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**ABSTRACT**

The study examined internal party democracy and political stability in Nigeria, a case study of PDP Imo state between 2007 and 2016. Documentary method of data collection was adopted. Qualitative description method based on content analysis was used as a method of data analysis. This work is predicted on the theoretical framework of elite power theory propounded by Vilfredo Pareto. The study found out that the activities of godfatherism in Imo state PDP has led to violence and electoral irregularities. It also found out that the lack of clear cut politics and candidate selection resulted to the decamping of PDP members to APC in Imo state. Finally the study recommended that political parties should embrace and encourage the practice of internal democracy as by so doing would reduce the activities of the party elites (godfathers) within the party and also ensure democratic consolidation.

**Keywords:** Democracy, intra-party, Conflict,Godfatherism, Imo state, Peoples Democratic Party.

**CHAPTER ONE**

**INTRODUCTION**

**1.1 Background to the Study**

There is no universal definition of the concept of intraparty democracy (internal party democracy), although many scholars agreed on some basic principles of electivity, accountability, transparency, inclusivity, participation, and representation.( Jeroen 2011) “Internal party democracy means that the party’s should be formed “bottom-up” and that the internal distribution of power should be marked by dispersion at different levels, bodies and individuals rather than by the concentration in one organ”.Cular(2004) Unlike most definitions of democracy at the level of political system, the definition of internal party democracy does not mean a state that can be distinguished from other forms of internal party order. It is rather about the scale by which we can measure the extent to which a party is democratically organized and eventually compare among other parties.

According to Salih (2006) internal party democracy “Implies support for the general interest of the party membership, the public and the state. It means that party structure and organisation are participatory and inclusive, essentially vehicles for the exercise of nascent democratic leadership and values”. There are two identified essential instrumental elements of intra-party democracy. The first group involves the organisation of free, fair and regular elections of internal positions as well as candidates for the representative bodies. While the second group involves equal and open participation of entire members and members’ group in such a way that interest are more or less equally represented. It is imperative to analyze actual practice by political parties in order to determine whether they adhere to the practice of internal democracy. Three levels of observations are determinable for the purposes of this analysis. These are legal requirements, party regulations, and actual practice. In Nigeria, these analyses will be carried out with reference to the Electoral Act 2010, (as amended), the Constitutions of the political parties and the actual conducts of the political parties during their various parties primaries conducted prior to the April 2011 general elections.

Political parties are one of the institutions that are carriers of democratic principles in any organised society. Thus, there are a number of ‘institutional guarantees’ that parties have to fulfil if they were to effectively meet what is expected of them in a democracy. One of such institutional requirements is internal (intra-party) democracy. As Magolowondo (n.d) points out, this very important institutional dimension is lacking in many political parties, particularly in emerging democracies. But the question is, what is Internal Democracy? Drawing on Scarrow (2004) study on ‘Political Parties and Democracy in theoretical and practical perspectives; Implementing intra-party democracy’, internal democracy is a very broad term describing a wide range of methods for including party members in intra-party deliberation and decisionmaking. It is democracy within the party and the extent to which a party subscribes to and abides by the basic and universal democratic tenets.

As Tyoden (1994) argues, hardly is a political system adjudged democratic without the central placement of political parties in its political process. This is because political parties are the major vehicles for the expression of an essential feature of the democratic process. In this case, however, inter and intra party relationships are vital because they determine the health and resilience of the party system and by extension the fate of democracy and the nature of the political system itself. In similar vein, Mersel (2006) asserts that various democracies in recent times have faced the problem of nondemocratic political parties, a situation where most parties only focus on external activities, neglecting internal planning and organisation. He argues that in determining whether a political party is nondemocratic, attention should be given to party’s goals and practices. This is so because some parties often ignore essential elements such as their internal structures.

Internal party democracy aims at developing more democratic, transparent and effective political parties. It identifies specific challenges in the internal management and functioning of parties and party systems. These include; candidate selection, leadership selection, policy making, membership relations, gender discrimination and party funding. From this outcome-oriented perspective, parties’ organizational structures should be judged above all in terms of how well they help the parties choose policies and personnel that reflect the preferences of their broader electorates. Another important effect of intra-party democracy in line with the assertion of Gosnell (1968) is that it provides necessary vertical linkages between different deliberating spheres and horizontal linkage between competing issues. The elements which are instrumental to intra-party democracy cannot be over-emphasized in having effective and working internal democracy. First and foremost, it involves in organizing free, fair and periodic elections of internal positions, as well as candidates for representative bodies. The second entails equal and open participation of all members and member groups in such a way that interests are equally represented.

The interplay between parties and democracies should reflect the parties’ adherence not only to democratic goals and actions but also to internal democratic structures (Mersel, 2006). Internal democracy aims at developing more democratic, transparent and effective political parties. It identifies specific challenges in the internal management and functioning of parties and party systems. These include: candidate selection, leadership selection, policy making, membership relations, gender, minorities, youth and party funding. It is in light of the above that the present attempts to investigate the internal party democracy and political stability in Nigeria, a case studyPDP Imo state between 2007 and 2016.

**1.2 Statement of the Problem**

Maintenance of internal democracy, through the process of selecting candidates among political parties in Nigeria, particularly in the People‟s Democratic Party has remained a vexed issue (Akubo & Umoru, 2014). Consequently, After decades long colonial rule and military rule it was expected that the new democratic dispensation would create an avenue for the maximization an true embracing of democracy and it’s principles in the country.

The trend remains an overt reliance on structures of political parties to aid in the achievement of such democracy; since political parties are dividends and makers of democracies, it is expected of them to not only aid in achieving the needed democracy in the country, but also ensure that they maintain democratic principles within themselves. In essence, political parties were seen as the purveyors of the democracy, because they themselves exude democratic principles among members. Hence, the achievement of these roles is largely hinged on the capability of the party to foster internal unity, relations, democracy and cohesion. However, although these political parties theoretically befit constitutional qualities and prospects ascribed to them, enhancing internal democracy remained a herculean task in practice; they have been bereft of proper adherence to their respective constitutional party structures, particularly in the process of selecting candidates and conducting its primaries.

Such discrepancy has sparked odious high level of instability that has enveloped the system over the decades. Necessitating the need to identify and explain some of the constraints of Nigerian parties towards promoting political stability and upholding the democratic principles internally and externally.

**1.3 Research Questions**

The following research questions were formulated:

1. How has the lack of internal party democracy contributed to the intra party conflict in Imo state PDP between 2007 and 2016?
2. How has the absence of internal party democracy accounted for the defeat of the PDP at the polls during gubernatorial elections in Imo State between 2007 and 2016?

**1.4 Objectives of the Study**

The broad objective of this study is to examine the internal party democracy and political stability in Nigeria with focus on PDP Imo state chapter 2007 and 2016.

The specific objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To examine if the lack of internal party democracy contributed to the intra party conflict in PDP Imo state.
2. To determine whether the absence of internal party democracy has accounted for failure of PDP at the polls during gubernatorial elections in Imo state between 2007 and 2016

**1.5 Significance of the Study**

The study has both theoretical and practical significance. Theoretically of contributes to knowledge of existing literature on who need previous knowledge of the Internal party relationship effects and advantages on political stability and the nation’s development.

Practically it will assist policy makers to serve as an indispensable tool for policy makers, politicians, stakeholders and future political aspirants intending to rule in various sectors of the government to guide and foster further co-existence among political parties, as it remains a building block, an eye opener and a light unto the path of citizens, students and political parties in upholding the democratic principles for the attainment of political stability.

**1.6 Hypothesis**

 This study will be guided by the following hypothesis

1. The lack of internal party democracy has led to intra party conflicts in Imo state between 2007 and2016.
2. The absence of internal party democracy has accounted for the defeat of PDP at the polls during gubernatorial elections in Imo state between 2007 and 2016.

 **CHAPTER TWO**

 **LITERATURE REVIEW**

**2.1 Internal party democracy**

Political parties as democratic institutions are expected to be carriers of democratic frameworks through which democracy can be properly actualized in the whole country at large, analysis of political parties have shown that they are indeed a vital aspect in promoting democracy.

Omotola(2009:pp.612) asserted that political parties are not only promoters of democratic principles but are themselves ‘makers’ of democracy, of which their absence also translates to an absence of democratic principles or structures . In essence, political parties are sine que non for the entrenchment of democracy.

Scarrow(2004) believed that intra party democracy is a very broad term describing a wide range of methods for including party members in intra party deliberation and decision making. Internally democratic political parties have a greater like hood in being open to new ideas, select more capable, appealing leaders and candidates to enjoy a greater electoral success (Mimpen,2007:p.1, Scarrow,2005:pp.4)

Ogundimu(2010) opined that parties primaries and models of candidates selection are one of the most important element of entrenching internal democracy among political parties as they should not face elections as a “ divided house’’.

Ojukwu & Olaitan (2011) opined some variables that are central to internal democracy. These include equal participation, inclusiveness and institutionalism. The first and major variable is equal participation of all members and groups in the democratic processes of the party. This emphasizes the involvement of the rank-and-file in the party’s policies, as well as representation at party activities and in party bodies.

Scarrow (2005) opined that in the most inclusive parties, all party members, or even all party supporters, are given the opportunity to decide on important issues, such as the choice of party leader or the selection of party candidates. Due to the fact that inclusiveness is a matter of process and formal rule, more inclusive parties will offer more opportunities for open deliberation prior to the decision stage.

Nwankwo (1992) argues that democratization is a process of political renewal and the affirmative acceptance of the supremacy of popular will and consensual obligation over the logic of elitism and parochialism. It embraces both the shift in the disposition of individuals and classes towards political parties albeit with some minor positive effects.

 Gauja (2006) asserted that intraparty democracy impedes decision-making within parties, precludes parties from choosing candidates they regard as most appealing to the electorate and transfers key political decisions to a small group of activists at the expense of the broader party membership.

Omonuyi(2002:pp.17) opined that the so called political parties are not in competition with one another rather they are in fraction which is more in completion within themselves . intra-party democracy suggest that it encourages political equality by creating a level playing field in candidate selection and policy development within the party; ensures popular control of government by extending democratic norms to party organisations such as transparency and accountability; and it improves the quality of public debate by fostering inclusive and deliberative practices within parties (Gauja 2006:pp.6).

Kura(2011) further asserted that the 2006 primaries which preceded the 2007 elections were also marred by resultant chaos and internal crisis. Internal party democracy in political parties refer to the levels and methods of including party members in the decision making and deliberation within party structure (Kari & Uchenna,2011:pp.35-36).

Norris(2004) asserted that one of the key issues in intra party democracy is the nomination process that it serves as a prism through which power distributions among organs and functions in the political party is understood. However political parties has failed in upholding what they tend to preach as a result of the elite hegemonic control over the party structures as describe as “political gladiators” (Akingbade, 2011)

Omodia (2010) opined that Nigeria state democratic process no doubt has been bedeviled with poor party politics as a result of lack of internal party democracy, ethnicity of party politics, poor political leadership, party indiscipline and lack of comprehensives and standard politicalideologies. Thereforeinner party democracy is of the supreme importance for strengthening democracy (NIMD, 2004).

Mersel (2006) stated that Internal democracy is aimed at developing more democratic, transparent and effective political parties. It identifies specific challenges in the internal management and functioning of parties and party systems. These include: candidate selection, leadership selection, policy making, membership relations, gender, minorities, youth and party funding

 Penning & Hazan (2001) opined that open candidate selection methods may in some instances actually increase the power of small elite, the political up-starts, It also enhances a necessary viable of democratic culture within the party as well as strengthen the organization by attracting new members and creating space for fresh ideas.

According to (Nwodo,2010) he stated:

*We sought to restore the image of our party, because*

*the image of our dear party, the largest political party*

*in Africa has been grossly eroded due to imposition*

*of candidates, godfatherism, moneybag politics, injustice* …..

 Mimpen (n.d) emphasized two essential instrumental elements of internal democracy. The first involves organizing free, fair and regular elections of internal positions, as well as candidates for representative bodies. The second entails equal and open participation of all members and member groups in such a way that interests are more or less equally represented. These two instruments are essential for creating an open and deliberative political party in which creating an open and deliberative political party in which people can participate in elections equally but may also engage in participation or be represented in other ways.

However, since 1999 the growth in number of political party from three in 1999 to thirty in 2002, fifty in 2007 and about sixty-seven today but instead of this meaning more representation , it has not. As the number of parties increased their relevance in terms of being channels of representation diminishes (Egwemi, 2009). (Schumpeter, 1942; Dahl, 1956; Downs, 1957; Miller, 1983; Sartori, 1987), argued that a system of competitive political parties is necessary for effective interest aggregation and the channelling of those in competing for government. Competitive democrats therefore view intra-party democracy as threatening the efficiency and compromising the competitiveness of political parties and thereby threatening democracy itself. in determining public policy and constitutionally guaranteeing all the freedoms necessary for open political competition” (Joseph, 1997:pp.365). Dryzek (2000) asserted that democracy is thus a process of deliberation as opposed to voting, interest aggregation, constitutional rights or even self-government.

Schattsneider (1942) opined that the lack of internal party democracy undermines party cohesion and decision making efficiency in the political party.

(Agbaje, 1999:pp.197).opined that

*Political parties are central to longevity and vitality of democracy*

*and that their ability to aggregate freely, articulate, represent and*

*organize within set limits is what Determines the extent and contours*

*of accountability in public life, including access to and use of power*

*as well as public performance.*

Dunmoye (1990) as cited by Akingbade (2011) asserted that the Nigeria fourth republic is characterized by its unhealthy rivalry for political powers, political violence,and crises of political succession andassassination of political opponents.

Tyoden (1994) argues that hardly can a political system be adjudged as democratic without the central placement of political parties in its political process. This is because political parties are the major vehicles for the expression of an essential feature of the democratic process. In this case, however, inter and intra party relationships are vital because they determine the health and resilience of the party system and by extension the fate of democracy and the nature of the political system itself. Similarly,

 Mersel (2006) asserted that various democracies in recent times have faced the problem of nondemocratic political parties, a situation where most parties only focus on external activities, neglecting internal planning and organization. He argues that in determining whether a political party is nondemocratic, attention should be given to party’s goals and practices. This is so because some parties often ignore essential elements such as their internal structures.

Nwodo (2010) stressed that party policies has been dominated by politics of godfatherlism, lack of understanding party manifesto and money bag politics which has undermined the practice of internal party democracy. Political parties has paid little or no attention on the development of the country rather they are engaged in political oppression having turned politics into warfare’s violation of the constitution and disregarding the cries of the people ( Ahmadu&Lawan, 2003).

Olorungbemi (2014) emphasized that the primary and mean responsibility of political parties is substance of democracy and that political party has failed in this responsibility as a result of the quest for power as they saw political offices as an ‘antidote’ for poverty due to their selfish interest and has amounted to their undemocratic ways to gain power. Party politics is poisonous it is the politics of war not of peace of acrimony, hatred and mudslinging not of love and brotherhood, of anarchy and discord not of orderliness and concords; it is politics of cleavages, divisions and disunity not of cooperation and unity (political Bureau, 1987)

Metuh (2010) opinedthat:

 *Internal democracy must succeed for PDP to grow, I get scared*

*Sometimes when I think of the fact that if we don’t manage our*

*Party very well, someday we might be in opposition.*

Omilusi& Peter (2016) asserted that political parties are elite owned instrument for seeking and maintaining political powers and since the elites of the parties are the major financers of the parties they tend to occupy high position, making their interest the objective and manifestoes of the party.

**2.2 Political stability in Nigeria**

Scholars have described Nigeria as an “unfinished state”(Joseph et al,1996) and as “a truculent African tragedy” (Ayittey,2006) In the midst of abundant human and material resources which are propelled in the vicious cycle of poverty and autocracy with enormous wealth from oil resource and economic social and political strength , Nigeria is qualified to be called the giant of Africa.

Huntington (1968) asserted that by regularizing the procedure for leadership succession and for assimilation of new groups into political system, provides the basis for stability and orderly change rather than for instability.

As (kew,2006.pp.5) noted:

*The giant was brought to its knees by 20 years of brutal and corrupt military rule which left a legacy of executive dominance and a political corruption in the hands of Nigeria so called “godfathers” powerful Political bosses sitting atop vast patronage networks who view the Government primarily through the lens of their own personal enrichment.*

Adeyeri(2013) opined that Nigerian political instability is conventionally attributed to the manner in which leaders sustain themselves in power. As the leadership pattern in Nigeria, lacks necessary focus capable of installing national development and promotes political stability.

The focus of the leadership of Nigeria has become parochial with the overriding consideration for personal survival rather than national development, vies for power and control over vast spoils of office (Sklaret al, 2006)

Alesina, Ozler, Roubin & Swagel, (1996), argued that political stability and Economic growth are deeply interconnected. On the one hand, the uncertainty associated with an unstable political environment may reduce investment and the speed of economic development. Democracy fosters political stability and enhances economic growth relative to nondemocratic rule in a given country and political stability regardless of the extent of democracy, has significant effect on growth in developing countries (Abeyasinghe, 2004).

Nevertheless Nigerian leaders are pre-occupied with their desires for the appropriation and privatization of Nigerian state rather than focusing on national development and economic stability (Sklaret al, 2006; Ake, 1995).

 Abdulrasheed (2007) opined that political stability is viewed as a condition of steadiness and firmness of political institutions and processes within the political system as well as absence of threat to an existing pattern of authority and behaviour, then it could be reasoned that political stability especially in plural society is a function of several society factors within the entity. These include the extent of polarization and opposing tendencies within the entity and the extent of adaptability of the government system to management of these divisions. It need be stressed that, while a situation of absolute stability may not be attainable in any society, relative stability of all organs as well as general acquiescence to rules is quite essential for the state to achieve its desired end.

Morrison (1989) observed that manifestations of instability are often a response on the part of communal groups in national population to elite instability which either fails to bring about a reapportionment of ethnic representation in government or a redistribution of other goods. the political stability of any form of government has to involve the stable realization of the political essence of that form of government, for instance, commenting on the idea of political stability in Nigeria, Usuman (2000:pp.5)

 Sottilotta, (2013), asserted that the concept of political stability is a very controversial concept. Sottilitta argued that; a first broad definition refers to the absence of domestic civil conflict and widespread violence. In this sense, a country can be considered rid of instability when no systematic attacks on persons or property take place within its boundaries. Secondly, classic interpretation equates stability with government longevity. Thirdly, political stability draws on the lack of structural change, that is, the absence of internally or externally induced change in the basic configuration of a polity.

Egbon (2000) opined that military involvements in politics of any state introduces instability in its political structures and subsequently brings down the economy to its knees.

Poluk (2013) argued that, political stability is expected to foster economic growth in the short run as Political stability in tells improvement in employment, protect the basic right of citizens, promote their culture and unity, provide basic infrastructure and services, electricity, water supply, healthcare and hence ensured increase in both local and foreign investment.

Drazen (2000) identified two reasons for which political instability affects economic performance. Firstly, it creates uncertainty about future return from the investment of firms and private agents, which inhibits the society as a whole to accumulate physical capital. Again, there is a direct effect of political instability on productivity as it distorts the functions of the market.

 Goldsmith (1987) as cited in Nomor & Lorember (2017) stated that for less developed countries of the world , political stability negatively affected economic growth. However, it was only to a little extent.

Scarrow (2005) asserted that a high level of party democracy could lead to party factions fighting, making them effective organizations and contributing to instability of the political processes and democracy. The need for political stability is paramount: without political stability there could never be anything more than a chaotic, violent and bloody struggle for power a condition of war of every man against every man (Shaun, 2000:pp.1)

Rampha (1979 ) as cited by Abdulrasheed (2007:205), asserted that, “for a federation to be able to resist failure, the Leaders and their followers must feel federal-they must be moved to think of themselves as one people with one common, self-interest-capable, where necessary, overriding most other considerations of small interests ….. “the good” for any must be consciously subordinated to or compatible with “the good for all”. This then is tantamount to an ideological commitment not to federation only as a means …..but ……as an end, as good form of its own sake, for the sake of answering the summons of history”.

**2.3 Gap in Literature**

In order to realize and examine internal party democracy and political stability in Nigeria, some scholars opined that political parties don’t only promote democracy but are makers of democracy and also essential in the attainment of democracy. (Omotola, 2009:pp612; Scarrow, 2004).

Some scholars also argued that the lack of internal party democracy undermines party cohesion, model of candidate selection and decision making efficiency in political party (Schattsneider, 1942; Gauja, 2006).

Some scholars also argued models of candidate’s selection are one of the important element of entrenching internal democracy among political parties (Ogundimu, 2010; Scarrow, 2005). Some scholars also argued that political parties has failed in their duty of upholding democracy as their internal structures with the domination and structures been held captive by “Elites’’ as they are been characterized by poor party politics. (Akingbede, 2011; Omodia, 2010)

Some scholars relatively argued that Nigeria political instability is as a result of its long military intervention which transited political powers into the hands of selfish political elites. (kew, 2006; Sklar et al, 2006)

The effort of writers shows that the connection and impact of internal party democracy and political stability in Nigeria between 2007 between 2016 has not been properly articulated, this forms the gap this work attempts to fill.

 **CHAPTER THREE**

**3.1 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

The theoretical framework adopted for this study is the elite power theory as propounded by vilfredo Pareto. The elite power theories hold that every society consists of two categories of men; the elite or the minority within a social collectivity such as a society, a state, a religious institution and a political party which exercises a proponent influence within that collectivity and the second group are referred to as masses or the majority which is government by the elite. Gouba (2003).

Elite theory of power was advanced in early twentieth century by three famous sociologists; Pareto, Mosca and Michels. Vilfredo Pareto (The Mind and Society; 11915-19) was the first to use the term “elite” and “mosses” to indicate superior and inferior groups in society, although the idea of such division of society was given earlier by Gaetano Mosca (the ruling class 1896) and Robert Michiels (Political Parties: A sociological study of the oligarchic tendencies of modern democracy: 1911). Mosca (1896) postulated that the people are necessarily divided into two groups; the rules and the ruled with the ruling class controlling most of the wealth, power and prestige in the society and exercises all power.

Furthermore according to Vilfredo Pareto (1915-19) there is existence of two types of elites;

1. Governing elites
2. Non-governing elites

And that at a particular stage one can circulate from being elite to non-elite

**Assumptions of Elite Theory**

1. Elite theory holds that every society consists of two categories; the elites and masses
2. Another assumption of this theory is that the ruling class who are the elites and controls most of the wealth, power and prestige in the society
3. There is a constant competition between governing and non-governing elites that will result to circulation of elites.

**Application of the Theory**

In the application of elite theory as a framework for explaining and showing the relationship between internal party democracy and political stability in Nigeria: focus on PDP Imo state chapter 2007-2016.

Internal party democracy is seen as bedrock on which accountability and transparency lies. Agbaje (1999 Pp. 197) opined that there is no doubt that political parties are central to longevity and vitability of democracy and that their ability to aggregate freely, articulate, represent and organize within set limits is what determines the extent and contours of accountability in public life.

The essence of this is that party and state leadership and management is been dominated by the political elites who controls the affairs of the state and party making it a self centred affair which has in turn influenced the state policies, party goals, leadership and internal structures of the party which contradicts internal party democracy, as internal party democracy does not only affect the credibility of elections but also the quality of leadership governance and economic development (Okhoude, 2012).

The politics of Imo state has actually rested on some few elites and political actors who have dominated the politics and power struggle in the state and party level over the years, elite like Chief Emmanuel Iwuanyanwu, Arthur Nzeribe, Hope Uzodinma, Achike udenwa, Emeka Ihedioha to mention but a few, are all in fore front of Imo state politics and party politics playing the role of elites and ruling elites so as to monitor and retain their hegemony.

In line with the above statement, the link between internal party democracy and political stability in Nigeria: focus on PDP Imo state chapter 2007 between 2016 is explained by elite power theory of Vilfredo Pareto.

**3.2 Research Design**

A research design is the structure of investigation for the purpose of this study we adopted ex post facto research design. Ex post facto research design is a research structure in which the independent variable or variables have already occurred and in which the research starts with observation of a dependent variable or variables and then studies the independent variable in retrospect for their possible relations to and effects on the dependent variable (Asika, 2006).

Ex-post facto research is ideal for conducting social research when is not possible or acceptable to manipulate the characteristics of human participants and is used to test hypothesis about cause and effect or co relational relationship (Simon & Goes 2013).

In hypothesis one, the (x) variable is the “lack of internal party democracy”while the (y) variable is ‘intra-party conflict in Imo state between 2007 and2016”. In hypothesis two, the (x) variable is the “absence of internal party democracy” and the (y) variable is “the defeat of PDP in the gubernatorial elections in Imo state between 2007 and2016”. Based on this research, we are measuring the lack of internal party democracy and how it has led to intra-party conflict in Imo state between 2007 and2016. We also measured the absence of internal party democracy and how it has accounted for the defect of PDP at the polls during gubernatorial elections in Imo state between 2007 and2016.

**3.3 Methods of data collection**

This study adopted a documentary approach which is the use of documents, public or private records, journals, books and dairies to support the view point or argument of an academic work (Ofordile, 2002)

 More also Secondary data was collected for this study which are second hand information already documented. Hence we used internet materials, journal articles and books from Godfrey Okoye University library.

**3.4 Method of data Analysis**

In view of my sources of data and method of collection, we adopted qualitative descriptive method of data analysis. According to Asika (2006) qualitative descriptive analysis involves summarizing the information generated for the study. Qualitative descriptive analysis requires creativity by placing the raw data into logical, meaningful categories and to communicate this interpretation to others

|  |
| --- |
| **LOGICAL FRAMEWORK** |
| **S/N** | **Research Questions** | **Hypothesis** | **Major Variable** | **Empirical Indicators**  | **Method of Data Collection** | **Source of Data** | **Method of data Analysis** |
| 1 | How has the lack of internal party democracy led to the intra-party conflict in Imo state between 2007 and2016 | The lack of internal party democracy has led to the intra-party conflicts in Imo state between2007 and 2016 | (X)Lack of internal party democracy (Y)Intra party conflict in Imo state between 2007 and2016 | * Imposition of candidates
* Pre-election selection
* Rigging in election.
* primary election violence
* lack of party cohesion
 | Documentary method of data collection based on content analysis | Secondary source of data e.g. online books, textbooks, journals etc | Qualitative description method analysis based on content analysis  |
| 2 | How has the absence of internal party democracy accounted for the defect of PDP at the polls during gubernatorial elections in Imo state between 2007 and2016 | The absence of internal party democracy has accounted for the defeat of PDP at the polls during gubernatorial elections in Imo state between 2007 and2016 | (X)Absence of internal party democracy(Y)The defect of PDP in the gubernatorial elections in Imo state between 2007 and2016 | * Internal party conflict
* Godfatherism
* Decamping of party members
 | Documentary method of data collection based on content analysis | Secondary source of data e.g. online books, textbooks, journals etc | Qualitative description method analysis based on content analysis |

**CHAPTER FOUR**

**DATA ANALYSIS AND TESTING OF HYPOTHESIS**

**4.1 The Lack of Internal Party Democracy has led to Intra-Party Conflicts in Imo state between 2007 and 2016**

**4.1.1 Introduction**

This chapter empirically verified hypothesis one and hypothesis two which are: “The lack of internal party democracy has led to intra-party conflicts In Imo state between 2007 and 2016” and “The absence of internal party democracy and defect of PDP in the gubernatorial elections in Imo state between 2007 and 2016” respectively. The chapter is divided into two major section and other sub-sections. The first section is the verification of the first hypothesis while the second section is verification of the second hypothesis

**4.1.2 Lack of Internal Part Democracy**

Internal part democracy means that the party’s should be formed “bottom-up” and that the internal distribution of power should be marked by dispersion of different levels, bodies and individuals rather than by the concentration in one organ (Cuhar, 2004).

 According to Salih (2006) internal part democracy implies support for the general interest of the party membership, the public and the state. Political parties are constitutionally formed to facilitate the establishment and sustenance of democratic rule, they are the instruments through which democratic process evolves, the primary responsibilities are to among other things, recruit and prepare candidates for elections. They check the excesses of government policies and programs by serving as opposition to a ruling party and political education of the citizenry.

However, since the inception of the present democratic rule in 1999, political party organizations were transformed into a battle field characterized by hatred, enmity, victimization and suspicion resulting from bitter struggles among party menders in their quest for personal interest and has totally disregarded the principle of internal party democracy and adhering to it in their internal structure, candidate selection which can be seen during party primary elections which is characterized by rigging, violence and thuggery.

 Furthermore, political parties as a result of lack of internal party democracy has brought about thuggery and unhealthy practices which has created democratic setbacks and accounted for several political assassination and conflicts. Lack of internal party democracy has been a major threat on the country’s nascent democracy. Recent part primaries throughout the country clearly shows that Nigeria political parties are not operating within the norms of democratic principles. Various political parties has failed to open up their parties to all part members who are eligible and want to run for office in their party primaries. Some candidates were imposed on the party without election by the godfathers and stakeholders of the party which was against the Electoral Act, however the electoral Act 2010 (as amended) made it mandatory for a political party to give notice to the commission twenty days before they conduct any convention, congress, conference or meeting convened for the purpose of electing members of its executive or for the purposes of nominating any candidate for any elective office specified as stated by the Act in section 85(1).

 Furthermore, the Act in section 87 gave a very detailed and comprehensive procedure for the nomination of candidates by political parties. Section 87(1) provides that a political party seeking to nominate candidate for elections under this Act shall hold primaries for aspirants to all elections positions. Sub section 2 provides as follows; “the procedure for the nomination of the candidate by political parties for the various elective position shall be direct or indirect primaries”. The Act further provides that a political party that adopts the direct primaries procedure shall ensure that all aspirants are given equal opportunity of being voted for by members of the party. However the concept of internal party democracy has remained a scarce commodity in Nigeria political system as political parties has resulted to the Machiavelli style of politics which is that the end justifies the means and have seen the political system as a business center based on the winner takes all which as a result of this made the political parties fail in their capacity to maintain internal democracy.

**4.1.3 Causes of Lack of Internal Democracy**

1. ***Monetization of politics***: Lawal (2007) posited that Nigeria politics is conceived as an investment by parties and politicians. The politicians having invested colossally on campaigns and others political activities coupled with the existing system of winner takes all, parties would want to win at all cost and the need to employ the use of thugs and touts to destabilize, rig elections and boycott internal democracy practices becomes inevitable.
2. ***Political party’s orientation***: The orientation of political parties in Nigeria is that the political system belongs to any political party that occupied the system. This has encouraged political parties to divert from the principle of democracy by introducing thugs and other unhealthy process into politics because every party wants to win the election at all cost.
3. ***Sit-tight syndrome***: This is a situation in which a political party tries to hold on to power. In an attempt to hang on to power, parties often create a regime of violence, clashes and killings ofopposing political parties member if they become intransigent.

**4.1.4. Intra-Party Conflicts in PDP, Imo state**

**4.1.4.1 History of Intra-Party Conflicts in Nigeria**

The concept of conflicts results when two or more persons seeks to possess thesame object or occupy the same position and play incompatible means of achieving their purpose.Okoli (2001) opined that intra party conflicts is an opposition within a political party. It is an internally generated opposition whereby dissident group of a party constitute itself into a splinter movements that stands to oppose the decision and activities of the parent party.

Since Nigeria assumed the status of independence the political parties has been challenged may conflicts of different dimensions, it has as a matter of fact culminated in political instability in the country as a whole. The political parties in Nigeria are enmeshed in internal crises within the party which has threatened and has tore the parties apart. Ogundima (2010) argued that for any party to brace up for any elections, it must go into the elections as a divided house. Conflict is inevitable in any society when people are denied their basic human needs for identity, equality, recognition, security, dignity and participation and where party policy is based in favor of a certain group.

Intra party conflict in Nigeria dates back to the colonial period. The history of this political party formation in Nigeria right from the creation of the first political party, the Nigeria National Democratic Party (NNDP) in 1923 shows the disturbing nature of intra-party conflict and the inability of the leaders to successfully manage their differences. The NNDP according to Webster (quoted in Nnadozie, 2005 pp. 144) was “wrecked by personal jealousies and quarrels over the spoils of office. The look of openness in the party caused a serious political rift and the eventual formation of Lagos Youth Movement (LYM) in 1933 which later metamorphosed to the Nigeria Youth Movement (NYM) in 1936. The Nigeria Youth Movement (NYM) originally started as a national-based political party by attracting membership that cut across Nigeria, it also broke the monopoly of the NNDP in Lagos which unofficial members were elected (Nnadozie, 2005). However, the Nigeria Youth Movement was short lived mainly due to intra-party feud and could not realize the promise of national front it held forth, the ethnic sentiment undermined internal democratic value of the party as it was dismembered by the Ikoli-Akinsanya crisis in 1941.

Furthermore, it is remarkable that the NCNC which started as promising national party was reduced to a regional party due to intra party conflict fuelled mainly by tribal sentiments. In the same view, the Action Group (AG) faced internal conflict between its leader Chief ObafemiAwolowo and his deputy leader, Chief Samuel LadokeAkintola. The intra conflict in the AG led to the formation of a new party known as the Nigerian Democratic Party (NNDP).

In the second republic, the experience was not different from the first republic. All the political parties registered and competed for elections in the 1979 general elections but was riddled with internal crisis. The National Party of Nigeria (NPN), the Unity Party of Nigeria (UPN), the Nigeria Peoples Party (NPP), the Peoples Redemption Party (PRP), the Great Nigeria Peoples Party (GNPP) and the Nigeria Advanced Party (NAP) were characterized by crises. These internal crises accounted for the breakup of the NPN/NPP alliance and the splits that occurred in the GNPP and PRP. All peoples party (APP) later ANPP was equally engulfed in the intra party conflict and political wrangling, the crisis’s within the party started at it formal launching in Lagos between the two associations that initiated the party, conference of fused association (CFA) and southern leaders forum (SLF) headed by AlhajiUmaruShinkafi and late chief Bola Ige respectively, one group wanted the party to bear Nigeria in its name while the other group disagreed, it was the inability of the party to resolve this conflict that led to the pulling out of southern leaders forum (SLF) from All peoples party (APP), (Jinadu,2001).

Meanwhile, the fourth republic also recorded a high level of internal party conflicts and dejection. According to Muhammed (2008) the intra-party conflict has remained a predominant feature of partisan politics in Nigeria fourth republic. The People’s Democratic Party has had to contend with series of intra-party crises both in the national and state level in the past eighteen years. Some major crises of the party in the national level was in 2000 when it was divided into two camps, one led by Chief Sunday BoharunduroWoniyi and the other headed by Chief Ume Ezeoke.

**4.1.4.2 Intra Party Conflict in PDP in Imo state**

 In 2007 during PDP primary election in Imo state which resulted to a serious internal conflict when Senator Ifeanyi Ararume who won the party’s gubernatorial flag bearer was substituted by the chieftains of the party with Engr. Charles for the governorship election in 2007. The electoral act used for the election stipulated that for any political party who tends to change any of her candidates, it shall give cogent and verifiable reasons. The only reason given by PDP for substituting Ararumes’ name with that of Charles Ugwu, who scored 36 votes and took the 14th position in the primaries was that Ararumes name was submitted in error (Vanguard, Saturday September 30th, 2006, Pg. 26). When Ararume took the matter to court, he was suspended from the party, the party brazenly declared that it was not submitting any name for the gubernatorial seat in Imo state following the Supreme Court verdict that Ararume remain the PDP candidate; he lost the election because PDP denied him support which as a result made him defect to Action Group of Nigeria (AGN).

 Finally, most of these crises is as a result of the failure to adhere to or embrace the spirit of internal democracy and has fallen short of the expectation of the competitive nature of election.

 **4.1.5 Brief history of Electoral Violence and Irregularities in Nigeria’s 4th Republic**

 Nigerians were dissatisfied with the annulment of June 12 Presidential election. Vociferous groups emerged, pressing on the Military to return the Country to democracy. Faced with this pressure, General Babangida formed an Interim National Government (ING) headed by Chief Earnest Shonekan, The ING was overthrown by General Sani Abacha. With the death of General Abacha on June 8, 1998, General Abdulsalami Abubakar instituted a Transition Programme with the view of returning the State to civil rule in 1999. Beside other programmes, the Regime set up an Electoral Body known as the Independent National Electoral Commission. The inauguration of this Body crystallized the beginning of the journey to Nigeria’s 4th Republic. The Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) set the rules and time - table for the commencement of political activism, thus, Political Parties were registered and only three Parties, namely: Alliance for Democracy (AD), All Peoples Party (APP) and Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) scaled through the huddle and were registered (Dode,2010 & Abimbola,2012). The results of the 1999 general elections indicated that the People’s Democratic Party (PDP), which fielded Chief Olusegun Obasanjo, winning in 21 States across the country was returned elected. The All Peoples Party (APP) came second with 9 states, while the Alliance for Democracy (AD), which held sway in the Southwest, had 6 states. As akin to other elections, there were irregularities, but not as pronounced as other experiments.

 Another general election was conducted in 2003 by President Obasanjo’s Regime, and President Obasanjo was returned again returned to power for the second time in an election that was so badly flawed. That election was described as the “most fraudulent election” in the history of Nigeria (Ezirim & Mbah,2014). In fact, the election results proved and confirmed that proper National Assembly, Gubernatorial and Presidential elections were not conducted in accordance with the INEC guidelines and the Electoral Act. Rather, figures were literally manufactured in Government Houses or collation centers as results for the return of President Obasanjo and the PDP to power. The alleged electoral malpractices of the ruling PDP were regarded as the most sophisticated in the electoral history of Nigeria. Further to the massive rigging were pockets of violence in different parts of Nigeria. A number of people have argued that there were no elections in 2003, but merely the intimidation of voters and the selection of already decided winners by elites and caucuses (Abimbola & Adesote, 2012). Both internal and external observers were unanimous on the unfairness of the competition in the electoral process which was said to have been manipulated by the so-called ruling party, Peoples’ Democratic Party. For example, according to the Human Right Watch’s report, between April and May 2003, about one hundred people were said to have been killed and many more injured during federal and state elections in Nigeria and that most of the violence was perpetrated by the ruling PDP and its supporters . Also, the Transition Monitoring Group (TMG), a coalition of over ninety Civil Society Groups, in its report on the 2003 general elections, passed a vote of no confidence on the elections. Some political parties and their candidates decided to challenge some of the results before the various Election Petition tribunals and have gone ahead to do so while others declared “mass action” to pressure a government without popular mandate to abdicate power . Most of them were however denied justice by a corrupt judicial system. It would be recalled that

 The 2007 general elections reeked off all manner of chicanery characterized by the brazen attempt to disenfranchise the electorate and announce fictitious results in areas where no elections took place, not to mention intimidation of the electorate by the police and military in many places, non-delivery of election materials, hijack of ballot boxes, thumb printing and even footprinting of ballot papers, incarceration and humiliation of independent election observers, bribery of electoral officers in order for them to look elsewhere when atrocious acts of perfidy were being perpetrated by party agents which all resulted in a bogus series of elections which both foreign and local observers described as nothing less than a travesty. Contributing to the above, Marietu (2010) opines:

*Prior to the elections, the political atmosphere was again very tense.Among other mind-boggling incidents, President Olusegun Obasanjo condescendingly declaredthat, for him and the PDP, the 2007 election was ‘a do or die affair’* …..

The political violence that erupted in all these elections progressively had high ethnic tones as there were ethnic insurgencies during the various elections, such that between June and August 2006, three gubernatorial candidates were assassinated. The run-up to the April 2007 elections was violent, as campaigning in many areas was punctuated with political killings, bombings and armed clashes between supporters of rival political parties. The violence formed part of a broader pattern of violence and abuses that is inherent in Nigeria’s still largely unacceptable political system . Without doubt, the 2007 elections was evidence that the cub of election rigging which was born in 1964 had now become a wild rampaging lion, consuming all it saw and leaving a shaking democracy in its wake. The process was characterized by unprecedented electoral malpractices which led to wide condemnation from local and international observers to the extent that upon inauguration, the then President, late Umaru Ya’Adua condemned the flawed election that brought him to power , thus, decided to set up a committee known as the Electoral Reform Committee (ERC) headed by justice Mohammed Uwais to fashion out a transparent system that would ensure the conduct of credible elections and thereby deepen democracy in Nigeria. President Yar’Adua was ready to deliver his promises of the restoration of the rule of law and guarantee sanity in the electoral system before his death in 2009. Nigeria’s 2011 polls marked the fourth multiparty election in Nigeria.

 The 2011 general elections were generally acceptable by both local and foreign observers to be partially fair when compared with the 2003 and 2007 general elections which were conducted under the fourth republic. The election however witnessed some violence during the pre-election and post election period. Akwa Ibom State witnessed one of the worst histories of political violence in March 22, 2011. An eye witness report on the matter indicate that many properties which included: 200 brand new Peugeot 307 cars; 500 brand new tricycles; the Goodluck/Sambo Campaign office which was burnt down by the rampaging mob; Fortune International High School owned by Senator Aloysius Etok which was razed down with school children in session and over 20 Toyota Hiace buses belonging to the PDP and Godswill 2011 Campaign Organization, nine Hilux jeeps belonging to the Government of Akwa Ibom State which were either completely destroyed or vandalized. Consequently, the Presidency set up a Presidential Committee of Inquiry to investigate the remote and immediate causes of the violence and recommend ways of averting future political violence in the State. This was aimed at seeking peaceful means of resolving the conflict. Further to the above, the release of 2011 Presidential election result by the Independence National Electoral Commission (INEC) which produced President Dr. Goodluck Jonathan of the PDP as the winner led to sectarian violence in some Northern parts of Nigeria. Some of the affected State were Bauchi, Yobe, Maiduguri, Kaduna among others. The post electoral violence that accompanied the 2011 general election resulted in the killing of about ten Youth corps members in Bauchi State .

**4.1.5.1Electoral Violence and Irregularities in PDP Primary Elections in Imo State**

Electoral violence and irregularities of primary elections has posed aa serious threat to democracy, property and life of individuals in the state. Several lives have been lost on account of electoral violence in Imo state and Nigeria as a whole such as the killing of Bola Ije , former Attorney General of the Federation, the killing of Funsho Williams in Lagos state, the killing of Honorable Oigunkelin in 2012 election period on the day of governorship debate and several others. According to Nwolise while quoting Albert defined electoral violence as all forms of organized acts or threats; physical, psychological and structural aimed at intimidating, harming, blackmailing a political opponent during and after election with a view of determining, delaying or otherwise influencing an electoral Process (Nwolise, 2007: pp. 159).

Furthermore, electoral malpractices is one of the methods of securing political relevance and transferring power to godsons by godfathers who in turn would be used as a tool to siphon state treasury for personal aggrandizement, this unhealthy competitions for scarce resources and massive violence and malpractice in election has led to conflict among committing clicks and post-election deaths. This act was displayed in PDP primary elections in Imo state in 2007 for the gubernatorial candidate who was highly manipulated as Senator Ifeanyi Ararume and his running mate Chief Ezenwa from Ezinifitte Mbaise were denied off their right after emerging as the winner. In 2016 the PDP Imo state chapter also faced a rejection in the result of the ward congress by party members across the twenty seven (27) council areas of the state; this congress election was a continuation of the struggle for the control of the party structure between Senator Hope Uzodinma and the former deputy speaker of the House of Representatives Emeka Ihedioha. The party members accused the chief returning officer for the ward congress, Chief Sergeant Awuse as responsible for the crises when he claimed that he had instructions from Abuja to recognize only seven leaders in the state. Daily Sun reliably gathered that several people were wounded in the tacos allegedly ignited by a former council chairman, Chief Emma Nworgu who is representing the state and a loyalist of the former deputy speaker of the House of Representatives Emeka Ihedioha who allegedly ordered his thugs to disrupt the election process after noticing the election was not going his way. The delegate lists from Orlu zone was allegedly torn to shreds by Senator Hope Uzodinma who had reportedly stated that he alone should determine who holds whatever position as the leader of the zone. Indeed the desire of individuals to rule or dominate at all cost has sold political and party leadership to the highest bidders by resorting to electoral manipulations which is detrimental to internal party democracy.

This section has demonstrated that the lack of internal party democracy has led to intra-party conflict in PDP Imo state between 2007 and2016. Therefore based on the data analysis we upheld our hypothesis one.

**4.2 The Absence of Internal Party Democracy has Accounted for the Defect ofPDP in the Gubernatorial Electionsin Imo State between2007 and2016**

**4.2.1 Introduction**

This section empirically verified hypothesis two (2) which is “the absence of internal party democracy has accounted for the defect of PDP at the polls during gubernatorial elections in imo sate 2007-2016”. It examined the link between variable (x) and (y) in Nigeria. The section is made up of a number of sub-sections, and the hypothesis was tested using its empirical indicators.

**4.2.2 Historyand Emergence of Godfatherism in Nigerian Politics**

The word ‘godfather’ appears in parenthesis in many western political studies. The situation is different in Nigeria. The patron/client relationships that popularized the term in Nigerian politics have cultural roots among many Nigerians peoples. It is not a totally new experience in the sociology of the Hausa, Yoruba and Igbo for people to have one or other type of ‘godfather’. For example, the word ‘godfather’ has a local equivalence in Hausa, Yoruba and Igbo languages and these words have been in usage since the pre-colonial era. A godfather is known among the Hausa as a ‘maigida’ (landlord or the head of a household). The word ‘maigida’ goes beyond its literal meaning. Abner Cohen (1965) used the term in their works to refer to those who provided brokerage services to Hausa traders in transit in different parts of West Africa. These Hausa traders brought cattle from their homeland to different parts of southern West Africa and took back kola nuts to the North. At the various transit centers where they have to stop to do businesses, they rely on a maigida to facilitate their economic activities. The maigida provides them with accommodation, storage and brokerage services.

 The maigida receive compensations for their services and many of them became rich from the number of clients they had. Even in Hausaland, from where these itinerant traders came, this kind of patron/client relationship is popularly known. As Ferguson (1972) observed: In Hausaland, when a stranger with kola is staying in the house of one man, and a potential buyer is staying in the house of another man, they bargain over the kola and on each calabash they set aside two kola nuts, ‘yan k’ida’, as a gift: one goes to each of the landlords. A ‘godfather’ is referred to in Yorubaland as ‘baba kekere’ (the small father), ‘baba isale’ (the father of the underground world), or ‘baba nigbejo’ (a great help in times of trouble). The most historical of these terms is ‘baba kekere’. It was used to depict community leaders with whom people of less social status identified as a way of providing physical, social, political and economic security for themselves. For example, most of the Yoruba refugees who came to settle in Ibadan in the early nineteenth century settled with the ‘baba kekere’ in the city. Falola (1985) these were military chiefs and patrons appointed to be in charge of certain Ibadan colonies by the town’s traditional council. The migrants who settled under these Ibadan chiefs paid the ‘baba kekere’ tribute, part of which the ‘baba kekere’ transmitted to the Ibadan authorities. In return, the chiefs were obligated to protect those under them against any act of violence that characterized Ibadan at this time. Dikson (2003) observed that the idea of godfatherism is grounded in the sociology of traditional Igbo society. He made reference to the popular relationship between ‘Nnam-Ukwu’ (my master) and ‘Odibo’ (the servant) in the Igbo world view. A younger person is entrusted to a more mature and experienced person for training in social, economic and moral adulthood. The role played by the man in this kind of relationship is akin to that of a godfather. The latter is expected to set the boy up in his business after undergoing whatever training the master must have given him. In the three cases mentioned above, a person of lesser social status attaches himself to another person, usually of higher status, for support, which could be social or economic. The godfather gets something in return from the adopted son for the transactional relationship. It is probably on this understanding that the modern notion of godfatherism in Nigeria is based. In other words, the phenomenon of godfatherism is not strange to the cultural world of the Nigerian people. The giving of kola by a client to his patron is also not strange. What is probably strange is that the transposition of this social or economic system into the political arena and also the ridiculous nature of what patrons now ask for from their clients as compensation for providing them with ‘brokerage services’.

 The present-day godfatherism is a primordial tradition taken to a criminal extent. The phenomenon has far-reaching negative effects on the democratization process in Nigeria. The founding fathers of party politics in Nigeria were godfathers of a sort. They were preceded by the first generation Nigerian elites to establish contact with the European in the late 1800s. The leading figures were the traditional Rulers who later became the hub of the indirect rule policy of the British in the country. Between the early 1900s and the late 1940s, the educated, religious and business elite competed for influence with the traditional rulers. These people acted formally and informally as the middlemen between the British colonial officials, European trading houses and the local people. Those who could not read nor write depended on the ‘professional’ letter and petition writers for making their cases before the colonial officials. The business-minded among this first generation of Nigerian elite competed with European firms for the sale of imported goods. For example, Chief Obafemi Awolowo and a few others invested in the transport business and gradually launched themselves into political activities. It was impossible to reach the Europeans without the facilitative roles of these godfathers. This provided many of them with the opportunity to become gatekeepers or godfathers; they determined who and who could not meet the Europeans. Those who wanted the favors of the white men had to go through these godfathers.

 Political godfatherism started with nationalist activities of the 1950s. The educated elite which constituted just six percent of the total Nigerian population championed this struggle for Nigerian independence. The educated elites, most of whom had only primary education, were respected for their knowledge and bravery in confronting the white man. They became idolized by their people and their personal opinions became the formal interests of the ethnic groups they claimed to represent. People who wanted to join in politics went to them and deferred to their ‘good judgment’ in almost all things. These father figures were the leaders of regional political groups that emerged in the 1950s and 1960s: the Northern People’s Congress for the Hausa-Fulani dominated northern Nigeria; the Action Group for the Yoruba-dominated south-west, and the NCNC for the Igbo-dominated eastern Nigeria. The role of the godfathers at this time was to show the way for the other Nigerians in a colonial system. As an Ibadan politician that belonged to this era noted, ‘our job at this time was to teach our followers how to disrespect the white man who wanted to rule us forever’. The political godfathers of this era included the then Sardauna of Sokoto, Sir Ahmadu Bello, who led the NPC; Chief Obafemi Awolowo, who led the AG, and Dr Nnamdi Azikiwe of the NCNC leader. The other elder statesmen that fell into this category in Nigerian politics include Mallam Aminu Kano and Alhaji Waziri Ibrahim. These political leaders, up to the point of their death, dictated who could occupy political offices in the geo-political regions they led. They were ‘clearing houses’ for political opportunities. The godsons of Sir Ahmadu Bello later became a mythical political cabal, known as the ‘Kaduna mafia’ in Nigerian politics. The godsons of the late Chief Obafemi Awolowo in South-western Nigeria, collectively known as ‘Afenifere’ (those who wish others well) included the late Chief Bola Ige, Alhaji Lateef Jakande, and Chief Bisi Onabanjo, all of who were state governors during the second republic in Nigerian history (1979-1983). Dr Azikiwe’s godsons in Eastern Nigeria included Chief Jim Nwobodo and Chief Sam Mbakwe, both of whom were also governors in Anambra and Imo states respectively from 1979 to 1983. Alhaji Abubabakar Rimi and Alhaji Balarabe Musa, who were governors of Kano and Kaduna states during the second republic, both recognized Alhaji Aminu Kano as their political godfather throughout his lifetime. The only difference between these early godfathers in Nigerian history and their contemporary peers is that they supported and nurtured their godsons positively rather than negatively. The emphasis of this generation of godfathers was on developmental issues and not money. They also did not demand, figuratively pounds of flesh from their adopted sons as the present day godfathers do. These godfathers of blessed memory motivated their adopted sons to higher levels of political morality and made it necessary for them to be accountable to those who voted them into office. They also provided the regimes of their godsons with logistical support. Some of the godsons produced by Ahmadu Bello, Obafemi Awolowo and Nnamdi Azikiwe (most especially Alhaji Jakande, Chief Bola Ige, Chief Jim Nwobodo, Chief Mbakwe, Alhaji Abubakar Rimi, Alhaji Balarbe Musa, etc.), later became godfathers themselves, most especially during the ill-fated third republic and the present political dispensation in Nigeria. Many of them however lack the commitment to democracy needed for reproducing the godfathers that produced them.

 In the South-west, many claimed and still claim to be followers of Chief Obafemi Awolowo. They dress like Awolowo and profess his political ideals but do something else. This duplicity was one of the reasons why the AD ‘was allowed’ by the Yoruba people to lose the 2003 elections in the southwest to the PDP. The ACF tried during the 2003 to make the people of the region see themselves as being led by the ‘children of Sir Ahmadu Bello’. But the people could see through the smokescreen that most of the people that now claim to represent the ‘old North’ are in fact individual godfathers who simply decided to cluster together with a view to forging a more reliable platform for protecting their narrow personal interests. The problem with ACF is with the contradicting interests of the individual godfathers in the group. The interests of M. D. Yusuf, Chief Awoniyi, etc., for example, are not the same. This explains why M. D. Yusuf decided to contest the 2003 election even when ACF had maintained the position that it was going to back another candidate against Chief Olusegun Obasanjo. The role of the Muslim leaders who dominate the ACF in the introduction of the sharia legal system in Northern Nigeria and their complicity in the many bloody inter-religious conflicts that took place in the region between 2000 and 2003, made many, including some Muslims, distrust them. The people would rather listen to individual godfathers who could put some immediate benefits into their pockets than to leaders who were perceived only to be interested in using the people and the now shop-worn slogan of ‘One North, One People’ to feather their own nests. This is why the people of northern Nigeria are scattered in the many political parties in Nigeria. What the 2003 election results demonstrated is that ACF does not have the political clout of ‘individual godfathers’ under the present political dispensation in Nigeria. They asked the people of the North not to vote for Obasanjo but Buhari but the people did the opposite.

 The contemporary godfatherism in the country is one of the ruinous legacies of the Babangida (1985-1993) and Abaacha regimes (1993-1998). The two regimes commercialized politics and made it difficult for people to get anything in Nigeria simply through hard work. Mediocrity and hypocrisy were an acceptable state philosophy. The problem was at its worst during the Abacha regime. Individuals who were ready to compromise their group interests were needed during this period to run errands for Abacha. The system provided them with sufficient financial resources to enable them build formidable clienteles. Such people spied on their ethnic groups, universities, pro-democracy and human rights groups, military officers etc.; they organized ‘rent-the-crowd’ solidarity rallies and ‘mass demonstrations’ in support of the Abacha administration and in the process became ‘big men and women’. Some of these people went as far as supplementing what they got from Abacha with criminal activities – sometimes across international borders. Security officers turned a blind eye as these people were let loose by the regime they diligently served. Many of these people were those that took over power during the 1999 elections in Nigeria. They were the ones that released Chief Olusegun Obasanjo from prison and made him the president of Nigeria. Many Nigerians did not believe that the regime of General Abubakar was truly committed to returning power to civilians in 1999. They therefore maintained a safe distance from the political transition program. This was how the godfathers took over power. They have been consolidating their grip on power since then. By the 2003, there were more political godfathers in many parts of Nigeria than those interested in vying for public offices. The 2003 elections thus took off with the godfathers fighting it out at party conventions: it was a ‘Naira for Naira fight; Dollars for Dollars; Pounds for Pounds’. Most of those who lost their chance of nomination at the party conventions did so not because they were not qualified but simply because their godfathers were not strong enough.

**4.2.2.1Godfatherism in Imo state politics**

Nigeria politics and process of selecting candidates for elections cannot be discussed without the activities of the party Godfathers. Godfather can be as a wealthy individual who controls the party structures and determines who gets what, how and when within the party (Egwu, 2014)

Therefore, desperate political aspirants who wish to win elections even if they are not qualified to contest such election embrace godfatherism which has become a factor in Nigerian politics such that no politician can achieve success without the backing of a godfather.(Atere&Akinwale, 2005). So worrisome is the situation in this fourth republic that godfathers create democratic setback by encouraging illegitimate means of seeking political power thereby indulging in corrupt practices such as arms-stockpiling, thuggery, bribery, election rigging and other form of political misdemeanor(s). This issue of godfatherism in this fourth republic has motivated inter-party conflict in Nigeria since the political parties believe that political system belongs to the political parties that occupied the system.

Political parties are major building blocks of democracy. However, the inability of many political parties in Nigeria to operate in a democratic manner introduces tension and violence in the electoral process. In Nigeria, political godfathers control the parties at the local and national levels. (Omobowale&Olanrewaju, 2007). These godfathers select the delegates who elect party leaders and candidates. Through their control of the delegates, the godfathers decide who gets the party’s nomination and leadership positions. The activities of political godfathers has created so much dissatisfaction in the political process because of their disregard for the formal procedures for party elections and nomination of candidates Ibrahim (2007: p., 5) identified five tactics used by Nigerian political godfathers to eliminate popular candidates from party primaries. These include;

1. Declaration of one candidate as the ‘consensus’ candidate and the insistence by the godfathers that those entitled to vote must support the candidates and that other aspirants must withdraw.
2. Use of zoning and other procedures to exclude unwanted candidates by moving the party zone for a particular seat or position to an area where the excluded candidate is not local thereby disqualifying him
3. Use of violence by thugs or security personnel to harass and intimidate candidates and the supporters of candidates who oppose the godfathers proteges
4. Use of money to bribe officials and induce voters to support particular candidates
5. Application of ‘results by declaration’; an aspirant wins a nomination or election, but polling officials disregard the result and declare the loser the winner.

Furthermore during party primaries party constitutions and other laws regulating candidate selection are rendered ineffective as primary elections are sometimes overturned by godfathers.In 2007 at Imo state primary election of PDP Senator Ararumewho won the PDP gubernatorial primary but was denied flying the Party’s flag by some PDP Chieftains due to their Political differences meanwhile the struggle in Imo state over the share of the ‘national cake’ explains why this Godfathers finance party activities and in turn to reap the reward in form of contracts award and other forms of patronage. The politics of Godfatherism in recent time has become a topical subject characterizing contemporary politics in Imo state like an epidemic it has underpin political progress in Imo state and played a serious role during the tenure of the formal governor of Imo state, Chief IkediOhakim who was then candidate of PDP with his sharing of ‘national cake’ among the stake holders and godfathers who dominated Imo politics like NzeOnuoha, chief AchikeUdenwaetc this made Imolitesat a certain stage got tired and failed up by PDP leadership in the state and with Chief RochasOkoracha inclusion oferadication of ‘Godfatherism’ in imo state as part of his manifesto, therefore presented him before the people as the messiah who God sent to rescue Imo state from the grip of godfatherism and arrogance of PDP led government.

**4.2.2.2 Impact of Godfatherism on Democratic Governance**

 Godatherism in Nigerian politics is a contest between elitism and democracy. Elitism, as Welsh (1979: 10) argued, is a system ‘in which the exercise of political control by a small number of persons is institutionalized in the structure of government and political activity’. The typical godfather in Nigerian politics basically seeks to manipulate state officials and institutions for his own interests. Conflicts occur only when their clients refuse to be manipulated. This kind of situation does not augur well for the development and growth of any democratic process. Democracy has to do with the protection of the interests of all and should not only focus on the narrow interests of the privileged in the society. The matter becomes more serious when the intention of these powerful elites is to exploit the state. The other point that must be made is that true democracy comes from the grass roots and not from the top; it evolves from effective participation of the citizenry in the political process. In a democracy, the governed do not only come out to exercise their voting rights, they also have the right to be voted for. Political godfathers use their influence to block the participation of others in Nigerian politics. They are political gatekeepers: they dictate who participates in politics and under what conditions. This kind of situation promotes mediocrity and financial corruption as ‘the incumbent godson is at pains to satisfy the whims and caprices of the godfather among other competing demands on the scarce resources of the government, the interest of the larger number is savagely under mined’. According to Nnamani (2003) any godson who fails to cooperate with the godfather is subjected to all forms of humiliations and political violence, as discussed above. Godfatherism is one of the most important factors responsible for electoral malpractices and violence in Nigeria. We should not be surprised about this fact given the assurance that godfathers give to their clients on winning elections when reaching agreements with them. The seriousness of the problem here is better appreciated when the fact is faced that there are many godfathers contesting for recognition at every election. The point was made earlier that the relationship between the godfather and godfather is instrumental: the godfather assures the latter of electoral success and the godson uses his political power after winning the election to advance the social, economic and political influence of his mentor. This explains why elections in Nigeria are usually a contest of power between godfathers. They come out with all the tricks that could help to given their candidates victory. The tricks include multiple voting, exchanging official ballot boxes with unofficial ones already filled with voting papers, stealing electoral boxes, chasing voters away from constituencies where their candidates are likely to have few votes, killing and wounding political opponents, etc. Such activities help to produce counter-violence during elections. This partly explains why most elections in Nigeria are violent (Olasupo, 2003).

**4.2.3 Decamping of PDP party members to APC**

 Nigerian democracy has witnessed series of political defection in the last 18 years of democracy with politicians decamping from one political party to the other, this development which is generally referred to as party defecting, cross-carpeting, party-switching, canoe-jumping, decamping etc. are employed to mean the same thing as defection (Malthora, 2005; Mbah, 2011).

The decline in the PDP’s electoral volume in Nigeria began with the formation of a stronger opposition party. All Progressive Congress (APC) a coalition of hitherto four feeble parties-Action Congress of Nigeria, Congress for Progressive Change, All Nigeria Peoples Party and faction of All Progressive Grand Alliance. The failure and defect of PDP emerged as a result of its prominent members decamping to APC; the defection of AminuWaziriTambuwal the PDP speaker, House of Representatives to APC and the defection of 37 other PDP members of house to APC further weakened the political hegemony of PDP governors dropped from 27 to 20 on 11th April 2015 governorship polls. Similarly, Nasir El-Rufai, former minister of FCT under Obasanjo led PDP government defected to APC, Aminu Bello Masari who was the speaker of House of Representatives under PDP ticket, defected to APC as a result of this all blames were led on the party for shooting itself on the leg through mismanagement and poor coordination of its internal crises, inability to tame unbridled ambitions of some of its members and absence of internal party democracy.

In Imo state some group of members in PDP decamped to APC in 2015, the decampees alleged that they were joining APC because they were badly treated in PDP and they felt their political futures lie in APC and as a matter of fact that PDP in the state Owerri zone failed in producing a consensus candidates formidable engage to wrest power from Okorocha of APC; meanwhile the PDP party’s governorship aspirant, Chief Jerry Chukwuemeka and Barr Bethel Nzimako and other decampees like leader of Owerrizone political leaders forum Chief Charles Amadi, also directors of senator HopeUzodinma campaign organization Barr Rex Anunobi, Chief SanfoNwankwo and Patrick Ekeji defected from PDP to APC, thus this was one of the greatest defecting PDP has ever recorded and which deepened the failure in 2015 both in federal and state level.

**4.2.4 Insensitivity to Supporters by PDP**

Peoples democratic party on several occasion been accused of the lack of concern for the feelings of the supporters and has failed in the fulfillment of their mandate and desire of supporter and candidate choice. The problem in PDP across the country as of today is caused by imposition of candidates, people being replaced by those who were not qualified for reasons best known to the party. A situation whereby a governor of a state would try to nominate his cabal not minding people’s choice and desire (Onabanjo, 2015)

 Elechi(2016) in his address said that he defected from the party alongside other of his supporters due to alleged injustice and lack of internal party democracy in PDP, as PDP administrations and leadership are characterized by selfishness, emblazing of state funds and embarking on unrealized elephant project that have no direct bearing on the lives of the people and as a result of the insensitivity and decaying of political values caused by PDP has led them to doom.

**4.2.5 Inability of PDP to control its stalwarts**

 The inability of PDP to control the affairs as well as sanction its stalwarts who goes contrary has created a loophole in the party, an incident was recorded in April 19, 2003 in AmaimoIkeduru Local Government when OnyewuchiIwuchukwu an ANPP member was shot in front of his family by gunmen alleged to be PDP supports on that same day Tony Dimegwu an ANPP state house of assembly candidate from AhiazuMbaise local government was seriously injured by thugs suspected to be PDP supporters. With all these arrogance behavior exhibited by PDP member and stalwarts lords gaining political power and sustenance of hegemony they failed in sanctioning them from such inhumane act.

According to AhhajiDahiru a former national organizing secretary of the people’s Democratic Party during his interview Aljazirah Nigeria in 1stoct 2017 said he might be forced to leave PDP if the leadership of the party refused to flush out corrupt members in the party. The problems of internal democracy in PDP took roots in party executives since 1999. This affirms the common saying that when the head of the fish is bad, the entire body becomes bad as well. The assumption is that some PDP executives, especially at the National level, feel that they have the latitude to turn things around as they wish in the party.

Meanwhile PDP has allowed itself to gradually come under the control of certain individuals who are major donors and has dominated the affairs of the party and are exhibiting dangerous level of undemocratic behaviors and have grown beyond the control of the party, PDP has not only lost the presidential position but have also lost the control of its stalwarts.

This section has demonstrated that the absence of internal party democracy has accounted for the defeat of PDP at the polls during gubernatorial elections in Imo state between 2007 and 2016. Therefore based on the data analysis we upheld our hypothesis two.

**CHAPTER FIVE**

**SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

**5.1 Summary**

This research work investigated on the internal party democracy and political stability in Nigeria: case study on PDP Imo state between 2007 and 2016. The following research questions were raised:

1) How Has the lack of internal party democracy led to the intra-party confllict in Imo state between 2007 and 2016?

2) How has the absence of internal party democracy accounted for the defect of PDP at the polls during gubernatorial elections in Imo state between 2007 and 2016?

The study also tried to fill the gap in literature by verifying the following Hypothesis:

* The lack of internal party democracy has led to the intra-party conflict in Imo State between2007 and 2016.
* The absence of internal party democracy has accounted for the defect of PDP at the polls during gubernatorial elections in imo state between 2007 and 2016.

The research work was predicted on the theoritical framework of Elite power theory. The subject matter of the theory centres on categorisation of the society into elites and non elites on the bases that the ruling class who are the elites controls most of the wealth, power and prestige in the society. The method of data collection based on analysis of documentaries was used.

The study has five chapters, chapter one contains background of the study, statement of the problem, objective of the study, significance of the study; chapter two is the literature review; chapter three contains theoretical Framework and methodology; chapter four is data analysis and hypotheses testing while chapter five is summary, conclusion and recommendation.

Since the embracing of democracy in Nigeria, it is expected that the political parties must be democratic not only in their external affairs but also democratic internally in their organizational practices and behavior but rather the People’s Democratic party of Imo state has failed in upholding and adhering to the democratic principles both internally and externally in Imo state and as a result of it has led to instability and conflict in the country.

**5.2 Conclusion**

The paper examined some of the hindrances of internal democracy in Nigeria’s political parties especially in the People’s Democratic Party in imo state which has translated to political instability. These include, non-observance of the code of conduct document which all the political parties assented to and endorsed to guide their conduit and performance particularly during elections, the non-transparent system of choosing candidatesin primary elections as well as in party leadership executive positions, and the executive arrogance within the parties which have not only torn many parities apart but also occasioned the decampment of many party stalwarts.

Political parties are one of the institutions that carryout and actualize the democratic principles in any organized democratic society. They have to perform a number of ‘institutional guarantees’ to effectively discharge what is expected of them in any democracies. Intra-party democracy is one of the institutional requirements. Before a country can be sanitized and developed, there must be a number of internal sanitation and development in the prospective parties that look forward to form government in such society. According to Scarrow (2004), internal democracy describes a wide range of methods for including party members in intra-party deliberation and decision-making. Intra-party democracy is a very broad term describing a wide range of methods for including party members in intra-party deliberation and decision making. as parties using internally democratic procedures are likely to select more capable and appealing leaders, to have more responsive policies, and, as a result, to enjoy greater electoral success. moreover, parties that “practice what they preach,” in the sense of using internally democratic procedures for their deliberation and decisions, strengthen democratic culture generally.

 Nevertherless, the ideal of intra-party democracy has gained increasing attention in recent years because of its apparent potential to promote a “virtuous circle” linking ordinary citizens to government, benefiting the parties that adopt it, and more generally contributing to the stability and legitimacy of the democracies in which these parties compete for power. Unfortunately, the case of intra-party democracy in the People Democratic Party (PDP) cannot lay claim to democratic consolidation if it continues with the current mode of organizing her primaries and internal positions . Intra-party conflicts captures the reality of Nigeria’s political parties because political parties had become useful for variety of tasks that required control or communication since political party was initially invented for more limited and self-serving purpose. Hardly a political system adjudged democratic without the central placement of political parties in its political process. This is because it is important and necessary for political parties to have intra-party democracy since political parties are the major vehicles for the expression of an essential feature of the democratic process. By extension, the fate of democracy and the nature of the political system itself lies in the health and resilience of the party system. The idea is that parties must be democratic not only externally in the operations, but also internally in the organizational functions. Those who emphasize the participatory aspects of democracy place the most value on intra-party democracy as an end in itself. They see parties not primarily as intermediaries, but rather as incubators that nurture citizens’ political competence. To fulfill this role, parties’ decision making structures and processes should provide opportunities for individual citizens to influence the choices that parties offer to voters (see Omotola, 2010:125-145). These opportunities will help citizens expand their civic skills, and inclusive processes can boost the legitimacy of the alternatives they produce. In this way, party institutions can perform useful educative functions while also transferring power to broader sector of society. The interplay and action existing between parties and democracies should show the parties’ adherence to internal democratic structures .

Furthermore, this work examined the activities of Godfatherism in imo state and as a whole Nigeria as it contributes seriously towards the undermining of internal and external party democracy as a result of candidate imposition by the Godfathers during the party primaries as PDP has failed totally in upholding the principles of democracy in Nigeria politics. Democracy depends on parties to survive, since the structure of elections, from citizen participation to candidate selection and presentation of competing political programsare done by political parties. The role of political parties becomes viable when there is an orderly political succession in the society by regularizing the procedure for leadership succession and for assimilation of new groups into the political system through embracing of a true internal and external party democracy.

**5.3 Recommendations**

Based on the findings of the study we recommend that:

1. To avert the re-occurrences of party conflict and violence the political parties should be guided by the constitution of the country and electoral act and the electoral body in charge (INEC) should make sure that the law are obeyed as stipulated.
2. Political parties should embrace and encourage the practice of internal democracy as by so doing would reduce the activities of the party elites (godfathers) within the party and also ensure democratic consolidation.
3. Political parties should not see the political system as the property of any political party that occupies the system, because this is one of the greatest orientation of political parties in Nigeria.
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