Lord Lugard emerged as it first Governor, and by 1922 Nigeria had its first constitution under another governor-sir Hugh Clifford. By the end of the Second World War, the U.S government pressurized all colonial powers to accelerate and prepare all colonise for self-government. This development shaped the political history of Nigeria as it had another constitution in 1946 called the Richards Constitution. This constitution claimed to integrate the various religious and ethnic identities in the country and further give them the chance to manage and control their own affairs. Based on these principles, the country was divided into three regions, an arrangement criticized by many as divisive. As a result of this, nationalist sentiment reached an unprecedented proportion, where the three dominant ethnic groups-Hausa/Fulani, Yoruba and Igbo's along with other minority groups narrowed their interest to their regions and religions.

In 1951, the Macpherson's constitution could not curb the tide of ethno religious and regional divide, and consequently the Lyttleton's constitution of 1954 supplanted the one of 1951, with a view to ameliorating the friction in the polity. Federal system of government was introduced-which tend to provide a sense of belonging to the various factions in the country. The two constitutional conferences in 1957 and 1958 respectively set a dateline for colonial exit. The federation of Nigeria gained its independence on the 1st-october 1960. The first crop of politician who took over from the colonial power administered the country based on the British parliamentary system, not leaving behind the identity politics they inherited during the colonial era. As Goodlings (2000) observed that regional, religious and ethnic differences plagued Nigeria from the outset. The Northern People's Congress (NPC) was an offshoot of Hausa Fulani ethnic, a political party that represented the interest of the north; Action Group (AG) was identified with the Yoruba cultural group, represented the west; and ,the National Council of Nigerian Citizens (NCNC) was forced to rely on the Igbo's and the east for mobilization of votes and support. The regime (1960-1966) was

characterized by political instability that resulted into a bloody coup in which the Prime minister, Premiers of the north and the west and, a federal minister were assassinated. The period between 1966-1979 was marked by coup and counter-coup, civil war, oil boom, creation of states, constitutional reforms, conduct of elections etc. While the period between 1979-1983, ushered in the second republic, which like the first republic was also marred by corruption, identity politics, victimization of opposition parties etc. And the events between 1983-1999 were characterized by another military intervention, aborted elections, imposition of interim government, constitutional conference, general elections etc.

The period between 1999-2011 came along with its own peculiarities even though it has been the longest period of democratic rule in Nigeria. Goodlings (2008) posit that the fourth republic, the longest period of stable civilian rule in the country's political history. Each civilian period before was ended by a military coup, a product in part of military predation and civilian political instability. This period experienced economic boom as a result of the unprecedented raise in oil price, this is followed by political corruption, ethno-religious conflict, terrorism, electoral malpractices and political violence, poverty etc. The history of Nigeria is one bedeviled by incompetence of the political class as each passing regime blamed the other of its predicament. Mule (2000) argued that this trend will continue…and will never get far unless the problems of corruption which are the manifestation of bad governance are addressed

BAD GOVERNANCE, CORRUPTION AND CONFLICT: CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATION
Bad Governance

There is no clear-cut definition of the subject matter of bad governance. Different scholars and policy makers tend to view and assess it differently, but one common thread. However run through all their perceptions; that it is detrimental to any political setup. Bekoe (2002:2) posit that "Bad governance is generally seen as one of the factors which contributed to the perilous world most African's are facing. It is a world of poverty and for many a world of early death. In many countries it is also a world of repression." To make much sense of the concept, it is imperative to start by defining governance which in a way will broaden our understanding of whether a particular act, form or practices of governance is good or bad. According to Kaufmann (2005:46) governance "is tradition and institution by which authority in a country is exercised for common good. This include: the process by which those in authority are selected, monitored and replaced (political dimension); the government's capacity to effectively manage its resources and implement sound policies (economic dimension); and, the respect of citizens and the state for the country's institution (institutional respect dimension)."Using the political economy approach, the World Bank (1992:32) defines governance as "the means by which power is exercised in the management of country's economic and social resources for development." Susan Rose (1999) on the other hand used the reductionist theory in assessing governance. She reduces governance to

*Usman Ismaila, ¹Kyari Goni Ali; ²Hajja Aisha Modu Sheriff and ³Goni Usman Ansar

check and balance in the legislative process, accountable implementation of policies, independent judicial prosecutorial institution, and, openness and accountability. Within the same school of thought, Johnson (1991) also reduced governance to efficiency and rationality in allocating resources; curbing corruption; enhancing legitimate freedoms of association, of speech, of press, of above all the individual; rule of law, and so an unfettered judicial system; guarantee of civil and human right; transparency; and above all accountability.

The institutional theory is adopted by the UNDP (1999:57) which views governance as "a complex mechanisms, process, relationship and institution through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate their differences." Synchronizing with this school thought, Ogundiya (2010:237) posit that governance include "institutional and structural arrangements, decision making processes, policy formulation and implementation capacity, development of personnel, information flows and the nature and style of leadership within a political system." The above postulations not only explain the concept of governance but also provided a framework within which we can measure and assess a particular governance system as good or bad. Therefore bad governance can be seen as a state of incapacitation or inability of a particular government to deliver the public good. Buttressing further on this position, Chigbu (2007) assert that bad governance is the unwillingness or inability of leaders to rise to their responsibility, to the challenge of personal examples which are the hallmark of true leadership. To Ogundiya (2010) bad governance is the absence of good governance…it is the inability of a government to achieve or realize the essence of the state at particular time. In the final analysis, governance can be bad when it fail to achieve the ideals; aspirations and purpose of the state define in terms of socio-political and economic development.

Corruption

The phenomenon of corruption has no single universally accepted meaning. Different literatures have postulated different meanings which appeal to different scholars. In its simplest form corruption, as the World Bank observe "Is the abuse of public power for private benefit." Disagreeing in part with this notion, Tanzi (1998: 51) contend that "in several cases of corruption the abuse of public power is not necessarily for one's private benefit but it can be for the benefit of one's party, class, tribe, friends, family and so on." This presupposes the elasticity of the concept as it may serve different interests according to needs and some time circumstances. According to Nye (1967:14) corruption "Is a behavior which deviates from the formal duties of a public role because of private-regarding (personal, close family, private clique) pecuniary or status gain; or violate rules against the exercise of certain types of private-regarding influence. This includes such behavior as bribery (use of reward to pervert the judgment of a person in a position of trust); nepotism (bestowal of patronage by reason of ascriptive relationship rather than merit); and misappropriation (illegal appropriation of

public resources for private-regarding uses)."USAID (1999) described corruption as encompassing unilateral abuses by government official such as embezzlement and nepotism, as well as abuses linking public and private actors such as bribery, extortion, influence peddling and fraud...arises in both political and bureaucratic offices and can be petty or grand, organized or disorganized. Looking at the concept more specifically from the public interest centered approach, Carl Fredrick assert that,

> *"The pattern of corruption can be said to exist whenever*
> *a power holder Who is charged with doing certain things,*
> *i.e., who is a responsible functionary or office holder, is*
> *by monetary or other rewards not legally provided for,*
> *Induced to take actions which favor whoever provides*
> *the rewards and thereby does damage to the public*
> *interest." (Fredrick, 1972:9)*

While Rose-Ackerman (1999:124) sees corruption as "a symptom that something has gone wrong in the management of the state. Institution design to govern the interrelationships between the citizen and the state are used instead for personal enrichment and provision of benefit to the corrupt." Osoba (1996) posit that corruption is an anti social behavior conferring improper benefits contrary to legal and moral norms and which undermines the authorities to improve the living conditions of the people.

Conflict

Conflict as a phenomenon is often intertwined with words such as crisis, violence, mayhem etc. William et al (1999) argue that "they are related though distinct terms." The interchangeable manner in which the terms are frequently used prompted many scholars to come with distinct meaning of the term, even though there is no single outstanding definition. William further observed that conflict may not necessarily be destructive, but violence in most cases, is .That is why we often hear of violent conflict in political parlance, which implies that not all conflict are violent. While Alabi (2010) argue that, Crisis is sudden eruption of unexpected event caused by previous conflict. According to Dutch (1973:343) conflict "is a struggle between social groups that sees each other as incompatible. These social groups with different frame of mind, beliefs, perceptions, values and feelings fight or compete with each other for their basic needs with the intention to prevent, interfere and injure. "In this case there is a struggle over values to claims to status, power and scarce resources in which the aim of the opposing parties are not only to gain but also neutralize, injure or eliminate rivals (coser,1956:8). Kesterner et al., (2002) argue that conflict is a social factual situation in which at least two parties are involved and strive for goals which can only be reached by one party, and or want to employ incompatible means to achieve a certain goal. A critical look at the above postulations, suggest that the struggle between the conflicting

*Usman Ismaila, [1]Kyari Goni Ali; [2]Hajja Aisha Modu Sheriff and [3]Goni Usman Ansar

parties could metamorphose into violence. This has not always been the case as some conflicts are constructive and may not necessarily be antagonistic.

According to Osaghae (2001) conflict means struggle and rivalry for objects to which individuals and groups attached importance. These objects can either be material or non-material. The material object may include scarce resources like money, employment, and positions including political ones, promotion in both private and public organizations. The non-material objects include culture, tradition, religion and language. "Environmental conflict theorist, Thomas Homer-Dixon(1994:221) identified three types of intergroup conflict: "scarcity conflicts, where groups clash over access to resources that are vital to survival, such as land or water; group identity conflict, linked to notions of 'tribal' or 'ethnic' conflict whereby populations displaced by resource scarcity and those with whom come into contact with, will have heightened awareness of their group identity and clash with other groups over who has right to access resources; and deprivation conflicts, resulting from the widening gap between the haves and the have-nots; as the resource available diminish, those in power will use their influence to maintain their standard of living at the expense of others." On the other hand, the Collier-Hoeffler model, identified greed and grievance as objects of conflict. Greed is measured by: dependence on primary commodity export; the proportion of young males in the population; and the average years of schooling undertaken. Grievance is measured in terms of: low income growth; inequality; political repression; ethnic grievances; and the utility of rebellion (Beswick and Jackson, 2011:41).

UNDERSTANDING THE NEXUS

A critical look at the relationship between bad governance, corruption and conflict at this point is appropriate, as it will provide an insight into understanding some of the problems raised at the onset of this thesis. Corruption has recently become a major item on the international security agenda, as many conflict affected countries are among those to deal with corruption is among the greatest indicators of bad governance. In demonstrating the governance model to showcase the interlace between corruption and governance, Chetwynd et al (2003) argue that, increased corruption reduces governance capacity…disrupt governance practice, destabilizes governance institution, reduces provision of services…rule of law and public trust in government and its institutions. Impaired governance, in turn, reduces social capital, public trust in governance, and increases poverty. It is evidently clear that, increased poverty might lead to frustration, and, in turn, lead to conflict. Beswick et al., (2011:45) argue that "… the poor are no more prone to conflict than any one else, but are more likely to choose it because they have a comparative advantage in violence, suggesting it is cheaper for them to do this because they forgo little else in the way of alternative…poverty is so bad that the risk to one's life is worth it."

Contrary to the above, is the argument that corruption is not always illegitimate and does not necessarily signify a breakdown of a political system rather it is part of that system. In societies where exchanges often take place in the shadow economy and survival and coping strategies often depend on petty trading, smuggling and bribery. In such circumstances, effort to eradicate corrupt practices may instead worsen poverty and instability and possibly even cause violence (Lindberg and Orjuela, 2011:208). It is imperative however, to point out that while bad governance and corruption stimulate conflict, much of it depends to some extent on the context within which the analysis is conducted, giving the fact that the cause of conflict is a multidimensional issue. In this thesis, I intend to argue that there exist a nexus between corruption, bad governance and conflict, especially going by the overwhelming and glaring state of affairs in Nigeria.

CONFLICT IN NIGERIA: CAUSES

There were surfeit of views on the character and causes of conflict in Nigeria. As different scholarly work struggle to understand the root causes of conflict, they arrived at corruption which is the manifest of bad governance as the major bedeviling factor. It serve as the vehicle through which other sub-factors equally contributed to the problem of conflict in Nigeria. At this juncture, it is essential to specify those sub-factors and demonstrate how bad governance/corruption played an influential role in their emergence. For the purpose of this monograph, they are classified into: ethno-religious; competition for Power and the resources of the state; poverty and its impact; and, the colonial legacy of Divide and rule.

First, Nigeria since independence has produced a catalogue of ethno religious conflicts that resulted in an estimated loss of over three million lives and unquantifiable Psychological and material damages (Salawu, 2010:1). Between 1986 to 1999, out of the 60 violent conflicts encountered in different parts of Nigeria; 56 were ethno religious conflict (Collier and Sambanis, 2005:90-94). And the HRW (2003) report, presented the latest figure-which claimed that between May 1999-June 2005, 35 different clashes occurred across the country. In the central region alone, a committee set up by the Plateau state on facts finding (7th June 2001-18th may 2004) put the number of death at 53,787; those rendered homeless at 280,000; and burned houses at 25,000. Even though this figure was challenged by the HRW as being exaggerated, it is true that the exact number of affected victims cannot be determine as a result of lack of reliable statistical data (Higazi, 2011).

It is attention-grabbing, however, to note that most ethno religious conflict in Nigeria prevail as a result of failure on the part of government to provide the basic necessities of life, as Synder (1993:74) argue that "ethnic nationalism predominates when institutions collapse, when existing institutions are not fulfilling peoples basic needs and when satisfactory alternative structures are not readily available- in other words when there is lack of effective statehood." Because of the absence of political restraint, each passing government chose the

path to failure in order to achieve personal ends. Salawu (2010) contend that the failure of the Nigerian leaders to establish good governance, forge national integration and promote economic progress through deliberate and articulate policies has led to mass poverty and unemployment. This has resulted into communal, ethnic and religious conflicts that have now characterized the Nigerian nation. Another dimension of ethno religious conflict is the one deliberately constructed as a political gimmick, which provide politicians with a cover for their corrupt activities. The "Us" versus "Them" syndrome prevails to draw a confrontation line between different ethnic groups. For example between 1999-2007, the Nigeria government earned about US$223 billion in revenues from oil exports, yet the government was handicap in providing answers on how this windfall was spent. In response to pressure from the opposition groups, the government resorted to ethnic and religious sentiment. Fagbadebo (2007) rightly observed that, in a bid to stem the rising tide of oppositions (on corrupt practices), political leaders exploit and manipulate the entrenched ethnic divide in Nigeria for political purposes. Competition for power and the resources of the state is another cause of conflict. Suffice it to say that, central to the understanding of conflict in Nigeria is the incessant struggle for political power; define in terms of economic benefit. Ake (1989:43) observe that "there is an irreconcilable struggle between an existing dominant social class and subordinate classes over who should hold power. This irreconcilable struggle for power triggers off conflict and violence, hence the state of consistent crisis." The antagonistic struggle between these classes is underpin by the economic interest- who get what, when and how, as Ogundiya (2010) argue that In Nigeria, political power guarantees unlimited and uncontrolled access to the resources of the state that are then appropriated for personal and parochial use and advantages. To accomplish this, the dominant political elites employ all means at their disposal ranging from money, blackmail, terror, violence etc to maintain and sustain power. In this respect the HRW (2007:17) argue that "there is a direct relationship between corruption and political violence- many public officials use stolen public revenues to pay for political violence in support of their ambitions." Therefore, political violence has become a central part of political competition across much of Nigeria and it takes many forms- from assassinations to armed clashes between gangs employed by rival politicians, for example, in two weeks surrounding the elections in 2003 more than a 100 people were killed (HRW, ibid).The number of death in the April 2011 elections is still not verified, as they count in thousands. This political attitude has trapped Nigeria in a crisis of governance, where violence and corruption were seen as a veritable means to political office and the primary channel of gaining access to wealth.

Poverty and its impact on the Nigerian society (unemployment, lack of health care, infrastructural decay etc) is unavoidably a major cause of conflict. The saying that 'everything looked possible-but everything went wrong' is the common axiom that described the social condition of the Nigeria state. Nigeria harbors one of the largest numbers of poor in Africa. There is gross inability of most Nigerians to achieve a certain minimal standard of living.

70.8% of Nigerians live below the poverty-line of $1 a day and up to 92.4% live below $2 a day at year 2003 (UNICEF, 2003; World Bank, 2006).In quality of life, Nigeria rates below all major oil nations from Libya to Indonesia, and has the third largest number of poor in the world after China and India (World Bank, 2005). This is compounded by corruption, as the Transparency International consistently ranked Nigeria among the top three most corrupt countries in the world between 1999-2006, where a minimum average of $4 billion to $8 billion per year were lost to corruption over the eight years (1999-2007) of the Obasanjo administration (HRW, 2007). The unimaginable level of poverty generated by corruption in Nigeria, led the World Bank to categorize Nigeria as a fragile state, beset of risk of armed conflict, epidemic diseases and failed governance (Tom O'Neil, 2007:1). As corruption impoverished and excluded the majority of Nigerian's from their national wealth, frustration, youth restiveness and violence sparked off, and the country became vulnerable and prone to the emergence of different armed militia groups: hence the rise of MEND/MOSOP in the south-south (oil producing region); OPC in the West; MASSOB/Bakassy Boys in the east; and mostly recently the Boko Haram in the north. These groups have asserted their dominance in their various regions and were pushing to run a parallel authority with the central government. The colonial legacy of divide and rule has been another source of conflict. It was designed and modified by the British purposely for administrative convenience. Nigeria had over 400 ethnic groups belonging to different cultures and religions, yet it has been dominated by three large ethnic groups- the Hausa/Fulani, Igbo and Yoruba. The British having amalgamated the country in 1914 (what many described as the mistake of 1914) was faced with this reality and thus reinforced it as a viable means of power sharing formula. The 1946 constitution institutionalized the three dominant groups as the ruling tribes when it divided the country into three regions and officially recognized the dominance of each within these regions. This has generated into neglect, marginalization, and domination of the minority groups- who by their numerical strength constitute over 60% of the total population. Adebisi (1999:7) argue that;

> *"The seed of ethnic violence in Nigeria were sown by the*
> *British with the adoption of a divide and rule tactics, which*
> *later robbed Nigeria of the common front for nation*
> *building. This tactics paved way for the emergence of*
> *regional parties, interests and leaders whose manifestoes*
> *were designed along ethnically motivated interests."*

Finally, the majority/minority nomenclature which is a powerful determining factor in the Nigeria's political life has planted a pattern of political rivalry, which now characterized political competition in the nation's body politics, is attributable to the history and process inherent in the state formation during the colonial and post colonial era. Thus the colonial

*Usman Ismaila, [1]Kyari Goni Ali; [2]Hajja Aisha Modu Sheriff and [3]Goni Usman Ansar

state was the foundation upon which the post colonial state was built (Abdullahi et al., 2007:29; Egwu, 2001:28).

CONCLUSION

It is obvious that bad governance and corruption links to conflict in Nigeria. The paper argues that bad governance and corruption has a major impact on undermining the government and public confidence in governance institutions. When people placed with leadership responsibilities put their personal interests over and above those of the state, the citizens will have less confidence and doubt the legitimacy of the governing institutions and hence resort to their ethnic nationalism especially in a heterogeneous state. Politicians have at the same time over-flogged the issue by capitalizing on the hostile ethnic nature of the Nigerian state to perpetuate conflict in order to divert attention from failures in leadership.

The paper also pointed that, the unending and irreconcilable tussle for power and the resources of the state by the political elites, with their exploitative and consumerist tendencies, not only engendered political violence in the name of winning elections but also increased the level of poverty to the extent that rendered Nigeria as volatile and fragile state. A common observable trend is youth restiveness and frustration, particularly at a time of windfall from the oil revenue that incited the emergence of militant groups agitating for various forms of political reforms. Bad governance and corruption are not the only major factors responsible for conflict in Nigeria. Colonialism laid the basis for ethno religious and political conflict that has persistently threatened the unity of the country. This was as a result of the deliberate and forceful merger of the various entities in 1914, without appreciating the differences in religions and cultures. This has also led to the establishment of administration based on ethnic lines that failed to recognize ethnic minorities as equal partners in the administrative process. This presupposes that post colonial conflict in Nigeria was partly contracted through the colonial policy of divide and rule. As I conclude, it seems the movement of opinions is faster than the movement of events. As poor governance continue to heighten, the current state of conflict gives cause for concern leading us to basic question whether Nigeria can survive as a nation or will collapse in 2015 as the National Intelligence Council predicted. Therefore to ensure the unity and stability of Nigeria, first, the fight against corruption which is a symptom of bad governance must be firm, genuine, multi-sectoral and transparent. This should be done through the institutionalization of good governance and accountability. Secondly, the federal arrangement should be restructured in such a way as to give the minority ethnic groups a sense of belonging.

REFERENCE

Abdullahi, A.A, Saka L, (2007) Ethno Religious and Political Conflicts: Threat to Nigeria Nascent Democracy. Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa (Vol. 9, No.3).

Adam Higazi (2011). The Jos Crisis: A Recurrent Nigerian Tragedy; (FES) Nigeria.

Adebisi M.A (1999) Ethnic Relations and Politics in Nigeria, in, A.A, Ali, Saka L (eds) Ethno Religious and Political Conflicts: Threat to Nigeria Nascent Democracy. JDSA.

Ake C (1989). The Present Crisis in Africa: Economic Crisis or Crisis of the State? In, Idowu W.O Ed., Citizenship Alienation and Conflict in Nigeria. Africa Development, Vol.24, No. 1&2 1999, pp.40

Alabi A.O (2010) Management of Conflict and Crisis in Nigeria: Educational Planners View. Current Research Journal of Social Science, 2(6):311-315

Bekoe, D.A (2002) NEPAD and its Achilles Heels, Alternatives. Turkish Journal of International Relations, Vol. 1, No. 4.

Beswick D, Jackson P, (2011) Conflict, Security and Development: An Introduction Routledge, New York, USA.

Carl Fredrick (1972) Corruption Concept in Historical Perspective, in, A.J Heiden-Heimer, M, Johnston (Ed) Political Corruption: Concepts & Contexts. Third Edition.

Chetwynd E, Chetwynd F, Spector B, (2003) Corruption and Poverty: A Review of Recent Literature, MSI, Washington, DC, USA.

Collier P, Sambanis N, (2005) Understanding Civil War: Evidence and Analysis, Vol. 1: Africa, IBRD, IMF, Washington DC.

Coser L, (1957) The Functions of Social Conflict, Glencoe, Free Press.

Daniel Kaufmann (2005) Myth and Reality of Governance and Corruption. The Brookling Institution, NW, Washington DC, pp. 82.

Dutch, M, (1973). The Resolution of Conflict: Constructive and Destructive Process. New Haven, CT, Yale University Press.

Egwu, S.G (2001) Ethnic and Religious Violence in Nigeria, Jos: African Centre for Democratic Governance (AFRIGOV).

Fagbadebo,O (2007) Corruption, Governance and Political Instability in Nigeria. African Journal of Political Science and International Relations. Vol. 1(2) pp. 028-037.

*Usman Ismaila, [1]Kyari Goni Ali; [2]Hajja Aisha Modu Sheriff and [3]Goni Usman Ansar

Ghani, A, Lockhart C, (2008) Fixing Failed State: A Framework for Rebuilding a Fractured World. Oxford University Press.

Googlings, N.A, (2000) Nigeria's Crisis of Corruption-Can the UN Global Hope to Resolvethis Dilemma? Vandarbilt Journal of Transnational Law, Vol.36.997.

Homer-Dixon, Thomas, F (1994) Environmental Scarcity and Violent Conflict: Evidence from Cases, in, Beswick D, Jackson P (Ed) Conflict, Security and Development: An Introduction, Routledge, NY.

HRW (2007) Criminal Politics and Violence: "Godfathers" and Corruption in Nigeria. Vol.19, No. 16 (A).

John Johnson (1991) Aid and Good Governance in Africa. Round Table, Routledge, 320, p.396.

Kesterner, B.P and Ray L (2002) The Conflict Resolution Training Programme. Leaders Manual, Jossey-Bass, USA.

Kyari Tijjani (2008) Metaphor of Underdevelopment: Reflection from Nigeria. Information, Society and Justice, Vol. 2, No. 2. pp. 137-162.

Le Billon (2008) Corrupting Peace? Peace Building and Post-Conflict Corruption. Vol. 15, Issue. 3, International Peacekeeping.

Lindberg J, Orjuela C, (2011) Corruption and Conflict: Connection and Consequences in War-torn Sri Lanka, CSD, Routledge, London, UK.

Mule H, (2000) Challenges to African Governance and Civil Society, in,

Akinyele S.T (2005) A Critical Analysis of Corruption and its Problems in Nigeria. Anthropologist, 7(1): 7-18.

Nye J.S (1967) Corruption and Political Development: A Cost-Benefit Analysis. In, Heidenheimer, A.J, Jonston M (2008) Political Corruption: Concepts and Contexts, Third Edition.

Ogundiya I.S (2010) Corruption: The Bane of Democratic Stability in Nigeria. Journal of Social Science. MSO.

Osaghe, E.E (2001) Ethnic Mapping Project: A Brief Concept, in, Osaghae (Ed.) Ethnic Group and Conflict in Nigeria. Ibadan, PEFS.

Osoba (1996) Corruption in Nigeria: New Paradigm for Effective Control. African Economic Analysis.

Salawu, B, (2010) Ethno-Religious Conflict in Nigeria: Causal Analysis and Proposals for New Management Strategy. European Journal of Social Science, Vol.13, No.3.

Susan Rose-Ackerman (1999) Corruption and Government: Causes, Consequences and Reforms, Cambridge University Press.

Synder, J (1993) Nationalism and the Crisis of Post-Soveit State, in Survival, Vol. 35, No. 1.

Tanzi Vito (1998) Corruption around the World: Causes, Consequences, Scope, and Cures. IMF, Fiscal Affairs Department.

Tom O'Neil (2007) Curse of the Black Gold: Hope and Betrayal of the Niger Delta. National Geographic.

UNDP (1999) Compendium of African Governance Performance: Good Governance and Conflict Management. New York, p. 11.

UNICEF (2003) Girls, Education and Development, Geneva.

USAID (1999) Democracy, Governance and Anti-Corruption. http://www.usaid .gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/technical_area/anti-corruption/

William O, Idowu O, (1999) Citizenship, Alienation and Conflict in Nigeria. Africa Development. Vol. XXIV, Nos. 1&2.

World Bank (1992) Governance and Development. Washington DC. World Bank (2006) World Development Report 2006: Equity and Development.