African Journal of
Political Science and
International Relations

Academic
Journals

ABOUT AJPSIR

The **African Journal of Political Science and International Relations (AJPSIR)** is published monthly (one volume per year) by Academic Journals.

African Journal of Political Science and International Relations (AJPSIR) is an open access journal that publishes rigorous theoretical reasoning and advanced empirical research in all areas of the subjects. We welcome articles or proposals from all perspectives and on all subjects pertaining to Africa, Africa's relationship to the world, public policy, international relations, comparative politics, political methodology, political theory, political history and culture, global political economy, strategy and environment. The journal will also address developments within the discipline. Each issue will normally contain a mixture of peer-reviewed research articles, reviews or essays using a variety of methodologies and approaches.

Contact Us

African Journal of Political Science and International Relations

ARTICLE

Review

Migration and citizenship question in Nigeria: A study of the Berom and Hausa/Fulani conflict in Jos

Oladiran Afolabi

Department of Political Science, Houdegbe North American University, Cotonou, Republic of Benin.

Jos, an ancient city in Northern Nigeria, had been known for its relative tranquility and peace until the manifestation of hostilities and outbreak of violent confrontations, which became particularly monumental in September, 2001 between the Berom "indigenous" ethnic group (the majority), the Anaguta and the Afizare (the minorities) on one hand; and the "migrated or settler" Hausa/Fulani(majority) ,other ethnic nationalities such as the Yoruba, Urhobo, Igbo, on the other hand. The crisis, which has some historical undertone, has been over the "true" ownership of land and the attendant struggle for the control of political and economic resources of the area. This paper critically examines the indigene- settler syndrome within the context of citizenship and interrogates the practicality of same, as found expressed in both the 1979 and 1999 constitutions of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. Essentially a historical and survey research, the study made use of data collected form archival sources and social survey to expose the structural disjuncture in the Nigerian constitution and the plight of Nigerian citizens who find themselves in areas other than their places of origin within the Federal Republic. It is concluded that the problem of citizenship in Nigeria and particularly with regards to the movement of the people across the length and breadth of the country actually derives from the ambiguous definition given to it in the 1999 constitution and the unwillingness of the state to address this through governance and institutional mechanisms which are the hallmark of democracy and national integration.

Key words: Migration, citizenship, conflict, indigene

INTRODUCTION

Nigeria is the most populous black nation in the world. The country is endowed with human and natural resources, enormous enough to make the country one of the greatest in the world and a major pride of the African continent. As we know it today, Nigeria was brought into existence through British colonial experiments in Africa. The colonialists found the extant indigenous system strange and inadequate for administrative purposes and imperatively transplanted the metropole's (British) system of administration and government to Nigeria (Yakubu, 2003: 5). Evidence from the over 350 ethnic nationalities that constitute the Nigerian State shows that the country is a highly pluralistic entity.

It is expected that the plurality and diversity of the Nigerian State would be sources of strength in all facets of socio- political and economic life of the country but the

reverse has been the case as this unique feature of diversity has become one of the banes of the country effort at national integration and peaceful co-existence. People's attachment to primordial interests and the mobilization of sentiments for political and economic resources of the state has made the indigene – settler syndrome a major issue in the citizenship question in Nigeria.

While Nigerians who find themselves in areas other than their native communities believe that they should be accorded the same rights and opportunities available in the socio-economic and political spheres as those that were born in the areas in question because they are the same citizens of Nigeria; the so called indigenes however question such aspirations, as people always see the difference between "we and them" particularly in terms of political and economic allocation of resources.   The definition of who is actually a citizen of Nigeria, as presently expressed in the 1999 constitution of the federal republic does not help matters as it is also enshrined with some notable ambiguities.

As "man's history is essentially a story of movement, of conquest of land from nature and from fellow (Scott, 1972: 3); people cannot but move out of their place of birth and upbringing in search of greener pastures or as a result of circumstances beyond their control. This is the case of the Hausa/Fulani community in Jos North Local Government in Plateau State, Nigeria.   History relates that Jos North Local Government is populated predominantly by the Berom ethnic group – who are historically more indigenous to the area and the Hausa/Fulani group – who migrated to the area. These two groups are the most prominent in the struggle for resource allocation in Jos North and hence are the major contenders in the ethno-religious conflict in this hitherto peaceful and harmonious environment.

Right from the pre-colonial period, the Plateau area has been known for tin mining and a resort site for refugee fleeing from invasion (Dunmoye, 2003:26). Historical account has it that the Berom entered into the plateau from the north, expanded and displaced other groups in the area now known as Jos. The Hausas also migrated to Jos in the early period of British colonialism and expanded in numbers because of mining opportunities. They also engaged in commerce and farming. The acrimony between these two groups has a long historical antecedent. It stated during the colonial period when in the 1940s Britain attempted to evaluate the Beroms to Hawan-Kibo-Sabon Zawan in order to make Jos more conducive for mining operations.

The Berom had accused the Hausas of attempting to force them out of Jos. They claim to be the original owners of Jos and regard the Hausas as settlers, who should not be allowed to dominate the "sons of the soil", particularly in the political arena. This was what led to the crisis that greeted the 1992 splitting into two of Jos local government. However, ethnic violence ensued when in

1994; a Hausa man was appointed as the chairman of Jos North Local Government by the then military administrator of plateau state. Many lives and properties were destroyed. The government set up the Justice Aribiton Fiberesima's Commission to investigate the causes of the conflict. Since then Jos has been thrown into a lot of violent situations borne out of suspicion, electoral disagreement and the struggle for economic cum political opportunities by the "indigenes" and the "settlers".

Other groups in Jos North include: the Anagata and the Afizare – who constitute the minority native people; there are also the Yoruba, Urhobo and Igbo – who constitute the minority migrants in Jos North. This simply means that Jos is home to many ethnic groups. But it is the Berom – the largest indigenous group, who are the most aggressive in the claim of ownership of Jos. On the other hand, it is the Hausa/Fulani group – the largest of the migrated groups, who had become assertive in the competition for the politico-economic resources of the area.   The Hausas went ahead to adopt the name Jasawa which allows them certain level of ownership claim of Jos North.

This paper is an attempt to situate the entire crisis in Jos North and other similar cases in the federation of Nigeria within the context of political manipulations by the elite group largely encouraged by the structural disjuncture in the Nigerian Constitution. It questions the practical unwillingness of the state to properly define citizenship in the constitution particularly as the country now consolidates its democratic experience with a decade record of civil governance.

PERSPECTIVES ON MIGRATION AND CITIZENSHIP

In its simplest meaning and context, migration is the movement of people from one place to another; which could be internal or international. When people move from one place to another within a sovereign state, the form of migration is internal, but when there is movement from one country to another, this is referred to as international migration.

Historical accounts show that migration (internal or international) could be due to a number of reasons or motives. Practically, migration could be due to "push" and/or "pull" factors. Harsh and usually deplorable conditions of a place could make the people move out of their domain to a more conducive and peaceful atmosphere. Practical factors in this case may include socio-political and economic factor such as civil strife, joblessness, poverty, and unfavourable political conditions, particularly oppression and repression – all of which represent the possible push factors for migration. On the other hand, the pull factors for migration may include peace and safety factors such as political freedom, job availability or opportunities, a guarantee of

better living conditions, better education and a general atmosphere of peace.

Citizenship is a status of full and equal membership in a self-governing political community that entails rights and obligations and supported by certain virtues; which means that citizenship connotes nationality – a formal affiliation to a state (Baubock, 2002: 4). Using the Swahili civilization in East Africa as a case in point, Adesoji and Alao (2009: 152) argue that citizenship could be defined not only in terms of obligations or responsibilities alone, but also in terms of rights and privileges. They observed that:

There was no discrimination on the basis of descent, period of arrival or even extent of stay, although the princely and merchant/business class among others continued to enjoy the privileges conferred on them by their ascribed or achieved status.

Although, the concepts of state and citizenship have changed in time and space, the idea of modern citizenship is still closely connected with that of the state; citizenship is tied up with the evolution of the state (Adejumobi, 2001: 78-79). The concept of Citizenship derives from the French word – citoyennete; to describe the relationship between a person and the city. The concept originally connotes "the free man of the city"; it was conceived in the context of the town particularly, the medieval and ancient city-state and hence it historically has an urban orientation (Longva, 1995: 201).

Citizenship is moral choice and action, that had been "extolled by so many different societies, pagan and Christian, because it has been viewed not only as an instrument useful in controlling the passion and attenuating private concerns, but also as a means well suited to draw out the best in people (Riesenberg,1992). In the Romans and Greeks societies, citizenship has along history as having been one of the basic factors for achieving an attractive ideal community. It is for the reasons of its importance to the creation of an ideal relationship in the state that:

Citizenship has survived so long and served in so many political environments because of this great inspirational challenge to individuals to make their neighbour's, their fellow citizen's life better and, by so doing, make their own nobler (Riesenberg,1992: xi).

Citizenship is a continuing series of transactions between persons and agents of a given state in which each has enforceable rights and obligations uniquely by virtue of: the person's membership in an exclusive category, the native born plus the naturalized; and the agent's relation to the state rather than any other natural authority the agent may enjoy (Tilly, 1996: 8).The concept could be viewed from four analytic perspectives of: Category, role, tie and identity. As a category, citizenship designates a set of actors-citizens-distinguished by their shared privileged position in a particular state; as a role, citizenship includes all of an actor's relations to others that depend on the actor's relations to a particular state; as a tie, citizenship identifies an enforceable mutual relation between an actor and state agents and; as an identity, citizenship can refer to the experience and public representation of category, tie or role (Tilly, 1996: 7-10).

As a form of symbolic relation between the individual and the state, citizenship connotes a regime of rights privileges and duties which could be broken down into civil, political and social rights, which include: the right to speech, association, due process, and equality before the law, franchise and social welfare (Marshall, 1964). Citizenship, is a mutual agreement between the citizens and the state for reciprocal privileges and rights, and obligation, loyalty and commitment; with the rule of law as the umpire and justice and fairness the Watch words.(Adejumobi,2001:80). In this form of social pact, by the dual elements of reciprocity and exchange between the individual (citizen) and the state, the individual enjoys those rights and privileges which no other social or political organisations offer, and reciprocally, gives his obligations, loyalty and commitment to the state. The implementation of the pact does not presuppose class, but civic equality: equality of access and opportunities in state institutions and structures, and fairness and justice in the interactions between the state and individuals amongst individuals and in a political community (Adejumobi, 2001: 80-81).

CITIZENSHIP IN THE NIGERIAN CONSTITUTION

The constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria confers citizenship on every Nigerian on "equal basis". Both the 1979 and the 1999 constitutions guarantee that every Nigerian is free to reside in any part of the federation without hindrance. As explicitly expressed in Chapter III of the 1999 Constitution, the citizenship of Nigeria could be by birth, registration and naturalization. The constitution (1999) states that*:*

(a) any person born in Nigeria before the date of independence (October 1, 1960), either of whose parents or any of whose grand-parents belongs or belonged to a community indigenous to Nigeria, is a citizen of the country.
(b) every person born in Nigeria after the date of independence either of whose parents or any of whose grandparents is a citizen of Nigeria; and
(c) every person born outside Nigeria either of whose parents is a citizen of Nigeria.

The constitution further states in section 26(1-2) that:

Subject to the provision of section 28 of this Constitution,

a person to whom the provisions of this section apply may be registered as a citizen of Nigeria, if the President is satisfied that:

(a) he is a person of good character;
(b) he has shown a clear intention of his desire to be domiciled in Nigeria; and
(c) he has taken the Oath of Allegiance prescribed in the Seventh Schedule to this Constitution.
The provision of this section shall apply to:
(d) any woman who is or has been married to a citizen of Nigeria; or
(e) every person of full age and capacity born outside Nigeria any of whose grandparents is a citizen of Nigeria.

There are also opportunities for naturalization as a citizen of Nigeria as explained by Section 27 (1-2) of the 1999 constitution:

Subject to the provision of section 28 of this Constitution, any person who is qualified in accordance with the provisions of this section may apply to the President for the grant of a certificate of naturalization.

The under mentioned are the conditions under which the citizenship of Nigeria is granted upon application to the president of the country. The applicant must prove that:

(a) he is a person of full age and capacity;
(b) he is a person of good character;
(c) he has shown a clear intention of his desire to be domiciled in Nigeria;
(d) he is, in the opinion of the Governor of the State where he is or he proposes to be resident, acceptable to the local community in which he is to live permanently, and has been assimilated into the way of life of Nigerians in that part of the Federation;
(e) he is a person who has made or is capable of making useful contribution to the advancement, progress and well-being of Nigeria;
(f) he has taken the Oath of Allegiance prescribed in the Seventh Schedule to this Constitution; and
(g) he has, immediately preceding the date of his application, either:
(i) resided in Nigeria for a continuous period of fifteen years, or
(ii) resided in Nigeria continuously for a period of twelve months, and during the period of twenty years immediately preceding that period of twelve months has resided in Nigeria for periods amounting in the aggregate to not less than fifteen years.

The definition of citizenship in the constitution, as presented above and coupled with the provision of fundamental rights in Chapter IV of the same 1999 Constitution: the right to life, dignity of the human person, personal liberty, fair hearing, freedom of movement,

freedom from discrimination, etc., are instituted with the aim of promoting the "national political objectives of building a united and free society for all Nigerians, and to as much as possible promote reciprocal obligations between state and citizens" (CFCR, 2002: 5).

These objectives re-echo in many important national documents such as the Second National Development Plan. The Second Development Plan clearly stated that the goal of national development is to build a strong and buoyant economy, a free, democratic and egalitarian society in which no one is oppressed on the basis of sex, ethnic and religious differences (CFCR, 2002: 6).

However, in implementation and application, citizenship has become problematic. It could be likened to a mere nominal phenomenon, as Nigerians are largely denied citizenship rights. It is this experience that has made people to make sub-national identities the basis of support and real identification. Citizenship therefore in the Nigerian context has a dual derivative and the consequence of this is the indigene-settler syndrome with its attendant socio-economic and political struggles as found manifest in inter-ethnic and intra-ethnic conflicts in many parts of Nigeria.

More worrisome is the way and manner in which this syndrome is entrenching into the consciousness of Nigerian from all walks of life. For instance, a Nigerian whose parents or grandfather did not come from his place of residence will find it difficult to get elected or even appointed to a political office, even though he/she was born or has lived in that area for the whole of his/her life. In virtually all parts of the Nigerian state, the invocation of primordial sentiments and attachments as the basis for actual citizenship has become an increasingly visible feature of social interaction. The situation is pre-eminent in the political arena, as elite political groups continue to rely on this illogical and ambiguous understanding of migration and citizenship dynamics as available strategy to sensitise and mobilise people for socio-economic and political gains. The effects of this on the political economy of the country are unquantifiable. Less qualified people are elected or appointed to offices in place of more qualified and technocratic individuals who are not from the state where such elections or appointments are taking place.

Perhaps the most problematic of the citizenship question in Nigeria is the constitutional ambiguity that is conspicuous with regards to who is a citizen of the country. Yardsticks such as descent and birth are more pronounced in determining who a Nigerian citizen is and not place of livelihood or residence. The indigeneity clause in the 1979 constitution was used to legitimize discriminatory practices against Nigerians of certain ethnic and linguistic backgrounds living in states "other than their own". To be an indigene of a state, your parents or grandparents must have been members of a

community indigenous to that particular state (CFCR, 2002: 7).

This issue of whose is a native of a place and who is not, metamorphosed into a major obstacle to the definition of the citizenship of Nigeria. Migrants who live outside their place of birth or their grandparents' hometown find it difficult to claim the citizenship of Nigeria, as the autochthonous people of such places always display attitudes or behaviours to remind the so called "settler" that "this is our own land and not your own". On the other hand, the migrants have also come to be convinced that one day they will return to their own home. Amongst the Yoruba ethnic group in Nigeria, there is a popular saying that: "Ile labo sinmi oko", meaning that after working on the farm, one normally returns home for rest; hence the Yoruba see any place other than where their parents originate from as a mere farmland where they had gone to look for daily bread but to return home at the end of the day's work. This orientation is applicable to other ethnic groups in the country. A typical Igbo man for instance will prefer to erect a building in his home town before thinking of doing such in Lagos, or Kano where he had lived all his life.

An attempt to remedy this citizenship problem by the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria is further truncated by the surreptitious inclusion of the indigeneity clause regarding the appointment of some public office holders (such as the ministers). The intention might be to forge for national cohesion through the operation of the federal character principle; but the implication it has for the proper implementation of citizenship rights as provided for by the same constitution makes it ambiguous. As lucidly stated in section 147 of the 1999 Constitution in sub-section (3):

Any appointment under subsection (2) of this section by the President shall be in conformity with the provisions of section 14(3) of this constitution: provided that in giving effect to the provisions aforesaid the President shall appoint at least one minister from each state, who shall be an indigene of such state.

The claimers to ownerships of their "native" homes are emboldened by the provisions of the constitution and the operation of same by the Nigerian state which is not in line with the universal application of citizenship and the rights accruable to the concepts. As observed by the Citizen's Forum for Constitutional Reform (CFCR, 2002: 9):

More often than not, so-called indigenes and natives are pitched against settlers in deadly confrontations over access to local power resources and questions of identity. To this extent these categories are used in a very negative manner to mobilize peoples sentiments and feelings that negate the national political objectives of integration and the evolution of a harmonious political community.

The scenario described above is epitomized in the Ife/Modakeke conflict, the Zango-Kataf crisis, the Tiv-Jukun conflict, Bassa/Ebira and other ethno-communal strife that have dealt a heavy blow on the stability of the Nigerian State. A similar pattern of competition and contest has been the root of the Hausa/Fulani – Berom conflict in Jos North Local Government of Nigeria.

THE HAUSA/FULANI – BEROM CONFLICT IN FOCUS

Before the terrible communal clashes that took place on the 12th of April 1994, Jos, an ancient city in northern Nigeria was known for its tranquility and peaceful co-existence amongst diverse communities and groups. Thereafter, for almost a decade, Jos and its environs experience another cycle of long peace which was terminated by the September 7th, 2001 outbreak of hostilities and violent confrontations between the Berom – the majority indigenous ethnic group and the Anaguta and the Afizare the minority ethnic group on one hand and the migrant or settler Hausa/Fulani – the majority and other ethnic nationalities such as the Yoruba, Urhobo, Igbo, etc. on the other.

The September 2001, crisis and the attendant socio-economic and political relations among the people of Jos North has been subjected to various dimensions of interpretation. According to the report of the Judicial Commission of Inquiry into the crisis, which was set up by the Plateau State government and received the blessing of the federal government of Nigeria, the crisis has both immediate and remote causes. The Justice Niki Tobi (who was then the presiding Justice of the Court of Appeal, Benin City, Nigeria and later Justice of the Supreme Court of the Federation) commission identify two major events as the immediate causes of the conflagration between September 7th and 12th, 2001 in Jos.

The first immediate cause of the crisis was the attempt and effort by one Miss Rhoda Haruna Nyam to pass through a road at Congo – Russia area of Jos on Friday 7th September 2001. Confrontation ensued when the Muslim congregation that have gathered for their Juma'at prayers in this area refused the lady to pass through the prayer ground.

As a matter of fact, it was agreed by the contending parties and indeed by all the witnesses who testified before the Commission of inquiry that the fracas which sparked off or set in motion the gruesome events of 7th to 12th September, 2001 occurred at the Congo-Russia area of Jos on a road just in front of a small mosque belonging to, Alhaji Tijani Abdullahi. It was a Friday and as was usually the case on all previous Friday afternoons since early 1996, the Muslims who normally held their Juma'at prayers there had gathered to pray when, Miss Rhoda

Haruna Nyam, a Christian, attempted to return to her place of work after the lunch break, as usual, through the portion of the road blocked by the worshipers. She was denied passage. These facts are echoed in virtually all the memoranda submitted to the judicial commission of inquiry which dealt with this aspect of the crisis. The only divergence in the evidence of the witnesses is in the details of exactly when and how the trouble began, whether or not Rhoda was attacked and the very material question of whose property was first destroyed before the fight spread to other parts of the city.

The second immediate cause of the Jos crisis was the appointment of Alhaji Mukhtar Usman Mohammed as the Chairman of the Local Government Monitoring Committee of the National Poverty Eradication for Jos North Local Government. By a letter dated 20th June 2001 and signed by the National Coordinator of the programme (NAPEP), Alhaji Mukhtar Mohammed was directed to convene and preside over the inaugural meeting of the Local Government Monitoring Committee of the NAPEP so as to facilitate the proper and immediate take-off of this laudable federal government established programme in Jos North Local Government council. He was also mandated to "oversee the NAPEP projects imple-mentation, co-ordination, monitoring and evaluation at the Local Government level".

However, Mukhtar's appointment was greeted by a lot of grievances and vehement oppositions. Certain groups in Jos North protested and wrote a lot of petitions to the Chairman of Jos North Local Government and the Governor of Plateau State calling for the immediate removal of Mukhtar as NAPEP Coordiantor. The Judicial Commission of Inquiry into the crisis; reported that:

all of these protests are unanimous not only in their condemnation of the appointment on the basis that Mukhtar is not an indigene of Jos North Local Government Council, but also in their demand that he be removed and replaced with an indigene. While some of them are no more than passionate appeals for a review of the situation, others are more violent in their language and actually contain veiled, if not open threats to the peace of the area should the authorities ignore their demand.

They ("the indigenes") called on the authority to act "appropriately" in order to avoid crisis in the area. In particular, parts of the exhibits submitted to the commission reads:

We however call on the Government to urgently look into this matter for the interest of peace. Our peaceful posture should not be taken for granted.

On the other side of the divide is the Jasawa Develop-ment Association, a predominantly Hausa group, which wrote a letter dated 20th August, 2001 to the Executive Governor of Plateau State, defending Mukhtar's

appointment and urging that it be allowed to stand. The letter was also admitted in evidence as exhibit to the commission. The writers of the letter drew the Governor's attention to certain posters pasted in front of Mukhtar's office by some unidentified persons who were clearly opposed to his appointment. In making their case for the retention of Mukhtar's appointment, the Jasawa condemned any reference to him as a non-indigene of Jos North and gave instances of acts of marginalization of their Community by previous Governments in terms of appointments and the refusal by the then Chairman of Jos North local government council, Dr. Frank Tardy to give their members certificates of indigeneship.

Investigations into the Jos North crisis, which the Judicial Commission of Inquiry also corroborated, reveals that there were also a number of remote causes which precipitated the violent outbreak of hostilities among diverse groups of a hitherto serene and peaceful environment. Amongst these were the issue of who are the "true" owners of Jos; the alleged efforts at Islamization of Jos and Plateau State in general; a long standing animosity, mutual distrust and suspicion between the Fulanis and some Berom communities over the trespass of the Fulanis on their (these communities) farmlands. Other remote causes include: the practice or habits of blocking roads in their immediate vicinity of worship by both Christians and Moslems on Sundays and Fridays respectively; the complaint of imbalance in the delimitation of electoral wards by the Afizare, Anaguta and the Berom, in which they claim that the Hausas are unfairly favoured; and the failure of government to implement the recommendations of the Justice J. Aribiton Fiberesima's Commission of Inquiry into the riots, demonstrations and counter-demonstrations that took place in Jos metropolis on 12th April, 1994; the issue of indigeneship which had caused so much bad blood between the Afizare, Anaguta, Berom – who claim to be the only indigenes, and the Hausa-Fulani group – who are also claiming to be indigenes in addition to the former three groups.

Many scholars and policy makers had attempted to analyse the Jos crisis as to the factors responsible for the dispute, and several interpretations had been offered. There are dimensions alluding to the role or impact of socio-cultural, religious and political factors in the crisis (Sha, 2005; Goshit, 2006; Higazi, 2007). This paper however argues that the constellation of both the remote and immediate causes into the 1994, 2001 and other crises in Jos North reveals that constitutional ambiguity, imprecise and improper definition of citizenship by both the 1979 and especially 1999 Constitution of Nigeria, is a also major contributing factor in the crisis and this also applies to other similar cases elsewhere in the federation of Nigeria. There is no law in Nigeria which deals directly with the issue of indigeneship, either at the Federal or Plateau State levels. All those using indigeneship as a basis for categorisation and identity in the political, social and economic spheres in any state of the federation has

no legal or lawful basis to do so. But most often than not, they claim that what they do or demand for is what is in vogue and practiced in other parts of the country.

So, the role of the state through the constitution comes to the fore here. The report of the highly esteemed panel of inquiry into the Jos crisis was of the understanding that the Nigerian state does not respond to issues of public concern swiftly until such issues become highly volatile and problematic. As rightly observed by the commission:

We think the time has come when, for the good of our society, our laws ought to be respected and enforced. It is our view that had the authorities acted swiftly and decisively when the residents of Congo-Russia cried out persistently against the blockage of roads for religious reasons, one of the major causes of religious antagonism between Christians and Muslims would have been eliminated at a very early stage.

It is no longer in dispute that the 1999 Constitution is essentially flawed and hence the attempt at a review. The process of this review as being presently organized by the federal government is shallow, elitist and restrictive, and does not involve the people of the country (Igbuzor, 2002: 10). The Constitution should therefore be made to provide answers to some of the critical issues dis-concerting the federation of Nigeria, as it is only a people's constitution they would significantly address these problems (Igbuzor, 2002: 10).

Regarding the movement of Nigerians across the length and breath of the federation, the constitution needs amendment in order to confer citizenship rights and privileges on all Nigerians irrespective of state of origin and place or region of residence. The constitution should be made to tell all contending parties in the Jos North crisis that every person either of the Berom, Afizare, Hausa, Anaguta, Fulani, Yoruba, Igbo or Urhobo origin, is a citizen of Nigeria. It then logically follows that anybody so found qualified by the constituted authority can become the coordinator of Jos North Local Government National Poverty Eradication programme and any other public agency for that matter. The constitution should be made to unequivocally and explicitly state that the home of a Nigerian citizen is the place that he/she has found conducive for residence and livelihood. Hence, the Jos North people would understand that they are at liberty to vote and be voted for any person or group of persons of their choice irrespective of whether he/she is from Oyo State or Plateau State; whether he/she is an Hausa, Berom, Igbo or Itshekiri.

Conclusion

Both in conceptual definition and in application, citizenship has become a manor problem in Nigeria. It is at the forefront of the indigene-settler imbroglio that has been responsible for many inter-communal and ethno-religious conflicts in Nigeria. The pluralistic nature of the Nigerian

federalism has meant that people would but move across the length and breadth of the country.

Either due to the pull or the push factors, the consequence of this migration is expected to be of great benefit in terms of national cohesion, integration and the building of an enduring nation-state.

The imprecise and ambiguous conceptualization of citizenship in both the 1979 and 1999 Constitutions of Nigeria, and its application and practice in the Nigerian sense, has continued to hamper the process of national integration. Consequently, there is always a sorry tale by Nigerians who find themselves in areas other than their places of origin within the federal republic. As practically illustrated by the Berom and Hausa-Fulani crisis in Jos North Local Government Area of Plateau State, migration and citizenship crisis in Nigeria has resulted in many monumental conflict with their attendant loss of lives and destruction of properties worth millions of Naira.

Genuine and sincere constitutional amendment becomes imperative in order to adequately define citizenship in terms of the universal application irrespective of where the Nigerian was born or originated from. Regardless of the state of origin, the Nigerian citizenship should be statutorily made tenable to all Nigerians with the entire associated rights and privileges. In the words of Paul Adujie, 2009:

A citizen of Nigeria is a citizen of the locality and state, which such Nigerian has adopted and where such Nigerian has lived in, meaningful and where such Nigeria may choose and such Nigerian has demonstrated and indicated, whether she is Adamu, Bola or Chima! And this, definition should be regardless of whether Adamu's grandparents were originally from Kaduna as Adamu has chosen Lagos as his home state, from where he can be the best Nigerian he can be. This will be regardless of whether Bola's parents or grandparents are originally from Ondo, and now, Bola has adopted Yobe State as her home state, Yobe would suffice for Bola. And Chima should be free to create wealth, health and happiness in Ogbomosho, regardless of the fact that his grandparents and parents were originally from Nnewi or Oguta. A Nigerian's home state should be where he chooses.

It is this explicit definition of citizenship of Nigeria and the readiness and willingness of the state to summon the political will to address whatever constitutional ambiguity through peoples orientated governance, that will form the bedrock of democratic stability and the practice of true federalism in Nigeria.

Evidences at the Justice Niki Tobi led Judicial Commission of Inquiry into the Civil Disturbances in Jos and its Environ in 2001 which submitted its report in 2002, brought to the fore the level of acrimony among the ethnic groups in jos. This paper find the report very illuminating in assessing the level of citizenship crises in Jos and other parts of the Nigerian State.

Conflict of Interests

The author has not declared any conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

Adejumobi S (2001). Citizenship, Rights, Internal Conflicts and Civil Wars in Africa. Afr. J. Polit. Sci. 6.2:77-96.

Adesoji AO, and Alao A (2009). Indigeneship and Citizenship in Nigeria: Myth and Reality. J Pan Afr. Stud. 2:9.

Adujie PI (2009). Nigerian Citizenship should be Redefined Now. at:http://www.nigeravllagessqare.com...redefind.html. Retrieved no 15/10/2009.

Baubock R (2002). How Migration Transform Citizenship: International, Multinational and Transnational Perspectives. IWE – Working Papers Series, No. 24, February.

CFCR (2002). Memoranda Submitted to Presidential Committee on Provisions for and Practice of Citizenship and Rights in Nigeria. Lagos: Citizen's Forum for Constitutional Reform.

Dunmoye RA (2003). General Survey of Conflicts in the middle Belt zone: Benue, Kaduna, Kogi, Kwara, Nasarawa, Plateau and the federal capital territory. Africa Peace Review-Journal of Centre for Peace Research and Conflict Resolution, Special Edition.

Goshit ZD (2006). Economy, Politics and Ethno-Religious Relations in Jos Plateau Area during the Colonial Period, 1900-1960, In: O. Akinwunmi, O. Okpeh and J.D. Gwamma (eds.), Inter-Group Relations in Nigeria During the 19th and 20th Centuries, Markurdi: Aboki Publishers.

Higazi A (2007). The Politics of Urban Violence in Jos, Nigeria, from Colonial Rule to the 2007 Elections", Politique Africaine, Issue 106, June .

Igbuzor O (2002). Introduction. in Contentious Issues in the Review of the 1999 Constitution. Lagos: Citizens Forum for Constitutional Reform (CFCR).

Longva A (1995). Citizenship, Identity and the Question of Supreme Loyalty: The case of Kuwait. Forum for Development Studies 2: Report of the Judicial Commission of Inquiry into the Crisis in Jos North and its Environs. 2002.

Riesenberg P (1992). Citizenship in the Western Tradition: Plato to Rousseau. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press.

Scott FD (1972). The Peopling of America: Perspectives in Immigrating. American Historical Association pamphlet No. 241.

Sha DP (2005). The Politicisation of Settler- Native Identities and Ethno-Religious Conflicts in Jos, Central Nigeria. Ibadan: Stirling-Horden Publishers Ltd.

Tilly C (1996). Citizenship, Identity and Social History. International Review of Social History Supplement 3:1-9.

Yakubu JA (2003).Managing Ethnic Pluralism Through the Constitution in Nigeria. Ibadan: Programme on Ethnic and Federal Studies(PEFS) Monograph New Series No 7.

Review

Bureaucratic politics and policy development: Issues and challenges

AGBOOLA, Theophilus Olumuyiwa

Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Administration, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria.

The paper examined the institutional interface of politics and administration in the public service in Nigeria; it also assessed the effects of the interface on service efficiency in Nigeria with a view to identifying the benefits or otherwise the interface of politics and administration, and assessed the role of bureaucracy and national development in Nigeria. Secondary data were collected mainly from relevant textbooks, official documents of various ministries, reports and proceedings papers. The findings revealed that the public bureaucracy in Nigeria is expected to play a leading role in the socio-economic transformation through innovation and social engineering. The need to take appropriate action is for designing, building and sustaining an effective and efficient administrative machinery in national development. The paper concluded that public bureaucracy is a catalogue of failed policies and development projects. The inability of government bureaucracy to deliver the much needed services to the citizens and the resultant decline in the standard of living of the people may be held by the same as a conclusive evidence of a failed Nigerian state.

Key words: Bureaucracy, politics, policy and development.

INTRODUCTION

The civil service is not a creation of modern times. It dates back to the ancient civilizations of Greece, the Chinese empire (462 BC) and the Han dynasty (202 BC), as well as to philosophers like Plato, Aristotle and Thomas Hobbes (Omoleke, 2013).One of the important discourses in public administration is the politics-administration dichotomy. Yet, across the world, the debate remains that of the most unsettled issues of political authorities and administrative institutions to a great extent in democracies. In other words, the

dichotomy between politics and administration has been one of the most central topics in public administration, especially since the writings of Woodrow Wilson in 1887. The question in the minds of most scholars of public administration is how the dichotomy fits into the governance process of any country (Afegbua, 2013).

Adamolekun (2004) opined that the debate on the relationship between politicians and administrators who operate the governmental machinery in Nigeria has lasted for decades and the controversy appears to have

increased in intensity as the country changed from one type of regime to another, that is, from parliamentary government to military rule, to presidential government.

The viewpoint was articulated by Abdulsalam (2006) that public administration is an important conditioning factor of the success or otherwise of any developmental policy or strategy of a government An examination of the relationship between development administration and administrative development is thus an attempt to explore the concepts of public administration and management in the context of national development, leadership role and leadership culture in Nigeria.

Bureaucrats play vital roles in the formulation, implementation, evaluation and review of government policies and programmes, but the frequent incursion of politics into the domain of the public service in Nigeria has undermined these roles to an unimaginable extent. Politicians usually embark on retrenchment of public servants for political expediency, and ostensible reorganizational and economic reforms which to an average public servant is frivolous, indefensible and atrocious.

During Obasanjo's administration, there were series of reforms such as privatisation, downsizing, monetisation, which had serious consequences on the livelihood of some affected civil servants (Oladoyin, 2011). The politics and administration interface does not always produce negative outcomes and consequences. If the interactions between politicians and administrators are better managed, they would likely lead to efficient and effective policy development in government in Nigeria (Afegbua, 2013).

The objective of this paper is to examine the politics and administration interface in the Nigerian public service. It also examines the beneficial effects, or otherwise, of the interface on service efficiency in Nigeria. The paper is divided into six sections. Section one reviews relevant literature. Section two examines the policy-administration dichotomy. Section three examines bureaucrats and the policy-making process under military rule. Section four analyses the policy makers: politician or civil servants. Section five examines the role of the bureaucracy in national development. The final section is for the concluding remarks.

Conceptual clarifications

In ordinary usage, bureaucracy' refers to a complex, specialized organization (especially a governmental organization) composed of non-elected, highly trained professional administrators and clerks hired on a full-time basis to perform administrative services and tasks.

Bureaucratic organizations are broken up into specialized departments or ministries, each of which is assigned the responsibility for pursuing a limited number of the government's many official goals and policies which fall within a single, relatively narrow functional domain. The departments or ministries are sub-divided into divisions that are assigned even more specialized responsibilities for accomplishing various portions or aspects of the department's overall tasks; these divisions are in turn composed of multiple agencies or bureaus with even more minutely specialized functions (and their own subdivisions). Bureaucratic organizations always rely heavily on the principle of hierarchy and rank, which requires a clear, unambiguous chain of command through which "higher" officials supervise the "lower" officials, who of course supervise their own subordinate administrators within the various divisions and sub-subdivisions of the organization (Johnson, 2005).

Politics is essentially characterized by struggle for power and influence, disagreement, bargaining or negotiation, reconciliation, resolution and consensus, among others, which albeit in varying degrees. Politics is based on disagreement, that is, where there is controversy, where there are issues, there is politics. Differences between individuals and groups provide reasons for disagreement; such diversities relate to different perceptions of human nature and of his role, and to differences in interests (Omolayo and Arowolaju, 1987).

Decision-making is another important ingredient of politics. At every instance of conflict, decision must be taken in order to arrive at reconciliation, if not a consensus, of interests. Obviously, in such specific instances, political goals may conflict with values in practice. David Easton was articulating this assertion when he suggested that politics is the authoritative allocation of values within a society, backed by the ultimate use of a monopoly of physical force (Easton, 1957).

Policy refers to those plans, positions and guidelines of government which influence decisions by government (e.g., policies in support of sustainable economic development or policies to enhance access to government services by persons with disabilities). There are various types and forms of policy. Types of policy include: broad policy which enunciates government-wide direction; more specific policy, which may be developed for a particular sector (the economy) or issue-area (welfare); operational policy, which may guide decisions on programmnes and project selection. With respect to the forms that government policy takes, it is reflected most typically in legislation, regulations, and programmes. These are often referred to as policy instruments (Adeola, 2003).

Policy development is the activity of formulating policy generally, which involves research, analysis, consultation and synthesis of information to produce recommen-dations. It also involves an evaluation of options against a set of criteria used to assess each option (Akhakpe, 2005). Leadership and management positions include any of the following who may have policy responsibilities: Ministers, deputy ministers, directors, executive directors,

coordinators or team leaders. Consultation refers to seeking input (advice, reactions, clarifications etc) during the policy development process from individuals within and outside government. Bureaucrats are the bedrock upon which the government is seated and balanced. It is the hub for the implementation of the programmes, policies, plans and action of government. More importantly, the bureaucrats are the vehicle for service delivery and good governance. The quality of the bureaucrats largely determines the pace of development of any nation (Adelegan, 2009).

There are numerous definitions of public policy. The following are some examples:
"Whatever governments choose to do or not to do" (Dye, 1988); "A proposed course of action of a person, group or government within a given environment providing obstacles and opportunities which the policy was proposed to utilize and overcome in an effort to reach a goal or realize an objective or purpose" (Frederich, 1963).

Bureaucracy refers to administration which takes place in a large, complex organisation. Such organisations are typically characterised by great attention to the precise and stable delineation of authority or jurisdiction among the various subdivisions and among the officials who comprise them, with the requirement that employees operate strictly according to fixed procedures and detailed rules designed to routinize nearly all decision makings. Some of the most important of these rules and procedures may be specified in laws or decrees enacted by the higher "political" authorities that are empowered to set the official goals and general policies for the organization, but upper-level (and even medium-level) bureaucrats typically are delegated considerable discretionary powers for elaborating their own detailed rules and procedures. Because the incentive structures of bureaucratic organizations largely involve rewarding strict adherence to formal rules and punishing unauthorized departures from standard operating procedures (rather than focusing on measurable individual contributions toward actually attaining the organization's politically assigned goals), such organizations tend to rely very heavily upon extensive written records and standardized forms, which serve primarily to document the fact that all decisions about individual "cases" are taken in accordance with approved guidelines and procedures rather than merely reflecting the personal preferences or subjective judgment of the individual bureaucrats involved (Johnson, 2005).

FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITY OF THE BUREAUCRACY

According to Adebayo (2004), it is a true fact to state that, with the emergence of modern states and the develop-ment of the presidential and parliamentary systems, the civil service evolved as the bed-rock of the executive arm

of government. Its main task is simply the implementation and execution of the policies decided by the legislature or those appointed to carry out the executive work of government. In accomplishing this task, the civil service has found itself involved in the formulation of policy and advising generally on policy matters. The civil service is also responsible for the management of the machinery of government and carrying out the day-to-day duties that public administration demands. It should be noted, however, that the ultimate decision and policy rests with the political head of the department or ministry, be he christened minister or commissioner.

The task of civil/public servant or administrator is to assist in the formulation and execution of policy as directed by the minister or commissioner. It is, therefore, his duty to supply his political boss with all the information necessary to arrive at a right decision. The civil servant must place before his minister the arguments on all sides of the case fully, rationally and fairly. Whatever his own sympathies, may be, he must set aside all his personal prejudices, sentiments, affinities and affections and faithfully present all the facts and information at the disposal of the department to enable the political head to take his own decision (Omoleke, 2013).

Olagunju (2001) said once the decision has been taken, a civil servant must loyally carry out the policy chosen, even though he has his own reasons to prefer a different course. He also has the duty to put his past experience at the service of the ministry and to offer constructive suggestions as developed out of his experience. Civil servants must therefore be constantly engaged in gathering facts and preparing findings that may enhance changes in policy or lead to policy decisions. In this way, civil servants or administrators help to define policy before the legislative stage is reached; they assist in drafting the law which provides the legal framework to carry out the desired programme.

Furthermore, the civil service executes policies and the substance of programmers, irrespective of the regime in power, be it a military or civil administration, a parliamentary or presidential system. This arises out of the fact that the concern of the civil service is the good of nation as a whole, irrespective of the political party in power. Its task is to lay the national point of view before each minister that comes. In this way the civil service ordinarily must strictly observe political neutrality, while ensuring the continuity of policy based on overall national interest (Olagunju, 2001).

Political neutrality

According to Olaleye (2001), the political neutrality of the civil service implies that the civil servant must put his politics in his pocket. This tradition is particularly British and Nigeria has patterned its civil service system and practice on this model. In France, political and

administrative roles are more mixed and blurred than in Britain. This is marginal politicisation of the civil service by the political system. For instance, French top civil servants often play political roles as mayors or councillors. Moreover, these are entitled to stand for election to Parliament and, if elected, they keep their civil services rights in cold storage and later return to their post in the civil service.

This is only true in theory; in actual practice, few civil servants who turn politicians ever return to the civil service. In most cases, they embark on full-time political careers. In the United States of America, the trend has been a steady movement away from patronage towards merits system, that is, a civil service based mainly on recruitment by merit for career officials. Even then, it is estimated that there are over 1,200 political appointments at the top of the American civil service and governmental agencies. Such appointments are excluded from the normal civil service recruitment and promotion procedure. They are, therefore, not strictly bound by the civil service convention of political neutrality. Their tenure of office is invariably limited to the period that government that appoints them stays in power. We will now turn to the dichotomy between administration and politics.

POLICY-ADMINISTRATION DICHOTOMY

Early in the emergence of public administration as an autonomous discipline, one of the central doctrines was that policy and administration were separate. The distinction was borne out of a concern to divest administration of politics. The founding fathers of public administration regarded governmental process as consisting essentially of two parts, viz: policy/decision making and policy execution. In their view, policy making is the prerogative of the politician, while execution is the business of administration, and if politics is distinct from administration, they should not be allowed to interfere with each other. Today, this position has almost been entirely abandoned. It is now generally accepted that both administration and policy are inter-related, inter-dependent and indispensable to each other as two sides of the same process. The view that policy and administration are separate is, therefore, seen as an inaccurate description of the governmental process. An inevitable attribute of modern governments is that administrators have a lot to say and do inpolicy making, a function which is widely diffused and deeply permeated by politics (Omolayo and Arowolaju, 1987).

Administrators are deeply involved in the making of legislative and executive policies in a number of ways. In the first place, they are responsible for the preparation and presentation of policy alternatives to the policy makers. More often than not, the policy maker is presented with the real choice, the administrator having narrowed down the alternatives to an obvious, irresistible and most plausible option through powerfully reasoned arguments Second, policy makers (ministers, commissioners etc.) rely on the advice of administrators Several factors have made this a compelling obligation on the part of the policy makers. They lack the expert knowledge of the administrators and they have no time to devote to analyzing the merits and demerits of most policy alternatives proposed to them. They are often saddled with party activity, official engagements and other matters which can deny them enough time and energy to spend on policy questions. Reinforcing the preponderant influence of the administrators on policy decision-making is their vantage position in which they monopolize official advice and information and can hide facts if they wish and enjoy stability of tenure unavailable to the policy makers. Finally in the process of applying and adapting vague executive orders and legislative acts to administrative situations, administrators tend to develop their own body of rules known as administrative legislation.

The picture of the policy maker-administrator relationship painted above is not to indicate that the administrator is superior to the policy maker, but only to show how both aspects of the governmental process permeate each other. The policy-maker has as much arsenal of influence in the process as the administrator has. A policy maker, who has access to outside information and superior advice or who is of a strong personality, may, for instance, reject the administrator's proposals. And all said and done, the policy maker has political strength which has an ultimately accountable to the people and must be relied upon to see departmental matters through legislation (Omolayo and Arowolaju, 1987).

Dichotomy of administration and politics

According to Wilson (1971), the earliest writers on public administration in modern times, notably American writers, drew a sharp dividing line between administration and politics. Woodrow Wilson stressed that administration lies outside the proper sphere of politics. He argued that, although politics sets the tasks for administration, it should not be suffered to manipulate its offices. John Pfeiffer took the same line and urged that politics must be controlled and confined to its proper sphere, which is the determination of stabilization and declaration of the will of the community; whereas administration is time into effect of this will of the community, once it has been made clear by political processes. He went on to conclude that politics should stick to its policy-determining sphere and leave administration to apply its own technical processes free from the blight of political meddling.

Another contemporary of Woodrow Wilson who was greatly concerned about the "meddling" of politics in administration was Frank Goodnow. He made a clear distinction between politics and administration by defining the former as "the expression of the will of the state" and

the latter as the execution of the will (Self, 1972). Willoughby went to the extreme of not merely separating administration from politics but setting it up as the fourth arm of government along with the legislature, executive, and the judiciary. Albert Stickney argued that "public servants must have duties of only one class", that the men in the executive administration should have nothing to do with general legislation, that is, the deliberating and deciding as to the policy of all departments of government should not meddle in the details of administration.

The advocates of separation, Wilson and his school postulated their theory against the background of the political circumstances of their age. For instance, American politics was dominated by spoils politics and the patronage system until about the second decade of this century. The operation of spoils politics was incompatible with the achievement of efficiency in public administration; it was in fact an obstacle (Omoleke, 2013).

Bureaucracy and politics in the public policy-making process

According to Adarnolekun (2004), the plea of a dichotomy between politics and administration is without question one of the key paradigms in the study of public administration. In its classic formulation, the paradigm is characterized by two contradictory propositions. The first proposition, which is commonly traced to Woodrow Wilson's seminal article of 1887, stated that politics and administration are two distinct spheres and that each has its own group of functionaries. The Wilsonian dichotomy was strongly supported by another American scholar, FJ. Goodnow, shortly after the initial statement:

There are then, in all governmental systems, two primary or functions of government, viz the expression of the will of the state and the execution of that will. There are also in all stales separate organs each of which is mainly busy to discharge of these functions. These functions are respectively politics and administration

The second proposition states that a rigid distinction cannot be maintained between public administration and policy making or politics. As Appleby has put it, "public administration is policy making while public administration is one of a number of basic political processes by which people achieve and control governance (Adamolekun, 2004). According to Obiyan (2006), there has been an age-long debate as to what constitutes or should constitute the role of the bureaucracy. On the one hand are those who continue the responsibility of the bureaucracy to that of merely executing settled policies by the politicians. On the other side of the divide are those who hold that administration and politics cannot be put into watertight compartments. Consequently, they contended that the role of the bureaucracy cannot be restricted to policy implementation, as the bureaucracy is

part and parcel of policy making (Obiyan, ibid:7)

Adamolekun (2004) stated that the first doctrine posits that there are two distinct groups of people operating the executive branch of government in a democratic polity. One category consists of largely elected temporary political officials who serve for as long as they succeed in obtaining a particular mandate at elections conducted at intervals. The second category is made up of officials who are appointed into a permanent (career) service which is expected to serve successive sets of political officials. This doctrine is sometimes summoned in the dictum governments come and go but the administration remains.

The second doctrine is the conception of administration as an instrument in the hands of political officials who are supposed to be the dominant group in the executive branch of government. The instrumental conception of administration is derived from a theory of democracy according to which sovereignty resides in the people. This theory is translated into practice through an arrangement in which the sovereignty of the people is exercised on their behalf by their representative in parliament, with or without a political chief executive who is a direct emanation of the popular mandate. In this arrangement, career administrators (who are also called civil servants) are expected to serve as instruments for carrying out the mandate obtained from the sovereign people by successive teams of political officials (Adamolekun, 2004).

INSEPARABILITY OF ADMINISTRATION AND POLITICS

According to Adamolekun (2004), by the closing years of the third decades of the 20th century, the issue of the dichotomy between politics and administration had been finally laid to rest. Thus, in 1937, Marshal Dimock, after examining a fresh concept of government in relation to politics and administration, observed that the two processes of administration and politics are coordinate rather than exclusive and by 1940, Carl Friedrich finally concluded that the idea of a dichotomy between politics and administration is a "misleading distinction" which had become a fetish, a stereotype in the minds of theorists and practitioners alike.

However, it is one thing for practitioners and academics alike to recognize that politics and administration are co-ordinate rather than exclusive; it is another for the functionaries in government and governmental agencies to be able to relate this recognition to the actual day-today operation of administration and policy. Up to the present time, there is evidence in various public organi-sations of constant bickering and friction between officials on the one hand and elected members or politicians on the other. The whole issue hinges on what should be the legitimate sphere of action between the two sides.

For example, in 1967 the Naude Committee on the Management of Local Government in British noted in its

reports that it believed that the lack of a clear recognition of what can and should be done by officers, and of what should be reserved as decisions for members lies at the root of the difficulties in the internal organisation of local authorities. In Nigeria one of the main problems confronting the Local Government Reform, which was launched in 1976, is the constant friction between the chairman of the local government council and the secretary as to what is the legitimate province of each function.

Often, conflict ensues between state commissioners and their permanent secretaries on the question of what matters a commissioner may properly seek information on or be briefed about. State commissioners sometimes want to know about the basis and rationale of the posting of career officers. In this situation and similar instances, some state commissioners, acting in their capacity as the political bosses of their ministry have sought to obtain information from permanent secretaries and have attempted to influence decisions. The officials, on their own part, have resolutely refused to brief or take direction from their political bosses on matters considered to be outside the jurisdiction of the commissioners. Consequently friction is generated (Omoleke, 2013).

Bureaucrats and the policy making process under military rule

Traditionally, political office holders or the executives (ministers) are meant to formulate policies which will be implemented by the public administrators. The military, however, discontinued with this practice because they had very little time to formulate policies and therefore relied on public administrators to propose policies and submit to them for approval. And because military rule was arbitrary, whatever was acceptable to the leader became the operating policies. This was the case during Gen. Gowon's administration, which was better known for the emergence of super permanent secretaries who were not just policy implementers but also policy formulators. Military rule introduced another dimension into public administration, namely, the abandonment of the rational decision process and adopted decision making at the whims and caprices of the military leader (Babawale, 2003).

THE POLICY MAKERS: POLITICIANS OR CIVIL SERVANTS

Obiyan (2006) posits that policy making as a function is primarily that of the politicians while the public bureaucracy/administration/civil service is to implement policies. Though he recognizes that the civil service plays a role in policy making, he asserts that the final decision on policy-making does not rest with the bureaucrat. Thus, it can be argued that the extent to which career officers

participate in policy-making is dependent on the latitude granted by the politicians.

To Adamolekun (2004), the dominance of the policy advice function by higher civil servants aroused little or no attention, except for condemnations from time to time by both government leaders and public opinion leaders during democratic dispensations. As correctly observed in the British setting, the so-called joint endeavour between a minister and a permanent secretary in formulating policies for a ministry is most often likely to result in dominance by the permanent secretary because the balance of ability is heavily tilted in his favour in terms of "the knowledge, experience and expertise available within the ministry". This is particularly true in Nigeria for most of the post-independence era, as several political heads of ministries have been men and women of limited ability. The ministers who served at the state and federal levels from 1979 to 2013 were selected largely for partisan or subjective reasons, and only a few of them had the ability and other leadership qualities to enable them to take effective charge of their ministries (Adamolekun, 2004). Thus, the higher civil servants have continued to wield considerable influence in the making of policy decisions, for example, the Revenue Allocation Act of 1981. Career higher civil servants joined with presidential special advisers in preparing a draft bill which the council of ministers under time chairmanship of the president considered and adopted (Adamolekun, 2004).

Spheres of policy and administration

According to Self (1972), administrators at all levels of responsibility are being constantly thrown into the area of decision making, and their decisions add up to major policies in the subsequent course of events.

As Hopkins rightly observed,

Day-to-day decisions are made -which, add up to a determination of policy. Instead of policy being made first, decisions are made first instead of policy governing decisions, decision govern policy; instead of people at the top making policy while people at the lower levels make decisions, top executives make both polices and decisions on some matters while subordinates make both policies and decisions on the other hand.

This implies that the administrator cannot avoid some policy-making responsibility in the application of the administrative process. The administrator has to weigh and consider conflicting demands and reconcile them. In the process, he makes consultations and tries to balance and synthesize the conflicting demands.

Appleby observed that:

The administrative hierarchy is an organ receiving message of popular demands, many of them contra dictory. It is an organ responding to such demands, reconciling them and in the course of response injecting

Table 1. Policy issues and administrative matters.

	Policy issues		Administrative matters
1.	Key decisions on the objectives of the department of agency and on the plans to attain them	1.	Provision and control of the necessary staff required for the work of the department or the agency.
2.	The task of reviewing periodically the progress performance and direction of the programme and goals of the department or the agency	2.	Tendering advice and placing all available information, knowledge, and experience at the disposal of the policy makers to enable them set the goals and objectives and the means of attaining them.
3.	Ultimate direction and control of the programmes and goals of the department or agency	3.	Day-to-day administration of set-vices.
4.	Issues involving significant political or social reaction.	4.	Taking decisions and action on settled policy.
5.	The determination of a general decision or policy and bringing such cases to the attention of the policy makers.	5.	Identifying peculiar problems arising out of settled decision or policy and bringing such cases to the attention of the policy makers.
		6.	Day-to-day routine inspection and control of the programmes and services of the department or the agency.

Source: Omoleke, 2013.

consideration of prudence, perspective, and principle including regard for other popular demands and aspiration than those expressed in the chorus of the moment. All this is a political process, much of it completed within the area of administration.

It is pertinent to discuss how an administrator should define and carry out the corollary to this. Of course, relation ought to subsist between the political chief and the administrator in their joint role of policy-making in the department, ministry or agency. In all democracies, the accepted practice is that the responsibility of policy rests with the political chief executive in the ministry or department. He sets the broad lines of policy to be pursued or, as Peter Self puts it, his role is that of climate-setting in deciding the way certain issues are to be approached. The administrator, on the other hand, is the instrument through which the policy is carried out. This is why Herbert Morrison stressed that the administrator should be instrument and not the master of policy and Charles Christies concluded that administration is the handmaiden of policy.

The foregoing shows that it is the role of the politicians to control the administrative system. This control can be exercised in several ways such as ensuring that administrators carry out policies faithfully through settled and laid-down policies and making sure that the politician is in a position of control to overrule the decisions of administrators whenever necessary. Furthermore, the politician gives continual political guidelines for the administrators and department. The question may then be asked: How does the politician know the matters on which to give political guidelines and control the administrator? The following table may assist, but it must

be emphasized that a sharp dichotomy between the two is impracticable and unrealistic. As already explained above, the reason for the division of roles between the policy-makers and the administrators is to ensure that one does not encroach upon the jurisdiction of the other in a meddlesome manner. So, it should be emphasized that in a considerable number of instances, questions of policy will be closely intermingled with administrative action (Omoleke, 2013).

The politics-administration relationship is not watertight as both can be likened to Siamese twins. For instance, a function which hitherto was considered to be within the administrative jurisdiction can snowball into the political realm. Take for instance, the booking of government resting houses falls within administrative assignments which a housekeeper under the directive of assistant director of protocol can easily handle. But for security reasons clearance will have to be obtained from the deputy governor or governor if circumstances call for it; hence, an administrative assignment has been hijacked by a political functionary (Table 1).

THE RELATIONSHIP OF MINISTER/COMMISSIONER WITH THE CIVIL SERVANTS

One interesting fact which must have been elicited in this paper is that, most of the time, the role and behaviour of civil servants have been defined in terms of their relationship with the minister. It is a trite fact that, in the day-to-day workings of a department, the two functionaries have such an interdependent relationship that it is difficult to see one or the other all on its own. Indeed, the nature and scope of public administration in term of the management of human and material resources

for the achieving a set goals and objectives of a state depending on the working relationship between the two (Omoleke, 2013).

The role of bureaucracy in national development

According to Abdulsalam (2006), it has long been recognized that we live in an "executive centred era", in which the effectiveness of government depends substantially upon executive leadership in policy formulation and execution. The conventional wisdom as articulated in classical writings in the field of public administration tells us that the civil service, as the nucleus of government executive organs, plays or is expected to play the following roles:

Recommending policy: Public policy issues in governmental settings in the modern era involve matters of technical complexity, requiring specialized knowledge and attention. The civil servant, because of his or her training and experience, possesses this knowledge and insight. Thus, at this stage of policy initiation and preparation with the .executive branch, and during consideration by the legislature, the two organs of government find the civil servant indispensable, as the provider of policy alternatives and source of guidance and advice. It should be noted also that the civil service helps to aggregate and articulate public interest, as a basis for making policy choices, by helping to weigh and balance competing interests in society and by adopting the public interests rationale to back one policy option against another.

Implementing policy and programmes: Policy and programme execution is the traditionally recognised responsibility of bureaucracy. In doing that, bureaucracy is expected to exercise considerable discretionary powers, thus wielding a remarkable influence on the pattern and quality of policy outcomes.

Carrying out the routine tasks of government: On a day-to-day basis, the civil service is pre-occupied with the regulatory and other routine duties of government and impinges on the state of law and order and stability of the state.

Custody official records: The generation of policy issues (or ideas) is often made from records/information already in government custody. Contained in official files are records and other information which form the basis of potential policy choices. The quality of any policy proposals is as high as that of the information gathered and maintained by the civil service. Thus, the civil service will probably become better known for its role as the information/intelligence or information management agent of government (Abdulsalam, 2006).

In general, public bureaucracy in Nigeria is expected to play a leading role in the socio-economic transformation through innovation and social engineering. This under-scores the need to take appropriate action to design, build and sustain effective and efficient administrative machinery (public bureaucracy capable and ready to play its expected role in national development (Abdulsalain, 2006).

Conclusion

In the past fifty years, the performance records of the public bureaucracy is a catalogue of failed policies and failed development projects. The inability of government bureaucracy to deliver the much-needed services to the citizens and the resultant decline the standard of living of the people may be held as a conclusive evidence of a failed Nigerian state. The peculiarities of the Nigerian socio-cultural and political set-up have influenced both the content and operation of the new constitution. Uncritical adoption of constitutional practices and conventions developed elsewhere should, therefore, be discouraged. Also bearing in mind that we are operating a new system of government, the operators of the system should meet periodically at workshops. It is expected that this practice will facilitate the emergence of traditions and conventions that will govern the relationship between the political class and the career officers.

Conflict of Interests

The author has not declared any conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

Abdulsalam I (2006). The Role of Public Administration in National Development Strategy: Challenges and Prospects. Management in Nigeria 43(1):28-34.
Adamolekun L (2004). Politics and Administration in Nigeria, Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
Adebayo A (2004), Principles and Practices of Public Administration in Nigeria, Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
Adelegan F (2009). Governance: An Insides Reflections on the Nigerian Politics. Ibadan: Terrific Publishers Limited.
Adeola JO (2003). Public Policy Analysis and Decision Making, Lagos: Printgenics.
Afegbua IS (2013). Effects of Politics-Administration Interface on Publics Service Efficiency in South Western Nigeria (1999-2012), Ph.D Thesis presented to the Department of Public Administration, O.A.U. April, 17.
Akhakpe I (2005). Public Policy and Policy Analysis A Developmental Approach Lagos: Word Wave Media.
Babawale T (2003). Ecology of Nigerian Public Administration, M.Sc, Seminar Presentation, Department of Political Science, University of

Lagos, Akoka.

Dye T (1988). Understanding Public Policy, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Easton D (1957). "An Approach to the Analysis of Political Systems", World Politics.Vol. 9.

Frederich CJ (1963). Man and His Government, New York: Wiley Press.

Johnson PM (2005). A Glossary of Political Economy Terms. Auburn: Auburn University Press.

Obiyan SA (2006). Public Policy-Maldng at the State Level in Nigeria, In: O. Aborisade & I.O. Aransi, State and Local Government in Nigeria: The Challenging Scene, Charlotte, USA: Catawaba Publishing Company.

Oladoyin AM (2006). The Military hicursion into Nigerian Public Administration, In: O. Aborisade & I.O. Aransi, Slate and Local Government in Nigeria: The Changing Scene, Charlotte, NC, USA: Catawba Publishing Company.

Olagunju JL (2001). The Role of Civil Servants in National Building in Contemporary: Issues in Public Administration (ed,) Femi Omotoso, Lagos: Bolabay Publication.

Olaleye A (2001). Fundamentals of Public Administration Ado-Ekiti: Yemi Prints and Publishing Services.

Omolayo S, Arowolaju B (1987). Elements of Government, Lagos: Friends Foundation Publishers Limited.

Omoleke LI (2013). Creating and Sustaining a Functional Relationship between Political Leaders and Accounting Officers in Nigerian Civil Service, Being a paper Delivered in a Workshop at AUNIFES, OAU Ile-Ife.

Self P (1972). Administrative Theories and Politics, London, George Allien and Unwin.

Wilson H (1971). The Governance of Britain, London: Sphere Books.

Wilson W (1887). "The Study of Public Administration". Polit. Sci. Q. (2):481-507.

African Journal of **Political Science and International Relations**

Related Journals Published by Academic Journals

- Journal of Geography and Regional Planning
- Journal of Economics and International Finance
- Journal of Hospitality Management and Tourism
- International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology
- Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research
- African Journal of Marketing Management