

The book cover features a dark blue background with a large, light blue triangular shape pointing upwards from the bottom right. Inside this triangle, at the top, are silhouettes of a group of people standing. A large, light green arrow points upwards from the bottom right towards the silhouettes. The title 'ABC of POLITICAL IDEAS' is centered on the cover. 'ABC' is in large, bold, green letters with a white outline. 'of' is in a smaller, italicized, white script font. 'POLITICAL IDEAS' is in bold, orange letters with a white outline.

# ABC *of* POLITICAL IDEAS

INNOCENT U OKAFOR  
FRANCISCA O. IFEDI

# ABC of Political Ideas

Innocent Okafor (Ph.D)  
Francisca O. Ifedi (Ph.D)

@ 2022

All right reserve. No part of this publication may be reproduced, transmitted, store in a retrieval system or transmitted into any language or computer language in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, magnetic chemical, thermal, manual or otherwise without the prior consent of the author.

Printed by  
San Press Ltd.  
13 Isuochi Street, Uwani Enugu  
08033169079

## *Foreword*

Dr. Okafor and Dr. Ifedi were my colleagues at the doctoral class in the Department of Political Science, University of Nigeria, Nsukka. Both have high pedigree for intellectual development. They have been engaged in teaching and research since graduation and so are eminently qualified to write a book on Political Ideas, an area that is the fulcrum of political science education.

The ABC of Political Ideas as the title indicates and as demonstrated by the authors brings out the tenets of political ideas and thoughts of formidable political thinkers and theorists in providing the prelude for development of modern society. Ideas generally guide and rule the world else most political practices will end up in mere abstraction and therefore, unscientific. The users of this book will be exposed to the fundamental issues that surround the organization and management of modern society as they go through the etymological foundation of the concepts and terms as developed by the pathfinders.

This ten-chapter publication is particularly relevant not only to Political Science students but also to students of the Social Sciences as a whole. The book will also be of immense value to the general public especially, the policy formulators who can derive inspiration from it as necessary guideline for policy enactment and execution.

I particularly want to draw attention to Chapters 3 and 10 which dealt with forms of government especially, democracy, integration and globalization. The discourse on democracy for instance, exposed the invention of the



concept as far back as 422 BC by Cleon and the inherent features of this form of government. Such features depict the institutions of democracy that derive its practice which aids its universal acceptance as one of the modest forms of government. The contentions associated with the electoral verdict in the 2020 Presidential election of United States – a state that is usually considered as a model of democracy in the contemporary world demonstrate the imperative of strong institutions and credible democratic culture over strong individual. It was such institutional orientation that ensured the peaceful transition of power from Donald Trump (Republican) to Joe Biden (Democrat) on 20 January, 2021, despite initial attempts by Donald Trump to avert the electoral verdict through the court system and civil disobedience. The reactions of Americans showed that democratic institution in its true sense is stronger than any person no matter the position occupied by such a fellow. If Trump had had his way, democratic ideas and principles may have been destroyed globally and the world would have been left with no reference point as a model of this form of government.

On integration and globalization, the book exposed the strength of the globalization process in integrating the entire world into a global village through the information super highways and the World Wide Web (WWW) mechanism. It also stressed the interdependence of the communities, countries and regions across the globe and communicates this interdependence in such a manner that facilitates easy appreciation and understanding by the readers.



Finally, I want to congratulate Okafor and Ifedi for this authoritative and incisive work in ABC of Political Ideas. I strongly recommend this book to all categories of students and the general public in Nigeria and developing world.

C. Nna-Emeka Okereke Ph.D  
National Defence College  
Abuja

# *Preface*

Man is saddled with myriad of political activities. In order to find explicit explanation to his political activities, he invented political ideas. It is, therefore, political ideas that provide the principles that guide political activities. That is why, he has been described as a political animal. This implies that a synergy exists between political ideas and political activities. Remove political ideas, political activities will be empty and without political activities, political ideas will end up as mere conjecture. The need, therefore, for an incisive discussion of political ideas cannot be over-emphasized. This constitutes a primary motivating factor for writing this book.

Secondly, the dearth of political ideas text in social sciences especially, political science, has been a source of great concern not only to the students and scholars in the discipline, but also to policy makers in our clan or environment. The need for this type of book therefore, becomes imperative.

Another justification for this book lies in the fact that most of the available texts in political ideas for teaching and research are scattered all over many text books instead of being found in a composite text of this nature. Thus, this book sets out to remedy the lacuna.

Innocent U. Okafor and  
Franscica O. Ifedi

# Chapter

# 1

## *Introduction*

Political ideas may be used as a collective designation for all perspectives of politics in a polity. This means that all forms of political ideas on all conceivable linguistic levels, from individual concepts to elaborate arguments, from emotively loaded statements to cognitive observations, and from simple descriptions of immediately observable phenomena to general theories of the nature of the state and the course of history form the nexus of political ideas.

Human perceptions of these phenomena are usually described in words such as political opinions, ideologies, doctrines, programmes or opinions. In this context, legal codes, rules of political ethics, and similar norm systems, as well as the concepts of models, and theories of political science, must necessarily be placed within the general category of perceptions about political ideas.

It is axiomatic that ideas rule the world. So, political ideas in all ramifications have attempted to lay the structures and processes in which modern states are organized. The ideas of teleological thinkers in their various writings provided the litmus test. Instances abound in the works of such thinkers like Plato, Cleon, Social Contract theorists – Hobbes, Rousseau, and Locke, Marx Weber, and Karl Marx.



Plato in his Republic envisaged a just society where he underscored the availability of a just man as a prelude to accomplishing the ideal society in which a philosopher-king presides over the affairs of man. He thus, prescribed the idea of division of labour vis-a-vis specialization and skill to be deployed by the just man.

Cleon in his political idea in 422 BC conceived democracy as "government of the people, by the people, for the people". Today, democracy is not only a universal lexicon but also the global minimum standard by which modern government is organized.

In a related development, the ideas of Thomas Hobbes, Jean Jacque Rousseau, and John Locke provided the structure of modern state, where the state is seen as a social contract because, the people in search of the protection of their lives and property surrendered their sovereignty to the state. This implies that, the inability of the state to guarantee the perceived protection or security amounts to failure of the contract.

Similarly, Marx Weber developed the idea of bureaucracy. Today, the thought provided the foundation for the structure and organization of the civil service.

Karl Marx visualized classless society in the Communist Manifesto. His ideas laid the inspiration for the Bolshevik Revolution of October, 1917 led by V.I. Lenin. The revolution threw up the socialist model in the annals of political economy.

Martin Luther King Junior conceived the liberation struggle against racial segregation and discrimination in the United States. The struggle culminated in his "I have a dream

speech". The dream after many decades manifested in the emergence of Barack Obama – a black American as the 44th president of USA.

The implication of these analogies is to demonstrate the relevance of political ideas in shaping the scope and structure of the society. In terms of conceptualization, therefore, political ideas can be better appreciated thus: Political ideas is one of the fundamental area of the discipline – political science. Many argue that the entire edifice of the discipline is based on it, as no comprehension of any other in any meaningful manner is possible without an understanding of political ideas.

Political ideas generally, rest on the efforts of the designers of modern society who in their various teleological thinking provided the condition in which modern society can be developed for the purposes of satisfying the basic demands of modern man. Thus, through the writings of the ancient political philosophers, the conditionalities for an orderly society were provided.

For comprehending the intricacies of contemporary political ideas, the starting point is the classical tradition. In understanding the pedagogy of political ideas, a dissection and continual reinterpretation of the classics in political ideas is an important exercise. Ever since Plato raised the question: "what is a just society?" in the Republic, the debate about the nature and meaning of good and just order continues. The classical tradition that began with Plato ended with Hegel. It is perhaps, on this premise that the issue of political ideas surrounds the entire discipline of political science where it traditionally extends to politics per se – actual politics and man's perceptions of it.

In actual politics are found, inter alia, such phenomena as political institutions, structures, processes, occurrences, and behaviours. The human perceptions of these phenomena entails issues earlier raised in this section. Perceptions about actual politics accordingly encompasses individual concepts of the type of "government and political system", cognitive convictions as to what is real, possible or necessary as well as emotive convictions as to what is desirable, forbidden or commanded. The essence is to exploit proper diagnosis for effective synthesis and evaluation of the phenomenon – political ideas.

In chapter two, the idea of modern state was examined. From the perspective of social contract, the thoughts of the leading exponents like Thomas Hobbes, Jean Jacques Rousseau and John Locke were examined. Drawing inference from the views of these theorists, it was established that modern state emerged to address the inherent social problems that confronted man in the state of nature. Among such problems are, security and other vices. Thus, man in the social contract surrendered his sovereignty to constituted authority so as to address the lacuna in the state of nature. The chapter concluded by examining the features and functions of modern state.

Chapter three, proceeded to look into the forms of government that have been created to see to the affairs of modern state. It principally examined monarchy and democracy. A great portion of the chapter was devoted to democracy because of its universalization and global acceptance in the contemporary society.

The doctrines of rule of law and separation of powers were examined in chapter four. The focus of these ideas centered on the fact that modern state is governed by rule of law and never "rule of man". As such, the institutions or organs of



government are expected to operate based on the principle of separation of powers so as to guarantee peace, justice and progress in the modern state.

In chapter five, the concepts of ideology and bureaucracy were reviewed. Emphases were laid on their philosophical and etymological development in relation to the development and growth of modern society.

Chapter six examined Karl Max's ideas and the revolutionary trend. The essence is to explore the evolutionary character of the contemporary society.

Chapter seven proceeded to examine the idea of diplomacy. It underscores the fact that the global society is made up of comity of states. As such, diplomatic practices become inevitable for their effective interactions.

In chapter eight, international organizations were explored; its classifications – traditional and modern were examined in order to assess the relevance of political institutions in contemporary global politics.

Chapter nine analyzed concepts of power and elitism. It examined the tenets of the two concepts and established the integral relationship between the two. It further explored their theoretical perspectives in elaborating issues of political ideas as it affects the manipulation and control of the society by the elite class.

Today, modern society is adjudged a global village. To test this assertion, chapter ten, undertook the examination of integration and globalization.

# Chapter

## 2

### *State As A Social Contract*

Among the numerous questions which political thinkers raised are: how did the modern state emerge? Have men always lived under some form of political organization? If they have not, what are the causes or those things that brought about the original establishment of Government (State)? In view of the above questions, there are many political ideas and/or theories concerning the origin of the state. Among such theories or ideas are: the social contract perspective, the divine right theory, the force theory, the patriarchal theory, the matriarchal theory and the evolutionary theory. For the purpose of this book, we shall restrict ourselves to the social contract ideas only. Notable among the social contract thinkers are: Thomas Hobbes, Jean Jacque Rousseau, and John Locke.

#### Thomas Hobbes (1588 – 1679)

Hobbes was born in 1588 and died in 1679. Hobbes was an English man who lived in days of the civil war (1642–1651). This fact is germane in explaining the nature of his political ideas.

Hobbes begins his political inquiry (*The Leviathan*, 1651) with an analysis of human nature. According to him, man is essentially selfish. He believed that man is moved to action

not by his intellect or reason, but by his appetites, desires and passions. Men living without any common power set over them, that is, in a state of nature, would be in that condition which is called warred; and such a warred, as is of every man against every man. Indeed, not war in the organized sense but a perpetual struggle of all against all, competition, diffidence and love of glory being the three main causes. Law and justice are absent. He concludes on a pessimistic note that the life of man is "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short".

In other words, the life of man in the state of nature was so insecure that life and property, the possession of man were nowhere safe because, it was all life of war against all where survival of the fittest reigns supreme. For instance, Mr. A must have acquired all manner of wealth and when he meets Mr. B who is stronger than he is, he surrenders all he has acquired to him because, might is right and frustrating in state of nature. As a result of the high level of insecurity and brutal nature of man, man begins to seek for a way to enter into contract with a fellow man, with a view to protecting his life and property. Such contract laid therefore, the fundamental of government where a leviathan king was authorized to oversee the affairs of man according to the contract rules. The leviathan oftentimes was extraordinary human being in terms of size and strength and so was dreaded by every man in the community. In Hobbes thinking, where a leviathan king was not easily found, the similar authority of the King was vested in an assembly of men.

Hobbes recognizes that even in the primitive, natural state, there are in some sense, laws of nature whose utility is self-preservation. In the liberty each man hath to preserve his own life. In essence, these laws are: to seek peace and follow it; to relinquish the right to all things which being retained



hinders the peace of mankind; and to perform their covenants made.

The only way to peace is for men to give up so much of their natural rights as are inconsistent with living in peace. In effect, a supreme coercive power is instituted. The contracting parties are not the community and the government, but subject and subject. Every man says to every other:

*I authorize and give up my right of governing myself to this man or to this assembly of men (government) on this condition that thou give up thy right to him and authorize all his actions in like manner (Mahajan, 1988 P.228-229)*

A state is thus created – modern state. This demonstration shows that men voluntarily gave to themselves certain rules and regulations that will guide the conduct of everybody in the modern state. This is known as social contract because, they provided for themselves the agreement that bound them together. A deviation from the social contract leads to punishment of the victim as prescribed by the contract laws.

The implication of the new state rests on the under listed:

1. The government is sovereign, and the sovereign's power is absolute for:

- i. the sovereign's power is not held "on condition" since the sovereign is the result of the pact, not a party to it.
- ii. the pact is not revocable at the pleasure of the subjects.
- iii. men surrender all their rights to the sovereign.

- iv. as the sovereign embodies in himself the wills of all, his actions are virtually their actions, on the principle that "whosoever acts through his agent, acts through himself.
- v. the anti-social instincts of man are too insistent to be checked except by absolute authority.

2. Sovereignty is inalienable, for it is essential to civil government that there should be no power in the state strong enough to gainsay the sovereign. For the same reason, sovereignty is indivisible and the sovereign is unpunishable. The sovereign is judge of what is necessary for the peace and defence of his subjects and judge of what doctrines are fit to be taught. He has the right of making rules whereby each subject may know to what personal property he is entitled. He has the right of judicature, of making war and peace, of choosing counselors, of rewarding, honouring and punishing.

Hobbes is aware that the sovereign thus defined need not necessarily be one man; sovereign may be located in an assembly. Hobbes, thus, bases an absolute state on free contract and consent.

### **Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712 – 1778)**

Rousseau had definite and seminal ideas which gave credence to the origin of modern state. In his thinking, Rousseau conceived man in the state of nature as essentially good and sympathetic. This optimistic view is contained in his thesis/book "The Social Contract and Emile".

To Rousseau, "every individual had unlimited liberty in the state of nature. There was no private property, no competition and no jealousy. Every individual lived the free life of a savage. He knew neither right nor wrong and was away from all notions of virtue and vice. There was innocence everywhere. This is, to say, that man in the state

of nature unlike the Hobbesian perspective is neither brutal nor wicked.

With the passage of time, things changed in the state of nature. The increase in population and dawn of reason were mainly responsible for the change. Simplicity and happiness disappeared. People started thinking in terms of mine and thine. In the words of Rousseau, "the first man who after enclosing a piece of ground, bethought himself to say "this is mine", and found people simple enough to believe him, was the real founder of civil society".

The implication here, is that as the population of man continued to expand, competition came in because communalism was no longer satisfying the people's need, hence, the quest for individualism and personal possession gathered momentum. As the desire for personal possession gained ground, selfish interest and envy surfaced and so man began to think how to dominate one another. Thus, paving way for social vices like brutality and annihilation of man by man.

Following this level of development, life became intolerable and insecure. There were wars and killings everywhere. The demand or search at this point was to find a form of association that would protect the life and property of the people and in virtue of which everyone while uniting himself to all remains as free as before (state of nature). Thus, social contract became inevitable to address the social problems.

### **Social Contract**

By social contract, everyone surrendered to the community all his rights and this brought about community (the state) that possessed the authority to direct and control the affairs and rights of man. This informed Rousseau's dictum "man is born free and everywhere he is in chains".



The social contract brought into focus the law that was passed by the sovereign. The sovereign fundamentally established the government which laid down the provision for the appointment of the governors that would see to the implementation or execution of the law (contract).

Rousseau identified sovereignty with the general will or the common interests of the community. The community, therefore, becomes sovereign. Principally, the will of the individual may conflict with that of the general will of the community which constitutes the sovereign, invariably, the social pact necessarily involves a tacit agreement that anyone refusing to conform to the general will shall be forced to do so by the whole body politic, that is, "shall be forced to be free", since the universal conformity to the general will is the guarantee to each individual of freedom from dependence on any other person or persons.

#### **Rousseau's Distinction of State and Government**

Rousseau made a distinction between the state and government. According to him, a state denotes the community as a whole created by the social contract and manifesting itself in the supreme general will, while a government denotes merely the individual or group of individuals that are designated by the community to carry into effect the sovereign will.

The government according to Rousseau is an intermediary between the sovereign state and the subjects. It is a subordinate agency through which the sovereign people express their will and realize it. No form of government he posits is ideal. An individual can resist the government but not the state. The social contract creates not the government but the state which is sovereign. In other words, the government is created by a decree of the sovereign to serve

as a means of complying with the general will. It is an agent of the sovereign who can change it. This means that the government does not make laws but merely administers them. Rousseau's view of government can be likened to that of the executive side of a modern government whose power may be withdrawn or modified by the sovereign legislature. The laws represent the general will and therefore, every state ruled by law, whatever its form of government, is a republic.

### **John Locke (1632 -1704)**

The political idea of John Locke rests squarely on his flair for constitutionalism which made him an ardent advocate of constitutional monarchy. His views were demonstrated in his famous book entitled "Two Treatises on Civil Government", that was published in 1689. In the book, Locke consistently used the term "in the consent of the people" and this formed the theme of Locke's theory. Like Hobbes, Locke also begins his essay with a description of the state of nature. However, his views differ from those of Hobbes.

### **Locke's Concept of Human Nature**

Locke considered human beings as decent fellows, far removed from the quarrelsome, competitive and selfish creatures of Hobbes imagination. To Locke, desire is the main spring of all human acts and a feeling of pleasure comes when desire is satisfied. Locke established further that the object of human action is the acquisition of pleasure and the avoidance of pain. Unlike Hobbes, Locke believed clearly in the goodness of human nature. In his words: "Men are basically decent, orderly and society-loving, capable of ruling themselves. They are rational and social". To him, the individual can live in a moral way even without the state. Man by nature is endowed with the light of reason which Locke describes as "the spark of divine nature".

The state of nature of John Locke was not a state of war. It was one of peace, goodwill, mutual assistance and preservation and was somewhat, somehow, characterized by inconvenience. This was due to the absence of an established and known law with the attendant adjudicator or judge to interpret the law. This scenario led to the individual's interpretation of the law of nature in accordance with his whims and caprices. This implies, in effect, that each individual was obliged to work out his own interpretation. Thus, life in the Locke's state of nature was engulfed with fears and continual dangers, hence, insecurity, just like in Hobbes state of nature became imminent.

On the above premise therefore, life in the state of nature became so fraught with inconvenience as the individual had to interpret the law for himself and had also to enforce it without the help of a constituted authority.

Although, Locke's, state of nature, was, endowed with liberty, yet it was not a state of license, that man in that state had uncontrollable liberty to intentionally either harm himself or any other person and even the creatures within his possession. The result was that the people obeyed the laws of nature and lived peacefully but was along the line confronted with the problem of absence of fixed laws and constituted interpreter. Following this development, the need for a constituted authority became imperative.

### **Social Contract (State and Government)**

Locke gave an insight into the emergence of civil Society/ State and Government through the provisions for two contracts – Social and Governmental. According to him, Social contract leads to formation of civil society and the governmental contract brought about the creation of government. The social contract put an end to the primitive state of nature. Society is organized to guarantee civil liberty



for the purposes of protecting life and property. This means that the demand for state or political society was necessitated by the inconvenience of the state of nature.

The demand for the political society was informed by threefold factors, viz: first, the need for an established, settled, known law, received and allowed by common consent to be the standard of right and wrong and, the common measure to decide all controversies; second, the need for a known and disinterested judge, with authority to determine all differences according to the established law; third, the need for power to back and support the sentence when right and to give it due execution (Appadorai, 1975 p.25).

Locke's civil society/state emerged therefore, through the medium of a contract in which each individual agrees with every other to voluntarily surrender to the community the natural right of enforcing the law of reason, with a view to having the life, liberty and property preserved. Anybody who flouts the agreement of the society is liable to be punished by the society. Emphasizing further on the social contract, Locke demonstrated that each individual gave up his right of interpreting and enforcing the law of nature. Only that right and not all the natural rights, according to Locke, was surrendered to the community as a whole.

It is noteworthy that the governmental contract preceded the social contract. Here, the people in their corporate capacity entered into the contract. The governmental contract empowered some persons through the consent of the community to legislate and interpret any agreement within the context of the law of nature, decide disputes and enforce laws, hence, the personnel in the government were given the legal authority to support the action of government. The government then became a party to the contract and became



bound by the terms of the contract. In this contract, sovereignty essentially, resides with the people that possessed the inalienable rights to dismiss the government if it acts ultra vires to the trust bestowed on it. Thus, Locke made the consent of the people the source of all government authority. In his impulse:

*The community perpetually retains a supreme power of saving themselves from attempts and designs of anybody. Wherever they shall be so foolish or so wicked as to lay and carry on designs against the liberties and properties of the subject, whenever anyone shall go about to bring them to slavish conditions, they will always have a right to rid themselves of those who invade this fundamental, sacred and unalterable law of self-preservation (Locke, 1924 p.72)*

The governmental contract is subordinate to social contract because, it has a limited power restricted to the legislative and judicative functions. The government is like a trustee. If it fails in the contract responsibilities, the people have the right to dismiss it and replace it with a new body. In this way, Locke became a leading advocate of limited or constitutional monarchy.

From the perspective of the social contract, modern states have been defined from many thoughts: Chinoy (1964), for instance, sees modern state as those institutions that establish who shall possess the monopoly of the legitimate use of physically force within a given territory, and that defines how the Power which rests upon that monopoly shall be organized and used. The person who exercises this Power composes the government.

To Laski (1961), state is a territorial society divided into government and subjects claiming within its allowed physical area, a supremacy over all institutions. He proceeded to infer that the state is in fact the final legal depository of social will. It sets the perspective of all other organizations. It brings within its power all forms of human activities, the control of which it deems desirable.

### Attributes of a State

There are four basic features of a modern state. These include:

(1) People: The people constitute a basic element of the state since the state as a social organization cannot be devoid of human beings – men and women. State is in existence when a people is settled in a country under its own sovereign government.

(2) Definite Territory: Modern state occupies definite territory that is usually known as part of that particular state. It possesses a geographical boundary or entity that distinguishes it from another state. The size of the territory is an important determinant of the viability of the state in terms of resources.

(3) Government: Modern state is a product of social contract. Thus, the people surrender their sovereignty to a constituted authority. The constituted authority in question is the modern day government. So, government is the machinery by which the state maintains itself, pursues and executes its objectives. It is a small group of men that directs the affairs of the state. Laski (1961), captured it right in his assertion that government is a body of persons within the territorial society that is entitled to use coercion to see that the imperatives are obeyed. In the Contemporary era, government emerges

either through a peaceful democratic process (periodic election) or a revolution (coup d'etat).

(4) Sovereignty: Sovereignty is an attribute of modern state that gives the state legal authority in all domestic matters and in its relations with other states. It is also the unlimited political authority of the state that is subject to no higher power as regards the making and enforcing of political decisions. Sovereignty in the international system is the claim by the state to full self-government. On this premise, Jean Bodin, the 16th century French Lawyer and political thinker did not hesitate to observe that sovereignty is the absolute and perpetual power of the state, that is, the greatest power to command. This means that, sovereignty bestows on modern state the sole authority and the only effective power within a given territory. The state is perpetual, indivisible and inalienable, and it is the supreme power over citizens and subjects, unrestrained by law. In other words, the sovereign authority cannot be surrendered or delegated.

Sovereignty is generally classified into internal and external dimensions. The internal dimension has to do with the internal supremacy of the state, that is, *de jure* recognition, while the external aspect deals with external independence, that is, *de facto* recognition. So, a state can only be said to be sovereign if it is independent, that is, being free from external control. To have gained independence from an imperial master or a metropolitan government denotes the status of modern sovereign state. For instance, while Britain and its colonial territories like Nigeria and Ghana, made up the British Empire, before their independence. The same territories on attainment of independence in 1960 and 1957 respectively, were by international law, equals with Britain in the comity of states hence, the birth of the British Commonwealth of Nations.



## Functions of Modern State

Modern state is saddled with certain responsibilities so as to address the lacuna that prevailed in the state of nature. In Marxian thought, these responsibilities have been captured from two perspectives of politics – Low and High. The arena designated as Low Politics covers social services. These services are issues that deal with welfare functions. Among them are: the provision of road networks which enable the people to access their environment. It denotes the construction of rails and bridges and even extends to the building of sea and airports that guarantee the free movement from one place to another or from one region to another and even to access modern global system through the sea and air transportation. Others include: the provision of Medicare, that is, health facilities, electrification, that is, energy or power for industrialization and other domestic uses, water (pipe), market, to mention a few.

The area of High Politics deals with the issue of security for the protection of life and property of the citizenry from internal and external aggression. To do this effectively, modern state keeps and maintains security agencies like the military, police force, and other para-military organizations. Every modern state keeps these security institutions. A state like Costa Rica that has no military organization depends on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) for protection against external security threat.

Another important function of modern state is the issue of international relations. Modern states constitute the contemporary global system and as such interact with one another from time to time. No state is an Island because no state is so self-sufficient that it can provide all its needs. It needs the co-operation and assistance of other states to complement its deficiencies. To do this effectively, modern



states formulate foreign policies to guide its interaction with other states.

Fundamentally, foreign policy has four basic objectives. These are, "security, welfare, autonomy and status/prestige" (Holsti, 1995 p.84). A proper scrutiny of these objectives indicates the role of national interests in foreign policy goals. This is in tandem with the assertion that foreign policy is the continuation of domestic policy. At the domestic level for instance, every state needs security so as to safeguard its citizenry from internal and external invasion.

In the contemporary era, the idea of welfare state demands a huge number of responsibilities from the state for maximizing economic growth, for minimizing unemployment, and for providing a variety of services that enhance the quality of life and economic and personal opportunities of all citizens. The failure of modern state to provide social services would amount to discontentment among the citizenry. Such scenario may lead to the rejection of the government in power by the next democratic exercise or outright uprising against the state.

Autonomy bestows on every modern state the power to exercise authority and control over the subjects. It demands the ability to formulate and execute domestic and external policies in terms of government's own priorities. It is the capacity to withstand influence, coercion, or domination by others.

Another value that appears to permeate every modern state is status and prestige. States seek to generate defence, respect and sometimes awe in the comity of states due to its military prowess and might. Many foreign policies reflect or incorporate these values.

# Chapter

## 3

### *Forms of Government*

#### A. Democracy

Democracy which is a form of government appears today to be a system by which modern states should organize their governments. In terms of the origin, it is necessary to note that the idea of democracy developed from the Greek city-states principally inspired by the ancient philosopher, Cleon, who declared in 422 BC, "that shall be democratic which shall be of the people, by the people, for the people" (Mahajan, 1988 p.793). This idea gave credence to President Abraham Lincoln's definition of democracy as "the government of the people, by the people and for the people".

Fundamentally, the word "democracy" is a combination of two Greek words "demo and kratos", where the latter (kratos) is the rule while the former (demo) is the people. This means that from the Greek perspective, democracy means, "rule by the people". So, it is a system of government in the Greek city-states where the decisions on matters of policy and on the laws which are to put that policy into effect are made by the people themselves.

In the democratic city-states of the 5th century BC such as Athens, all the adult male citizens used to meet together in an assembly in which issues of policy were debated,

decisions were taken, and laws were executed. No citizen could then claim that policies were being foisted on the community against his will.

By 7th Century BC, democracy in the Greek city-states assumed a new dimension through development of a new voting pattern – voice votes. Following the expansion of the old and modern states due to population explosion, it became increasingly impossible to assemble all adults in a particular place for decision on matters that affect them. Thus, taken cognizance of the popularity and universalization of democracy in our contemporary society, it becomes unimaginable to assemble in a country like USA with a population of over 3000,000,000 and Nigeria, with a population of about 280,000,000 in a particular place for a collective decision in the name of democracy. It is as a result of these complexities that the idea of representative democracy emanated.

Principally, representative democracy developed in England around 1250 and 1650 AD, as an alternative approach to the problem of ensuring that policy decisions were made as far as possible in accordance with the popular will of the people. Representative democracy therefore, presents the idea or empowers the people to choose representatives of their own choice to sit together in a national assembly or parliament or congress, to take decisions on their behalf. Through this process, any decision taken by the representatives appears to be the collective decision of the entire citizenry since the people through their individual will empowered the representative to speak on their behalf.

Today, representative democracy is built in almost all the countries of the world on two national capacities. For instance, in the USA with the presidential system, the Congress is made up of the upper and lower chambers –

Senate and House of Representatives, where the composition of the Senate is 100 while that of House of Representatives is 435 and in Nigeria with presidential system too, the National Assembly is made up of the upper and lower chambers – The Senate and House of Representatives, where the Senate is composed of 109 Senators, where 3 Senators represent each of the 36 states and Federal Capital Territory with one, whereas the House of Representatives is composed of 360 members representing the various federal constituencies.

### Features or Principles of Democracy

Democracy and/or Representative Democracy is built on essential attributes for smooth operation and efficacy. Among these major attributes are:

1. **Tolerance and Compromise:** This attribute is very important for the smooth operation of democracy because, democracy involves the concept of majority rule and the acquiescence of the minority in the decision of the majority. If either presses its demands at the expense of the other, democracy becomes difficult to operate. Such a temper can exist in a society only if there is a general agreement on fundamentals among the members thereof. The parlance "majority carries the vote" in democracy can only work when there is tolerance and compromise among the people, especially if the processes that led to the decision were transparent and fair enough.

2. **Rule of Law:** This implies equality of all citizens under the law. For the efficacy of democracy in a society, the constitution of the state must guarantee this very important element. In effect, democracy has to be played according to the constitution of the land.



The use of force or coercion under democratic process can lead to anarchy and chaos which must be resisted or frowned at by the people. The beauty of democracy rests on the general will and not on might. The constitution of the land has to lay down procedures for change of government.

**3. Party System:** The existence of political parties in a democratic setting provides the basis for the operation of democracy. The party system preferably multipartism, (that is multi-party system) provides the people with the opportunity to make their choice under a party umbrella from among the numerous candidates that will present themselves for the election. Through this, the possibility of an alternative government becomes feasible as the people can easily change the party in power when they become disgusted with the ruling party.

**4. Periodic Election:** To guarantee peoples' participation in a representative government, general election has to be organized from time to time so as to enable the people have a fair contribution in the government decisions through their representatives. For instance, if the constitution prescribes a long interval between one election and the next, the electorate will have very little real control over the assembly. If on the other hand, elections are held at too frequent intervals, say once a year, the country will be almost continuously in the grip of election fever, and the assembly will busy itself only with short-term policies, which will produce results before the next election is due, hence, moderate electoral period is always recommended. For example, in Nigeria, it is every 4 years, in USA, it is every 4 years for presidential election, and 6 years for senatorial election, in Angola, every 5 years, in Canada, every 4 years, in Britain, every 5 years.

5. **Free and Fair Elections:** Voters should have the opportunity of choosing the people they wish to represent them in a free and fair election. They must therefore, have genuine freedom of choice. Any eligible candidate should be allowed to stand for an election without hindrance, and the voter must feel free to vote for anyone without fear of unpleasant consequences. This implies, that voters must be free to vote according to their conscience without coercion or pressure from any quarter.

6. **Public Opinion:** This attribute calls for the opinion of the people on government policies and programs. Since democracy is the people's government, the people must have the freedom to express their views on the activities of the government, either by criticism or praise. They can place their demands and support for the government through the medium of public opinion.

### CHALLENGES OF MODERN DEMOCRACY

In spite of the universalization of democracy in our contemporary world through the orchestrated jingle for its adoption by the United Nations and United States, this form of government according to Encyclopedia Britannica (2020 p.16-18), is today confronted with some observable challenges. Among these are:

1) **Inequality of Resources:** In our modern world, decentralization of economy seems to propel the political economy of nations but when they are not sufficiently regulated by the government, such economies would eventually end up in producing large inequalities in economic and social resources, from wealth and income to education and social status. For the fact that those with greater resources [that is, the "haves" (bourgeoisie)] naturally tend to use them to influence the political system to their advantage, the existence of such inequalities constitute a

persistent obstacle to the achievement of a satisfactory level of political equality, especially in the states where the democratic institutions are weak. This scenario is commonly observed in the developing and third world economies, hence, democratic values in such countries are most of the time manipulated.

2) Immigration: After the Second World War in 1945, immigration to the countries of Western Europe, Australia and the United States, both legal and illegal, increased geometrically. This development was informed by the search for better economic conditions and security. Immigrants from the developing countries most of the time take up menial jobs in service industries and agriculture. Difference in languages, culture and appearance between immigrants and the citizens of the host country, as well as the usually widespread perception that immigrants take jobs away from citizens and use expensive social services often times fan the embers of hatred and subsequent racial discrimination. This in turn leads to anti-immigrant sentiments. Sometimes, the anti-immigrant sentiments contribute to the emergence of radical political movements and parties, such as the National Front in France, the Republicans in Germany, the Militia and various white supremacist groups in the United States, and the Skinhead movement in the United States and Britain.

Some of such organizations led to the growth and development of racist or neo-fascist doctrines that were hostile not only to immigrants but also to fundamental political and human rights and even to democracy itself. In 2016, and 2020, the anti-immigrant sentiment played a huge role in the electoral victory and exit of US former president, Donald Trump.

3) Terrorism: Acts of terrorism, widely committed today across the globe has posed serious threat to security. In the



United States for instance, remarkably few terrorist attacks had taken place before the 2001 bombing of the World Trade Centre in New York. The deadliest single act of terrorism in human history was recorded in September 11, 2001. In the attack, the World Trade Centre (now World Trade Organization) in New York and the United States Military base, the Pentagon were destroyed. Over 3000 people were killed in the attack.

In response to such events and especially, in the wake of the September 11 attacks, democratic governments adopted various measures designed to enhance the ability of Police and other law-enforcement agencies to protect their countries against terrorism. Some of these initiatives or measures entail restriction policies on citizens, civil, and political liberties. Most of the time, such restrictions are unconstitutional or otherwise inconsistent with democratic principles.

4) International Systems: After the first and second world wars in 1918 and 1945, the focus of both the theory and the practice of democracy shifted from the small association of the city-states. Although, their increased size enabled democracies to solve more of the problems they confronted, there remained some problems that not even the largest democracy could solve by itself. To address these problems, several international organizations were established after World War II, most notable of which is the United Nations Organisation (1945).

These organizations posed two related challenges to democracy. First, by shifting ultimate control of a country's policies in a certain area to the international level, they reduced to a corresponding extent the influence that citizens could exert on such policies through democratic means.



Secondly, all international organizations including those that were formally accountable to national governments lacked the political institutions of representative democracy. The United Nations which has been driving the campaign for the globalization of democracy is a victim of its campaign. For instance, the permanent membership composition of the Security Council of the UN which is the supreme organ of the organization does not in any way reflect democratic aspiration as the five permanent members of the council has remained unchanged with veto power since its inception 76 years ago. The implication of this is that UN orchestrated jingle for democracy is only a lip-service because in practice, most of the policies of the UN are not arrived at through democratic principles rather through Veto and Resolutions.

### **B. Fascism**

The concept of fascism is a political idea that has its root from Italy. Etymologically, it is a movement that can be traced to the Latin word *fascis* which means a group or cluster. It is used for a cluster of plants or branches which grow stronger by being thus bound together. A *fascis* of sticks with an axe in their midst was carried by the Roman lictors before the Roman consuls and represented the authority of the state. It was from the lictors' *fascis* that the Italian fascists derived their emblem. This implies that the theory of fascism is primarily an Italian product that evolved to justify the fascist movement.

The contemporary development of fascism was systematized by Benito Mussolini in Italy in 1919. Thus, in Mussolini's words, "fascism is based on reality, bolshevism (the great October, 1917 Russian Revolution) is based on theory. We do not want to be definite and real. We want to come out of the cloud of discussion and theory. Again, my programme is action not talk". This development gave birth to fascism in Italy immediately after the First World War. Although, Italy

was one of the victors of the war, she was deprived of the gains of victory by the Treaty of Versailles of 1919. Mussolini exhorted the masses to embrace this system of government and consequently formed a movement in March 1919 which by 1921 had metamorphosed into a political party. In October 1922, the Fascists marched on Rome. The democratic government of Italy was not able to withstand the onslaught, and so the King of Italy invited Mussolini to form the government.

This scenario gave credence to the definitions of fascism as provided by: (i) Florence Elliot who sees it as "a nationalist, anti-communist and authoritarian political creed by Benito Mussolini in Italy in 1919". (ii) A Political Science Dictionary, defines fascism as "a political system of extreme right, which incorporates the principles of the leader, a one-party state, totalitarian regimentation of economic and social activity and the arbitrary exercise of absolute power by the regime". (iii) Mario Einaud perceives fascism as being used primarily to identify the political system by which Italy was ruled from 1922 to 1945. It was also used to identify a prototype of totalitarianism and it applied to variations of political systems thought to parallel the Italian one.

### Salient Features of Fascism

The features or characteristics of fascism are embedded in its philosophy that are totalitarian and authoritarian in nature. Among the features are:

1. The Fascists Glorified the State which was Regarded as an End in Itself. To Mussolini, government meant "everything within the state, nothing against the state, nothing outside the state". The Fascists view was that the state was an independent entity with a real will of its own. They regarded the state as a spiritual being. The state is all and all, hence, it has a truly sovereign authority that dominates all the forces

in the country and which at the same time is in constant contact with the masses, guiding their sentiments, educating them, and looking after their interests. It is totalitarian in nature and so, repudiates individualism.

In this concept of government, the conduct of life cannot be left to the individual choice of the people; it must, instead, be determined for them by a power which is above them and comprehends them, viz, the state. The state must preside over and direct national activity in every field, and no organization, whether political, moral or economic, can remain outside it "All within the state; none outside the state; none against the state. As the Fascist Charter of Labour in Italy puts it: "The Italian nation is an organism having ends, life, and means of action superior to those of the separate individuals or groups of individuals which compose it. It is a moral, political, and economic unity that is integrally realized in the Fascist state".

**2. Human Inequality:** Fascism does not believe in human equality. Ebenstein writes, "the denial of basic human equality is a common denominator of all Fascist movements and states. True enough, democratic societies do not always live up to the ideal of human equality, but they at least accept equality as the long-term goal of public policy. Fascist societies not only accept the fact of human inequality, but go further and affirm inequality as the ideal". In Fascist code, men are superior to women, soldiers to civilians, party members to non-party members, one's own nation to others, the strong to the weak, etc.

**3. Violence and Lies:** Fascism favours violence and lies and glorified war. Fascism defended violence as a means of achieving political end. Violence played a major part in the movement through which Mussolini captured power in Italy. Violence was considered morally necessary. The Fascists



knew only enemies and not opponents and for them the enemies must be annihilated. Fascism justified mass murders in concentration and slave camps. War was considered not only necessary but even inevitable. Mussolini used to say, "War is to man, what maternity is to woman" Again, "three cheers for the war. Three cheers for the Italy's war and three cheers for war in general. Peace is hence, absurd or rather a pause in war. Peace is the slogan of the weak and impotent nations".

4. **Totalitarianism/Authoritarianism:** The fascists believe in the idea of an authoritarian, totalitarian and omnipotent state. They put emphasis on the duties of the citizens and not on their rights. They were always prepared to sacrifice the individual at the altar of the state. Fascism proclaims the rights of the state, the pre-eminence of its authority and the superiority of its ends. No aspect of social life escapes the wise discipline of fascism.

5. **Fascism Repudiates Democracy and Liberalism:** The Fascists were the enemies of democracy and liberalism. They had no faith in a parliamentary form of government which they described as stupid, corrupt, and slow-moving.

Equally, democracy they argued pave way for the misled of the masses by clever, and unscrupulous demagogues who have the gift of the gab and whose loquacity are full of deceit.

6. **Principle of Private Ownership of Production Vis-a-vis State Control:** The fascists did not believe in the laissez-faire principles of individualism neither does it accept the idea of public ownership as advocated by state socialists. They believed in the institution of private property which was to be worked in the interest of the nation. There were to be no

strikes or lock-outs. Complete harmony was to be secured in industry in order to achieve the goal of highest production.

7. **One Party System:** Fascism believed in the existence of one party in the state and the entire administration was to be run by that party. The basic slogan of fascism was: "one party, one leader". Through one party system the state will be guided by one ideological framework.

8. **Absolute Loyalty and Obedience to the State:** The Fascists encouraged absolute obedience from all. All were to behave like faithful dogs to the leader who had no use of the intellectual power of the people. The people could not understand national problems and their only work was to have faith, to obey and to fight. This development was deepened in the state through the engagement of brute force in all occasions.

### C. Monarchy

Monarchy essentially, is a form of government. Ideally, forms of government have a place in the political development of man. And so, the political ideas inhabited in the forms of government most of the time determine the structure of the state, and level of freedom enjoyed by the citizenry.

Monarchy as a form of government is on record as one of the earliest typologies. Conceptually, it has been described as government by one individual. It is the personification of the majesty or kingship and sovereignty of the state in an individual. Monarchy is principally, classified into two: Absolute and limited or constitutional one.

#### **Absolute Monarchy:**

It is the hereditary type that is characterized by kingship of the state acquired through lineage or family system (Royal

family). Here, the King has absolute authority in all the facets of administration. He is the head of the state both in name and in fact, and so, has unlimited power. Before the modern civilization, this type of monarchy was the earliest and the most prevalent in all societies.

#### Limited or Constitutional Monarchy:

This type of monarchy originated from Great Britain. It is characterized by dual headship – The Queen (Ceremonial Head of State) and the Prime Minister (the Head of Government). Here, the powers of the Queen or King are limited by the constitution and so, its position is more of a nominal or ceremonial head whose functions manifest in such duties as ceremonies, to receive another leader, the inauguration of a new government, the receiving of a foreign Head of State and Ambassadors/High Commissioners etc. The actual governmental functions are performed by the cabinet under the headship of Prime Minister who discharges the functions according to the constitutional provisions of the state. He can promulgate only those laws which are agreed to by the elected parliament. Equally, the financial arrangements and the granting of taxes are also dependent upon the cooperation and consent of the representative bodies.

In the contemporary society, some of the countries that are still under monarchical system of government include: Cambodia, Bhutan, Denmark, Brunei, Luxemburg, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Jordan, Japan, Monaco and Malaysia. In terms of the argument for the monarchy system of government, the salient points include:

- Monarchical arrangement encourages leadership stability. This is more pronounced in the absolute monarchy where the source of power (leadership) is situated in the royal family. In the constitutional or



limited type, the political party that commands the majority in the parliament or that won the general election is expected to produce the head of the government. Such arrangement encourages collective responsibility and as such stability most of time is the watch word of the party in power.

- Monarchy is less expensive to run. This is because, in the absolute monarchy for instance, election and all its financial involvement is not engaged to produce a leader. Whenever there is a leadership vacuum in a state, the processes involved for a new leader to emerge are conventionally laid down. In most of the constitutional monarchy, the electoral process is far less expensive because, a single general election is conducted to produce the cabinet members from where the head of government would be produced.
- It lessens cases of corrupt practices. In absolute monarchy, family or family lineage as established earlier is the source of state power. For the fact that power is always concentrated on such a family, there is always a strive by the members of the lineage to live up to the societal expectations so as to preserve the integrity and legitimacy of the throne. Such strive always discourages corrupt practices and other vices that could damage the image and reputation of the throne. On the side of the constitutional monarchy, the political party in power equally, tries as much as possible to save its image by jettisoning all manner of corrupt practices that could cause disaffection and subsequent loss of the next general election.

The major demerits of this system of government centered mainly on the following:

- Poor leadership/tyrannical governance. In absolute monarchy, a single person is required to be at the helm of affairs and in constitutional or limited monarchy, the political party that won the election is expected to form the government. This arrangement implies, that while the masses do not have power to remove the leader in the absolute system, the party that won the election on the other hand is solely allowed to form the executive arm of government. This arrangement can degenerate into tyranny because absolute power, it is always said, corrupts absolutely.
- Monarchy, especially the absolute type does not allow democratic process. This is, because the monarch is not chosen or elected by the people. So, the sovereign decision of the people in deciding who their leader should be is always denied. In the constitutional monarchy, there is principle of collective responsibility. Such principle does not encourage divergent opinion rather any member of the cabinet who disagrees with the government policy is expected to resign. This principle fundamentally, negates the ethos of democracy.
- It invests much power and fame on a single individual especially in absolute monarchy. A monarch is recognized as a supreme legislator, judicator, and executor. Though, he is helped by personal advisers, his decisions remain final.

#### D. Anarchism

Anarchism is derived from the Greek word "Anarchia", meaning "no rule". The doctrine of anarchism as a political idea is more of an utopian principle or idea because of its philosophical foundation – that seeks the "abolition of organized authority. Anarchists hold that every form of government is evil and tyrannical. They want a free association of individuals without armed forces, courts, prisons or written law".

It is perhaps, on the above premise that Kropotkin defined anarchism as a "principle or theory of life and conduct under which society is conceived without government – harmony in such a society being obtained not by submission to law or by obedience to any authority, but by free agreements concluded between the various groups" (Mahajan,1988 p.728),.

Equally, E. M. Burns sees it as opposition to government based upon force. Bertrand Russell observes that, anarchism as its derivation indicates, is the theory which is opposed to every kind of forcible government. It is opposed to the state as the embodiment of the force employed in the government of the community.

Fundamentally, there are two views that underscore the philosophical interpretation of anarchism. These are the Individualistic and Communistic anarchists. From the individualistic perspective, the individual is vested with property rights. The view of Max Stirner was that the individual was the only reality and his right to freedom entitled him to overthrow any authority whatsoever.

For the communistic anarchists, their doctrine rests on the replacement of the state by voluntary associations via revolutionary mechanism as opposed to evolutionary



methods. It is difficult to however, achieve revolution through this process in order to bring about the necessary changes.

Drawing inference from the above conceptual elucidation, it is crystal clear that anarchism seeks the withering away of the state and government and recommends a society where the people could be free from any control and influence. The anarchist state as earlier established is an utopia. In reality, no such state has existed in human history.

Fundamentally, anarchism as a political doctrine is characterized by salient features. Among these are:

1. **Voluntary Social System:** The anarchists stand for a social system organised on a voluntary basis. They are against any form of authority. They would like to destroy any kinds of authority. Particularly, they attack the state, the church, and private property or capitalists.
2. **Superfluous State:** The Anarchists see the state as being superfluous. This means, that there is nothing which the state does which cannot be done without its existence. Although, the state performs the duty of the defence of the country against foreign invaders and maintains armed forces for that purpose, the view of the Anarchists is that, the same work can be done more effectively if the state ceases to exist.
3. **State is not Necessary for Maintaining Law and Order:** The necessity of boundaries arises in a state on account of the existence of the social order based on injustice and inequality. The authority of the police and magistracy is required for the purpose of maintaining the status quo. In the anarchist society based on justice, freedom and voluntary cooperation of the people, there will be no necessity for the state. To them, man by nature is not bad, but he is made bad

by his environments and so does not need the presence of state laws and order to enforce obedience on man.

**4. The Anarchists are Against Representative Government:** The anarchists are opposed to representative government because they regard it as a fraud. Joad writes: "Representative Government is a government by men who know just enough about everything to enable them to do everything badly and not enough about everything to enable them to do anything well". The idea of Representative Government is complex because, it is difficult to say that any person can represent the people adequately. The representative may express his opinion on a particular matter and such opinion cannot be said to be a reflection of the general opinion of the people he represents.

**5. It Advocates Classless Society:** The anarchists would like to set up a stateless and classless society. People with common tastes will join together for particular purposes. They will cooperate with one another to produce things required for society. There will be no compulsion for grouping. The people will group themselves in a way which is most advantageous to their growth and development. There will be no competition but free cooperation. There will be no conflict but mutual aid. There will be no coercion but voluntary grouping. Each will help the other to do that which is in the highest interest of society as a whole. Such, is possible because human nature grows when there are no unnecessary restrictions or interruptions from without, the anarchists maintain.

# Chapter

## 4

### *The Doctrines of Government*

Following the emergence of modern states and forms of government, political thinkers and scholars have proposed the necessary doctrines that would guide the organization and running of the state. The essence they attempted to infer, is the propagation of rules and regulations that would see to the smooth management of government in the emerged society. Thus, this chapter seeks to underscore such fundamental doctrines.

#### **A. Rule of Law**

The idea of rule of law originated fundamentally, from the British Constitution and was popularized by Professor A. V. Dicey in his book – “The Law of the Constitution” published in 1885. His doctrine stresses the basic idea that the law is all important and that while law can be invoked to maintain order, any exercise of power must be in accordance with law of the state. Bluntly put, it means that, it is law of England that rules the country and not the arbitrary will of any leader.

#### **The Principles of Rule of Law**

Rule of law has certain basic principles that bring out its functionality. The common principles include inter alia:

1. **The Supremacy of the Law.** This principle underscores the supreme character of the law, where the law is seen as the



fundamental guideline for governance. The society is governed by the law, hence, the idea of rule of law and not rule of man. This implies, that the rule of law guarantees the maintenance of law and order in the state without which life will be insecure. Law, defined as a body of rules and regulations is a way of regulating human conduct. The violation of law is punished by the government. This is done, in order to maintain a peaceful society where there will be no frictions among the citizens. Thus, the supremacy of the law holistically implies, that our modern society is regulated by the presence of the rule of law. This is why, ancient philosopher and thinker like J. J. Rousseau declared that the civilized man is born free but is everywhere bound in chains. The chain here, refers to the existence of the rule of law that regulates every conduct of the modern man; for he cannot behave as he likes because, the eagle eyes of the law are on him.

(ii). **Equality before the Law:** The notion places everybody in the state equal before the law of the land. This is to say, that nobody is above the law. There is equality of all persons before the eye of the law. Everybody is subject to the law of the land. The law is therefore, no respecter of persons, status notwithstanding. So, every official from the office of the Prime Minister or President, as any other citizen down to the messenger is in principle, under the same responsibility for every act done without legal justification. This means, that whatever the status of a person, he must submit to the ordinary law of the country and ordinary court of the country. In this sense, the rule of law excludes the idea of any exemption of officials or others from the duty of obedience to the law which governs other citizens, or from the jurisdiction of the ordinary tribunal.

(iii). **The Principle of Legality:** This principle recognizes the innocence of the citizenry in the face of any crime committed until the trial in a competent court of law. This means, that under the notion of rule of law, no one can be subjected to any punishment except from a definite breach of law, as made justifiable in the ordinary law court of the land. Even, where a man is alleged to have committed a crime, he is, assumed to be innocent until the court of law has found him guilty. The implication here, is that, where there is rule of law, the question of arbitrary arrest does not arise. The central message under this principle is that, what emanates from the supremacy or predominance of the constitution or regular law as opposed to the influence of arbitrary power is the idea that those vested with the exercise of power in the state must not exercise them arbitrarily but in strict conformity with the law.

(iv). **Notion of Liberty and its Constitutional Provision:** The liberty of the citizens in a state popularly referred to as the fundamental human rights are treated by the rule of law as sacrosanct entity because, they are duly laid down in the constitution of a state and tagged as inalienable rights of the people. Rule of law defines the rights of the individuals under the law. Rights and freedoms are inherent in the individual within the limits prescribed by the law. Some of these rights and freedoms that include: right to life, freedom of association and movement, right to private property, are fundamental and so entrenched in the constitution for purposes of emphasis and their safeguard. The government cannot deprive the individual of these rights and liberties except for state security where the need arises. Under the common law, every person is entitled to freedom of expression, publication, association, worship, public meeting, etc. While the state provides necessary rights and liberties to citizens in order to ensure individual happiness,

it is the citizen's moral obligation to refrain from interfering with the rights and freedom of other citizens.

### Limitations to the Rule of Law

Modern developments have proved some of Professor Dicey's analysis of the rule of law defective and so the principle is confronted with certain limitations that render its operation impotent to a certain degree. These limitations that are glaring on the principles of rule of law can be summarized as follows:

1. **The Supremacy of the Law Vis-a-Vis the Grant of Discretionary Powers to Government Officials:** Following the extension of government activities into new fields such as town planning, education, public health, it has become necessary that government officials and agencies be given considerable discretion to execute government policies and programs outside the conventional provisions of the law. Furthermore, officials can make statutory regulations and administer penalties to those who break them. This then, implies, that the liberties of the citizens are restricted not only by the law but by other agencies, such as the discretionary powers of officials. Such development fundamentally, raises question on the supremacy of the law.

2. **The Notion of Equality before the Law Vis-a-Vis Immunity:** The positions of certain officials are specially safeguarded in their relations to the law of the land. They are wholly or partially immune from the operations of the rule of law. The provisions of the constitution of many countries place the President or Prime Minister, State Governors, and even Ambassadors/ High Commissioners above the law within the tenure of their office. For instance, no President or Governor can be tried in the law court as far as he remains in the office, no matter the offence he committed. Equally, Ambassadors and High Commissioners cannot be tried in the law court of



the state where they are serving. If the offence committed by the diplomat becomes so unbearable by the host country or community, such person can be declared *persona non-grata* and asked to leave. Such scenario brings into focus the proverbial statement by George Orwell that "all animals are equal but some are more equal than others". So, the existence of such situation where some people are given preferential treatment before the law implies that principle of equality of everybody ends up in mere theory because, in practice it is not so. Note also that suit can be filed against a trade union for any act committed by its officers or members in furtherance of bona fide trade dispute.

**3. Fundamental Human Rights:** The existence of certain conditions in a state or country oftentimes affect the fundamental human rights of citizens. For instance, a citizen cannot because he has freedom of speech make a defamatory statement. If he does so, he may be liable in accordance with the law. Note also that State of Emergency which may be decreed from time to time may lead to imposition of curfew in a state can affect the freedom of movement.

#### **B. Separation of Powers**

The political idea of separation of powers is an attempt to identify the institutions or organs of government that surrounds the power of enactment of law, its implementation and adjudication. These functions spelt out the three traditional organs of government – legislature, executive, and the judiciary. Primarily, the idea that these organs should be separated and its functions performed by separate bodies were conceived by John Locke. John Locke divided the activities of government into legislative, executive and federative, but he made only a passing reference to the theory of separation of powers. His main contribution was the insistence on the fact that the functions of legislation,

execution and adjudication must be separated. It was not wise to invest the makers of law with the duty of enforcing them. There was always the possibility, he said, that the makers of law might exempt themselves from the application of those laws or situate the laws to serve their own ends.

However, the theory of separation of powers was popularized by Baron de Montesquieu in his famous book entitled "The Spirit of Law" which was published in 1748. In the book, he emphasized the political idea of separation of powers on the notion that there must be a separation of powers if liberty is to be safeguarded. Separation of powers and liberty go hand in hand.

The famous statement of Montesquieu is etched in these words: "when the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person or in the same body of magistrates, there can be no liberty; because apprehensions may arise lest the same monarch or senate should enact tyrannical laws, and execute them in tyrannical manner. Again, there is no liberty if the judicial power be not separate from the legislative and executive. Were it joined with the legislative, the life and liberty of the subject would be exposed to arbitrary control for the judge would then be legislator. Were it joined to the executive power, the judge might behave with violence and oppression. There would be an end of everything, were the same man or the same body -- to exercise those three powers, that of enacting laws, that of executing the public relations, and of trying the cases of individuals".

The implication of Montesquieu's thesis is that the three organs of government – legislature, executive and judiciary must stand out separately in their functions whereby the law making function must be performed separately independent of the executive and the judiciary and that of execution must

be independent of the legislature and the judiciary whereas the law interpretation by the judiciary has to be performed independently of the executive and the legislature. The essence of these separate functions is to avoid over-concentration of powers in an organ so as to avoid the abuse of power. This is because, if one organ say executive is to perform the three functions, there will be absolute power and this will bring about power corruption. Thus, a British historian of the early 20th century – Lord Acton avers that power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

The theory of separation of powers is obtained in constitutional presidential democracy of the United States and the Nigeria typologies and any other presidential system in the world. In the parliamentary democracies like the UK, France and Canadian kinds, there is no absolute separation of powers because, the parliament forms the executive organ, especially, in the UK. This is the popular Westminster model.

In practice, as obtained in the presidential democracies there is no concrete separation of powers rather what we have is fusion of powers because of the oversight function provided in the constitution. For reference purposes, see the Nigeria's Constitutional provisions on the functions of the executive, legislature and the judiciary. You can also see the US Constitutional provisions on the functions of the three organs of government. A clear survey of the constitutional provisions on the functions of those organs of government brings out clearly the interwoven or over-lapping of the functions of the three arms of government.



## Chapter 5

### *Ideology and Bureaucracy*

#### Ideology

Ideology is a complex and difficult notion to grab, following its multi-disciplinary concept. However, what appears to be a common and general knowledge has been underpinned to the 20th century development among Social Scientists especially, Political Scientists and Sociologists, and Anthropologists. From their various perspectives, ideology is more of a social or political philosophy where practical elements are as prominent as theoretical ones. It is a system of ideas that seeks both to explain the world and to change it. Thus, Freedman Michael, writing in Routledge Encyclopedia of philosophy, captured it vividly when he opined that "an ideology is a set of ideas, beliefs, and attitudes, consciously or unconsciously held, which reflects or shapes understandings or misconceptions of the social and political world. It serves to recommend, justify or endorse collective action aimed at preserving or changing political practices and institutions".

Aligning herself with this perspective, Jennifer W. See, in 2019 Encyclopedia.com, asserted that "ideology is a shared belief system that may serve at once to motivate and to justify. It generally asserts normative values and includes causative beliefs". She buttressed the conceptualization further by maintaining that an ideology may be utopian and

progressive or protective of the status quo and offers a way in which to order the world.

### Origin of Ideology

Etymologically, ideology made its first appearance in France as *idéologie*. It was at the time of the French Revolution. A philosopher, A. L. C. Destutt de Tracy introduced it as a short form of what he termed his "science of ideas". He anchored his explanation on Francis Bacon's epistemological framework where science is said to hold sway in proffering solution to human problems. It was this same union of the programmatic with the intellectual that distinguished Destutt de Tracy's *idéologie* from those theories, systems, or philosophies that were essentially explanatory. The science of ideas was a science with a mission: it aimed at serving people, even saving them, by ridding their minds of prejudice and preparing them for the sovereignty of reason.

As the society progresses especially, prior to 20th century, ideology was seriously undermined as scholars shifted their emphases to economic and political interests in their explanations. By the last few decades of the 20th, century the scenario began to change as diplomatic historians increasingly turned their attention to the study of ideology (See, J. W., Encyclopedia.com).

Essentially, nowhere has the debate been more intense and pragmatic than among scholars of cold war. The dynamic process, in part, developed, from the intense attention which diplomatic historians have devoted to the superpower conflict. This was informed by the nature of the Soviet-American rivalry that partitioned the globe into major ideological camps – capitalism and socialism, hence, scholars were forced to confront the issue of ideology.

The two camps basically anchored on the pragmatic projection (analysis) of Karl Marx, especially in his Capital – Volumes I – III. Marxist theory finds the determinants of social reality in material factors and, especially in economic structures. For instance, in the historical materialism, Marx opined that human society was passing through a series of historical periods or stages. A different form of economic modes of production – communalism – feudalism – capitalism – socialism and eventually communism (the utopian mode) – each especially from the second to the fourth mode with its own dominant class defined the various stages.

This is where ideology comes in. For Marx, ideology served the interests of the dominant class, whether kings or merchants in the economic systems mentioned above. What this implies, is that in feudalism, capitalism, or socialism, two classes of people – the dominant and the dominated exist and this essentially, brings about the issue of class antagonism or struggle/conflict. It created the alienation of workers in capitalist society that slowed the inexorable revolutionary progress in the early 20th century.

Lenin represents perhaps the most significant and influential of Marx's disciples. To Marxist theory, Lenin added a revolutionary caste of intellectuals who could provide an ideology for the working class. In Leninist posture, revolution became not just inevitable but also a leeway for reordering of the society. The revolution of 1917 in Russia, engineered in part by Lenin's Bolshevik, seemed to attest to the connection between ideology and revolutionary upheaval.

Going by the discussions so far, ideology which underscores set of ideas, beliefs, attitudes and motivation can be principally classified into capitalism, socialism, communism,



fascism/totalitarianism, anarchism, nationalism, liberalism. Each of these laid down the structure and character of a society in terms of economic system and the subsequent mode of governance. In all the sectors available in each ideological setting, bureaucracy underscores the necessary rules that see to its management.

**Bureaucracy**  
Bureaucracy which is oftentimes associated with red-tapism is a process in organizational administration that is based on established rules. It is distinguished from informal and collegial organizations and marked by rules rather than kinship, friendship or patrimonial or charismatic authority. The concept is deeply rooted in sociology and political science, where it is referred to as the way that the execution or enforcement of legal rules is socially organized. Bureaucratic organization can be found in both public and private institutions like governments, armed forces, corporations, hospitals, courts, schools, and markets.

#### Origin of Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy, according to the New World Encyclopedia is derived from the word "Bureau" where it is used to refer to not only a writing desk, but also to an office or a workplace. To the Greece, the suffix "kratia" or "kratos" means "power", or "rule". Thus, bureaucracy logically means office power or office rule.

The propagation of the concept in its modern form found favour with the writings of Marx Weber, a German sociologist. Weber, in his theory described the ideal characteristics of bureaucracies and provided the explanation for the historic development of bureaucratic institutions. According to Weber, the defining features of bureaucracy sharply distinguished it from other types of organizations based on non-legal forms of authority. This

exercise has placed Weber as a leading purist of bureaucratization of society, hence, many aspects of modern public administration are traced back to him. On this premise, a classic and hierarchically organized civil service of the continental type has oftentimes been referred to as "Weberian Civil Service".

To Weber, administrative regulations determine areas of responsibility and control the allocation of tasks to each area. In Weber's analysis, a bureaucratic organization is governed by the following seven principles:

1. Official business is conducted on a continuous basis.
2. Official business is conducted with strict adherence to fundamental rules.
3. Every official's responsibilities and authority are part of a vertical hierarchy of authority, with respective rights of supervision and appeal.
4. Officials do not own the resources necessary for the performance of their assigned functions but are accountable for their use of these resources.
5. Official and private business and income are strictly separated.
6. Offices cannot be appropriated by their incumbents (inherited, sold, etc.).
7. Official business is conducted on the basis of written documents.

The above principles are usually guided by the major characteristics of bureaucracy. These characteristics can be summarized as follows:

**1. Jurisdictional Competency:** Jurisdictional competency is a key element of bureaucratic organization which is broken into units with defined responsibilities. Essentially, jurisdictional competency refers to bureaucratic specialization, with all elements of a bureaucracy possessing a defined role.

Here, skill and competency are emphasized for the purpose of actualizing the objectives and goals of the organization. The performances of the officials in the course of discharging their duties are rewarded positively or negatively. Positively, salary advancement or promotion from one cadre to the other are incentives for hard work and efficiency. Negatively, the reward may be stagnation in salary, demotion, suspension or outright dismissal for non-performing officers. The organizational division of labour enables units and individuals within an organization to master details and skills thereby ensuring that mediocrity and technical errors are reduced to the barest minimum.

**2. Command and Control:** Bureaucracies have clear lines of command and control. Bureaucratic authority is organized hierarchically, with responsibility taken at the top and delegated. The arrangement guarantees the flow of order from top to bottom. Obedience to such orders goes with a compelling force, else, necessary penalty may follow. The essence is to check organizational parochialism produced by limited or specific jurisdictional competencies. Authority is the glue that holds together diversity and prevents units from exercising unchecked discretion.



3. **Continuity:** Continuity is another key element of bureaucratic organization. Rational-legal authority necessitates uniform rules and procedures for written documents and official behaviour. A bureaucracy's files (that is, its past records) provide it with organizational memory, thereby enabling it to follow precedent and standard operating procedures. The ability to utilize standard operating procedures makes organizations more efficient by decreasing the costs attached to any given transaction. The structure guarantees the continuity of an organization and renders it independent from any leadership.

4. **Professionalism of the Management:** Professionalism as a feature of bureaucracy requires a full time corps of officials whose attention is devoted exclusively to its managerial responsibilities. In government, professionalization is vested in the corps of civil servants whose positions have generally been obtained through the passage of tests based on merits. The civil service is usually considered as the engine of bureaucracy and as such is characterized by anonymity (nameless officers), permanence, neutrality (non-membership of any political party), to mention but a few).

The civil service is sometimes considered a permanent government, distinct from the transient politicians who serve only for a limited time and at the pleasure of the electorate in democratic political systems. In businesses and in other non-governmental bureaucratic organizations, there is also a professional cadre of managers. Professionalization increases expertise and continuity within the organization. Even when organizations are temporarily leaderless or experience turmoil in their top leadership positions, the professional cadre helps to maintain an organizational equilibrium.

# Chapter

## 6

### *Marxism and Revolution*

#### **Marxism**

The Marxist political idea is widely viewed as a radical approach to addressing the social conditions of the society. The writings of Marx confer comprehensive statements about the elements and structure of society and recognizes the primacy of economic determinism in political actions. It situates capitalism as the mode of production that creates the social condition of men which underscores two classes of people – the propertied and propertyless. Indeed, the propertied refers to the bourgeois class that own and control the factors of production whereas the propertyless constitute the proletariat who have no access to means of production but dwell on the labour to earn a living.

The relationship between the duo, Marx emphasized, is a perpetual struggle and war because the propertied class would always want to exploit the proletariat or working class. This relationship is lucidly explained in Marx's Capital volumes I – III. Thus, capitalism in all ramifications is a product of class division along economic lines. So, in order to address the problem of capitalism, Marx places emphasis on social change and dwells extensively on methodology of historical and dialectical materialism with a view to creating social consciousness.

Drawing inference from Marx's inspiration, Beckman (1983 p.106) demonstrates that, historical materialism is "concerned with historical causation and laws of historical development while materialism focuses on objective determinants as rooted in the material conditions of a society, rather than on subjective motives, ideologies and great personalities in explaining social change". Proceeding further, he maintains that dialectical materialism stands for the significance attributed to interaction of opposites in the dynamics of social development.

The central focus of dialectical materialism underline the inherent class contradiction between the propertied (bourgeois) and the propertyless (proletariat) that always results to the Hegel philosophy of thesis – antithesis – synthesis, that is, the negation of the negation that is always in constant motion signifying the inherent struggle and war between the proletariat and bourgeois class. Thus, Marxism employs the philosophy of the historical and dialectical materialism to provide the need for revolutionary change as well as the scientific methodology of bringing about revolution. Marx demonstrated this desire in the Communist Manifesto where he made a clarion call on the working class (that is, the proletariat) to unite and uproot the bourgeois class so as to entrench a new form of economic system (socialism) that would address the social injustices in the society.

### Revolution

The concept of revolution is today a household phenomenon. It occupies a serious space in the lexicon of socio-economic and political spheres. The concept is used by analogy in such expression and purview as the industrial revolution where it denotes a radical and profound change in economic relationships and technological conditions. This



implies, that revolution covers economic, social and cultural facets of life.

Technically, revolution has been defined by Ellul (1991 p.101), as "that, that is used interchangeably with other activities like outburst, upheaval, unrest, agitation, rebellion, revolt, coup d'etat and the like which aim at changing the status quo". The scholar establishes further that, revolution entails rebellion against the established political system or the government of a state.

Going by the impulse of this conceptualization, revolution now implies a fundamental departure from any previous historical pattern. It constitutes a challenge to the established political order and the eventual establishment of a new order, radically different from the preceding one. The great revolutions of European history especially, the Glorious (English), French, Russian and the Chinese revolutions changed not only the system of government but also the economic system, the social structure, and the cultural values of those societies.

The contemporary political theory focuses on politics of power and its application in directing the affairs of the state that manifests either positively or negatively in its manipulation. When the negative manipulation appears to dominate through coercion or threats by the engagement of the government agencies like the security apparatus, the state or society becomes automatically vulnerable to revolutionary waves. Thus, the existence of the negative tendency described above leads to ruthless exploitation of all kinds, poverty and degradation of the citizenry. The expected outcome in the face of such ugly situation is a revolutionary outburst, the like of French Revolution of 1789.

Going by the historical trajectory, the concept (revolution) was seen as a very destructive force, from ancient Greece to the European Middle Ages. The ancient Greeks for instance, saw revolution as a possibility only after the decay of the fundamental moral and religious tenets of society. Plato believed that a consistent, firmly entrenched code of beliefs emanating from his postulated just society in the "Republic" could prevent revolution. Aristotle elaborated on this idea by concluding that if a culture's basic value system is tenuous, the society will be vulnerable to revolution. Basically, any radical alteration in basic values or beliefs provides the ground for a revolutionary upheaval.

Revolution in its modern sense, can be logically said to have developed after the emergence of secular humanism during the Renaissance. The 16th century Italian writer Niccolo Machiavelli recognized the importance of creating a stable state that could endure the threat of revolution, but, at the same time his detailed analysis of power brought out entirely a new belief in the necessity of changes in the structure of government as the need arises. This new trend of change placed Machiavelli as a leading purist of modern revolutionary thought. Although he never used the word revolution in his writings, his concern for the creation of a truly stable state attest to his thought.

The 17th century English writer John Milton as indicated in Encyclopedia Britannica was an early believer in the strength of revolution to help a society realize its aspirations. To him, revolution is the right of society to defend itself against abusive tyrants, with a view to creating a new order that reflected the needs of the people.

Fundamentally, the 19th century German philosopher G. W. F. Hegel was a strong catalyst in the propagation of 20th century revolutionary thought. He saw revolutions as the

fulfillment of human destiny, and situates revolutionary leaders as the agents and instigators of reforms. Hegel's theories laid the foundation for the most influential revolutionary thinker, Karl Marx. Marx used Hegel's thesis as the basis for a plan of class struggle centered on a fight for economic determinism. The climax of Marx revolutionary thought was articulated in the Communist Manifesto where he advocated for the overthrow of the propertied class that is, the bourgeoisie by the proletariat that is, the working class, with a view to having a socialist society where deprivation and exploitation will be overcome. Marx saw this eventuality as the conclusion of the human struggle for freedom and a classless society thus, eliminating the need for further political change. Communist revolution led by Marxists took place in Russia, Yugoslavia, China, Vietnam, Cuba, among other countries in the 20th century.

#### Possible Determinants of Revolution

Revolution generally, does not happen by a sudden flight rather, it occurs as a result of a prolonged experience. So, many factors are oftentimes responsible for revolution. These factors are generally tagged as stages of revolution. Prominent among the factors or stages are:

**Long-Term Phenomenon:** Revolution developed after a long accumulation of grievances and dissatisfaction against a social order. Revolution emanating from such process is generally determined by remote factors. The pressures can develop from political, economic and social trends. These grievances or pressure at the onset may not be sufficient to spark a rebellion. However, they can undermine the ruling class, the political order or prevailing economic system. As the condition persists, ordinary people become dissatisfied and frustrated. Revolutionary pressure begins to circulate and grow. These unsettling ideas might simmer for years or even decades before any action is taken. They provide



therefore, a fertile intellectual ground in which the seeds of revolution can germinate.

**Short-Term Trend:** Every revolution is triggered by at least one immediate event or crisis. These events create, worsen or highlight existing grievances, conditions or sufferings. This, leads to more urgent demands for action or reform. The common events or crises that might degenerate to revolution include: disastrous wars or military defeat, the passing of unpopular laws, government resistance to reform, a rapid deterioration in economic conditions or standards of living, corruption and bad governance. Revolutionary pressures becomes imminent when people see the government as unwilling or incapable of reform and improvement. If the revolutionaries realize that change and reform will not come from the top, they become more determined to bring about change from bottom through the uniting of the less privileged class.

### **Typology of Revolution**

Revolution in terms of classification is generally associated with the level of consciousness of the people. This consciousness sets the magnitude or the dimension in which a revolution can take. On this premise, Changte (2016) did not hesitate to capture vividly the typology of revolution. He classified revolution as follows:

1. **Liberal Revolution:** This emanates from a democratic process. Here, revolution manifests through the democratic triumph over dictatorship. Such a dictator is usually removed through the ballot box where the people exercise their franchise and reject the unpopular leader. Instances of this process abound in the cases of the 1776 revolution of Americans over the colonial, imperial, British powers and the 1995 Indonesian people over Dutch imperialists.

**2. Radical Revolution:** This type of revolution arises from the political consciousness of the people that desire to obtain greater emancipation and equality for the less privileged groups in society through effecting a change of the social system. In other words, they want a complete overhaul of the system. This revolutionary trend is anchored on the Marxist philosophy which was translated into action by V.I. Lenin and his Bolshevik group in the Great Russian Revolution of 1917, that threw up the communist/socialist system in Russia. The great Communist Revolution in Russia extended its tentacles to countries like China in 1947, Vietnam and other socialist countries of the world.

**3. Evolutionary or Quasi-Revolution:** This type of revolution is attained through dialogue, discussion and debating process. The decision of the elites sets out the modality for changes. This is typical of General Charles De Gulle who established a new constitutional system substituting parliamentarism with Bonapartism and the Tunisian 2011 mechanism. Ten months after collapse of Zine El Abidine Ben Ali's authoritarian regime, Tunisia balanced the revolutionary urge for change and a pragmatic need for continuity through dialogue process. Following this arrangement, and in anticipation of elections for a constitutional assembly due on October 23, the country that ignited the "Arab spring" emerged as the regional paradigm of a stable democratic transition without resort to any barrel of gun or demonstration.

**4. Reformist Revolution/Revolutionary Movement:** This type of revolution is driven by the desire for improvement in social order. Here, the revolutionaries are engaged in a movement that seeks for a greater freedom and equality for the less privileged groups in society, through making changes in the social system. The focus of the movement is

the modification of certain aspects or practices in the system, leaving the system essentially intact.

### Functions of Revolution

Revolution whenever it occurs throws up in the society a new structure and order. Among the outstanding outcome of revolution are:

- i. **Alteration of Values of Myth of the Society:** This function is akin to a cultural revolution of the Chinese type. For instance, the Chinese revolution introduced changes in everything, ranging from the educational system and cultural configuration to land tenure patterns.
- ii. **Creation of a new social structure:** Revolution especially, radical one when it occurs throws up a new social structure. For instance, the great Bolshevik revolution of Russia in 1917 dislodged the capitalist economic system of the bourgeois class and created the socialist economic system.
- iii. **Alteration of Institution:** This function cuts across all the typologies of revolution because revolution generally replaces an existing old institution with a new one.
- iv. **Change in Leadership Formation either in Personnel of the Elite or its Class Composition:** This was witnessed in Chinese and Russian revolutions. In Russia for example, when the bourgeois class was overthrown along with their economic system, the proletariat class emerged with their socialist ideology.
- v. **Transfer of Power by Legal or Non-Legal Means:** The legal means of transfer of power in a revolution is usually obtained in liberal and evolutionary revolutions.



# Chapter

# 7

## *Diplomacy*

The emergence of modern states in the global political system demands interaction and action among the international communities. This development necessitates burning issues in international relations. The efficacy and scientific calculus of international relations is driven by diplomacy, hence, diplomacy is closely associated with international relations or world politics. Diplomacy is central to an understanding of world politics and to the foreign policy behaviour of states and other international actors. This implies, that the idea of diplomacy and/or its origin is as old as humanity since interaction among the different peoples has been in existence in the history of man.

In terms of definition, diplomacy has been conceptualized in various ways. In some aspects, it is generally seen as the inevitable outcome of the co-existence of separate political units with any degree of contact. In another, it is technically the business of communication in bilateral and multilateral relations. Providing more insight to the conceptualization of diplomacy, scholars like Wood and Serres (1971), see it as the art of resolving international difficulties peacefully. They proceed further to demonstrate that diplomacy is an art, a skill of professionally applying principles without passion, and of seeking jointly the harmonious solution of various clashing interests.

To Holsti (1972 p.177), diplomacy is the application of tact, common sense and intelligence to contacts with foreign officials; a technique used primarily to reach agreements, compromises and settlements where actors objectives conflict in the international system. Bull (1977, p.162), defined it as "the management of international relations by negotiation". By this process, according to Bull, relations among states are adjusted by envoys, High Commissioners and Ambassadors.

From the above definitions, it can be discerned that diplomacy is an art of communication that is integral to the workings of the international system. This is to say that diplomacy is taken to represent a defined institution of international relations. This is because, relation among states is hugely characterized by (four Cs) – Competition, Conflict, Crisis, and Co-operation. The tension that is usually generated in the process of competition snowballed into conflict and crisis. In the interaction, while conflict and crisis are at one end of the spectrum, co-operation is on the other end. At the side of co-operation, diplomacy is usually engaged to drive the spectrum to represent forms of interaction that centre on the resolution of conflict by negotiation and dialogue. Negotiation might entail persuasion, compromise, conciliation, threats, rewards or punishment. The essence of diplomacy is to prevent the degeneration of conflict and crisis into war.

## Types of Diplomacy

The major classifications of diplomacy are:

(1) **Traditional / Permanent Diplomacy:** This is the oldest form of diplomacy. Traditional diplomacy dates back to the period of the Greek city-states, the pre-colonial states in Africa and the era usually referred to as the classical age. In

this era, especially in 1648, the well-defined sovereign states in Europe according to White (1990) were few. Here, diplomats are exchanged between international communities or states on permanent basis.

In Africa, diplomatic procedures were observed in interactions among "the states" like Yoruba, Asante, Dagomba, to mention but three. Traditional diplomacy is saddled with two responsibilities. These are: Chancery duties such as representation, reporting, negotiations and intelligence; and Consular duties such as visas, information, welfare of nationals, trade and commerce, and economic matters" (Ofoegbu, 1980 pp. 71 - 72). In this typology, diplomats were sent abroad specifically for negotiating with other states on a wide range of issues on a regular basis. In this period, diplomacy ceased from ad hoc activity to being institutionalized. Diplomatic protocols were developed. It included ceremonies and series of rights, privileges and immunities were also attached to both diplomats and diplomatic activities.

Traditional diplomatic agenda was dominated with prestige and personal ambition of the monarchs. Thus, the acquiring of territory, issues of sovereignty, issues of war and peace characterized the international relation of this era. So, within the period of its existence, foreign policy was hugely seen as the exclusive preserve of monarchs and their advisers.

2) Personal Diplomacy: This type of diplomacy consists of key decision makers of the international communities and or / states. The composition of these major players include: heads of state and governments, foreign affairs ministers, secretaries-general of international organizations, very senior ministers like those of defence and finance. The major arguments in favour of personal diplomacy is that it quickens the processes of decision, eliminates distortions inherent in



excessive dependence on other people's reporting and aids experienced foreign policy decision makers to evaluate the general and specific environments within which their colleagues in other states operate. Equally, by coming together, important world leaders can use the avenue to review contending issues and avert possible danger that may erupt.

3) Ad hoc Conference Diplomacy: This type of diplomacy demands the attention of professional bodies across the globe with a view to discussing technical issues that surround their profession. The regularity of the international conference of the professional bodies these days is such that hardly a week passes without witnessing two or three international summits of delegates of the professionals. Ad hoc diplomacy is necessitated by three primary factors. Among them are: (a) Many technical, scientific and professional groups question the competence of diplomats to discuss and negotiate technical treaties, agreements and protocols. They also frown at accompanying the diplomats in subordinate capacity. They rather prefer the arrangement whereby they talked directly with their colleagues from other actor-states; settle the details of proposed agreements; and leave the ceremonial aspects of ratifying such agreements to heads of states, external affairs ministers and ambassadors. (b) Technology: modern movements across the globe are quicker and easier. It is therefore, possible these days to assemble specialists easily for some days without disorganizing their work schedules and plans at home. Today, virtual conference goes a long way in facilitating ad-hoc diplomacy. (c) United Nations and its specialized agencies: the work of the UN and its agencies now spans many fields like health, education, labour, agriculture, food, telecommunications among others. Specialists and experts in these fields convoke internationally at the demand of the UN, and regionally, at the request of regional organizations, to

discuss action programmes in their areas of specialty. These conferences are ad hoc in nature. They disperse immediately after their meeting. All other continuing roles thereafter revert back to the international and regional organizations that convened the ad hoc conferences, and to the permanent conference diplomats accredited to these actors.

4) Cold War Diplomacy: This form of diplomacy emerged immediately after the Second World War in 1945. It underscored the ideological rivalry between the Capitalist block in the West and the Socialist block in the East, denoting the polarity of the world into capitalist and socialist ideology. While the capitalist ideology was led by America and its allies, the socialists block on the other hand was led by Russia and its former allies in the Soviet Union. From 1945 until the late 1980s, world affairs were dominated by the ideological confrontation between the USA and the Soviet Union. Each superpower and its allies attempted to undermine and defeat the other by all means short of real war. Cold war diplomatic activity focused on the absolute necessity of avoiding a global and nuclear conflict that could destroy the international system. So, it was a diplomacy that was characterized by non-shooting war and espionage, spy, and brinkmanship.

5) Nuclear Diplomacy: The development of nuclear weapons has constituted a palpable threat to the human race since World War II. This has generated great concern and worry for international peace and security. In recent time, this problem has been compounded by the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The production and spread of these weapons have been made possible by modern technology. "Through the invention of modern technology, many nations have been introduced to nuclear weapons which are weapons of mass destruction" (Adeniran, 1983 p.137). In view of the above development, the number of countries

which have been able to acquire nuclear weapons have increased. Apart from such countries like the popular big five – the United States, Russia, China, Great Britain and France traditionally known as the nuclear powers, Israel, India and North Korea among others have demonstrated nuclear capability.

Nuclear diplomacy simply explains the interaction between states that have nuclear weapon/capability especially, where one or more countries threatened to use them either to dissuade an opponent from undertaking an action or to persuade an opponent to withdraw an action that has been begun.

In spite of the Non-Proliferation Treaty signed in 1970, many countries have continued to show interest in the acquisition of nuclear weapons for military purpose. The treaty fundamentally, underscores the relevance of nuclear diplomacy in international relations. It glaringly manifested in the arms control efforts. The remarkable event in the efforts was the various Strategic Arm Limitation Talks (SALT) between the then two super powers – United States and the Soviet Union. There have been four of such talks. The first was from 1969 to 1972 which produced two treaties. One, Limited Anti-Ballistic Missile Defence System and the other one imposed force level on the nuclear weapons to be maintained by the super powers. In 1974, two additional agreements were reached and endorsed in Moscow. These later agreements were to permit the destruction of excess weapon system and the replacement of Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles (ICBM) launchers by newer launchers on modern submarines.

The Second SALT Talk of 1974 seemed, however, not to have yielded the intended objective of arms limitation. However, it did have the effect of at least keeping the talks going. The



two other talks since then, SALT IH and IV, have not made enough progress in arms reduction or limitation.

### Functions of Diplomacy

The roles of diplomacy as an idea in international relations or politics among nations are very germane. These important functions have been summarized by Morgenthau (1964 p.361). Among them include:

(I) The determination of a country's objectives or national interests in the comity of nations in relation to its power actually and potentially available for the pursuit of these objects: The self-assessment will enable the state to employ various forms of strategies that will help in the actualization of its intention taking cognizance of the domestic demands.

(ii) To evaluate the objectives of other nations and the power actually and potentially available for the pursuit of these objectives: The essence is to ascertain if the power resources of other nations are superior to yours and to determine if their own national interest is in conflict. Such understanding will enable a state to engage a tactful approach in the relationship.

(iii) To determine the extent these different objectives are compatible with each other: Here, diplomacy would enhance the harmonious relationship between or among the states that have this compatible interests. For instance, in the dependency theory, there is always the assertion that a harmonious relationship exists between the centre of the centre state and the centre of the periphery state because the latter seems to possess the natural resources that could be harnessed by the former because of its technological prowess and for the probable advancement of the two states.

(iv) To employ the means suited to the pursuit of its objectives: Diplomacy, after the general assessment of the diplomatic interaction between or among nations would device the necessary means or strategy to execute the foreign policy that underpin the necessary action needed for international politics.

### Diplomatic History

The historical trajectory of diplomacy can be traced to over 1000 years ago. The origin of diplomacy can, therefore, be traced to the societies of the world that have been in relation with one another peacefully and formulated policies that guided the relationship. Past interactions and relationships that constituted the earliest international political systems were not global in character, rather they existed in contemporary terminologies as regional and local. In view of the above reality, the discourse of diplomatic history can be carried out diachronically across modern globe. Our global concepts of today are the results of revolutions in communications, technology and politics. Our survey of the traditional states span Edo/Benin (Nigeria), Greek City-States and China.

### Edo/Benin (Nigeria)

In the pre-colonial Edo/Benin system, there was a far-flung empire that ran as far West as Eko (modern Lagos) and extended to far East as Onicha Ado (modern Onitsha). Within this imperial system there existed many political entities that owed their initial creation to the Edo, participated in Edo wars and paid allegiance to the Edo's central monarchy. As these entities developed their own political and administrative structures, and acquired additional territories, coupled with the constraints imposed by transportation and communications systems it became increasingly possible to delink from the imperial capital at Benin. They subsequently became "sovereign autonomous

units", hence Eko's relations with Dahomey (the present Benin Republic), Ijebu, Britain and France were essentially its international relations rather than aspects of the external and imperial relations of the Edo. Equally, the relationship between "Onicha and its neighbors particularly, its wars, trades and politics with the Oze, Obosi, Osamiri and other riverine states on the River Niger, became its external relations instead of the external relations of the Edo" (Nzimiro, 1972 pp. 41 -42).

### Greek City- States

The Greek political units (city-states) were small and autonomous. These states interacted frequently through trade and commerce and shared socio-cultural values, religion, sports and arts, hence, each system of the interstate relations benefitted from, and contributed immensely to the development of a common pool of international identity (Culture).

The Greek city -states (800 BC to 322 BC) were very proud of their independence. They lost and gained territories through war and rejected the feudal practice of central monarchy that created and sustained peripheral political units. Subsequent upon this development, the Greeks formed the Hellenic League which was a military alliance led by Athens and thereafter created the Peloponnesian League which was also a military-security alliance led by Sparta. The Greek states were largely trading states and cultural centres. Commerce held sway in their political economy because it was source of their military strength.

The Greek city-states fundamentally, laid the foundation of modern diplomacy and were greatly concerned with the safety and rights of their merchants in other Greek states. They were very much concerned with securing for them clear definition of state rights, duties and obligations in times



of peace and war; and besides, they originated the practice of orator – diplomats who were dispatched to other city states to persuade them to conclude treaties, eschew hostilities and restore relations. Thus, to Greek is ascribed one of the creations of such diplomatic machineries as arbitration and conciliation in the peaceful resolution of conflicts between states.

### The Chinese State System under the Chou Dynasty

For the Chinese, their known international political system in the early days was China, hence, their historical international relation was not the interaction between China and the rest of the world – Europe, Asia, Africa, the Americas, among others. It was rather, a series of engagements among Chinese states and kingdoms.

Historically, the emergence of the Chinese states/kingdoms can be traced to the international politics of the Chou Dynasty, 1122 BC to 221 BC (Holsti, 1995 p. 25). In addition to these nine centuries of Chinese history, there were three possible fundamental structures that aided its international political processes. First, was the feudal system that lasted from 1122 to 771 BC. This period was marked by the establishment of dynasty and the defeat of the central Chou monarchy by insurgent feudal lords. This feudal epoch was referred to as Western Chou period. Second, was the era from 771 to 483 BC and it was known as the Spring and Autumn period. This period led to the development of independent states. Third, was from 403 – 221 BC. It was generally characterized by conflict and competition among the larger states, decline of stable alliances and the polar power structure, and subsequent destruction of the system itself.

### The Nature of Interaction among the Chinese "States"

In the feudal era, the degree of political and commercial interaction among the units (Sovereign states) was low, except where formal diplomatic and ceremonial exchanges were undertaken between the dukes, princes and other nobility and the central Chou monarchy. In the Spring and Autumn and Warring states period, each of the independent states conducted its foreign relations without reference to the official center of the empire. There was a proliferation of contacts between states, not only formal and diplomatic, but also, trade and commercial.

The diplomatic relations of China within the era manifested in the following processes: Ch'ao, a court visit paid by one ruler to another; hui, meetings between permanent government officials of two or more states; P'in, friendly missions of information or inquiry; Shih, exchange of emissaries; and Shou, hunting parties where government representatives combined diplomatic affairs with recreation. These exchanges often had a direct connection with a state's security or expansionist objectives, even when contacts ostensibly had ceremonial colouration.

Another dimension of the interaction is commercial exchange. Ordinarily, commercial engagement ought to be a private concern of the merchants who move from one place to another for transaction without the necessary government interference. However, for the fact that the government needs grains to feed the army, it became imperative for the government to interfere so as to have sufficient food for the military. In this order, government had to send out diplomats on economic missions to procure food from other states with a view to complementing their reserves.

In terms of war diplomacy in the old Chinese system, war was a common tool of diplomatic interaction among states

during the Spring and Autumn and the Conflict periods. For instance, Duke Huan of Ch'in according to Holsti (1995 p.32) "went to war twenty-eight times in a reign lasting forty-three years". In the feudal system, force (organized partly by the vassals) was used primarily by the Chou dynasts against the "wu" and occasionally against errant nobles whose actions were deemed inimical to the interests of the empire. In the system of independent states, all the units used organized violence as a method of accomplishing their objectives as necessitated by the domestic quest. During the feudal era, engagements were seldom fought as battles of annihilation, but more as trials of strength, so as to prove superiority over weaker kingdom. This is akin to the foreign policy objective of prestige. During the period of warring states, wars had become great contests, among conflicting states. Within the era, wars were fought brutally by huge armies, depending on the population strength of each state.

The Chinese also engaged various forms of subversion and intervention in other state's internal affairs as techniques of realizing their diplomatic objectives. In the Spring and Autumn periods, for example, there were at least thirty-six of such successful subversion where states or kingdoms demonstrated their strength over the weaker ones.



# Chapter

## 8

### *International Organizations*

Following the emergence of modern states in our contemporary global system and in recognition of the interdependency of states, the need for international organizations becomes imperative. This is because no state is so self-sufficient as not to need the cooperation or assistance of other states to complement its needs. Thus, international organizations cut across both political and economic spheres.

Fundamentally, international organizations are important actors in international relations. They constitute a major theme in interaction of states. An understanding of the political ideas of these organizations is, therefore, as important as the study of international relations itself.

International organizations usually emerge out of the agreement or treaty reached by contracting parties or members. Once the agreement is undertaken every member state is obligated to adhere to the norms, hence, the popular rule "pacta sunt servanda"; that is to say, every agreement reached must be kept. Most agreements/treaties are bilateral in status. This occurs when they are made between one actor and another.

However, at the regional level and within the frameworks of intercontinental political organizations and specialized agencies, a growing body of multilateral treaties that are contracted by many actors are emerging, hence bilateral and multilateral treaties are the existing principal modes of treaty law. Generally, there are two major categories of international organizations. These are traditional and modern ones.

However, certain characteristics underpin the pre-requisites of international organization. Among these are: (i) they operate within the context of states. (ii) international organizations operate in a situation in which there are contacts among the states. (iii) international organizations emerge when there is recognition of certain problems that are common to all the states. (iv) the states also realize that they need to come together to organize and solve the identified common problems together.

At this juncture, it is necessary to review the origin of international organizations. The origins of international organizations according to Adeniran (1983) can be traced to three streams of development. These include:

- The period of high-level political conferences in which political leaders with or without their ambassadors met to solve problems of which the Vienna Congress of 1815 is a good example.
- The Hague System of 1899 and 1907: It took the form of many nations meeting in a large and sometimes disparate conferences with a view to codifying relationship among themselves. This was more or less the precursor of the General Assembly with its one state one vote approach.

- The era of public international unions such as the Rhine and Danube River Commissions and the Universal Postal Union: They focused on non-political problems among states, especially the economic and social programmes that are today undertaken by the United Nations' specialized agencies like the World Bank, and the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO).

Significantly, the three streams above converged in the formation of the League of Nations. The Council of the League manifested in the first stream in the development of international organization. The Assembly of the league represented the Hague system while the Secretariat represented the third stream which was co-operation on non-political matters specifically for jointly solving the problems which affected the various existing nations of the world.

### The Traditional International Organizations

The traditional international organization as mentioned earlier covered the pre-League of Nations and United Nations period and even extends beyond the period of the three streams referred to above. For instance, several centuries ago, there was the Delian League which was one of the first international frameworks for handling common problems. It was a union of Greek City-States under the leadership of Athens and it covered the periods 478 to 404 BC and 378 to 338 BC. The union was more of an alliance, especially within the first period. It was designed to unite in opposing Persia (now Iran) and they succeeded, trying as much as possible in holding their members together to solve specific problems.

Equally, there was the Hanseatic League. This was an 11th-17th century mercantile development (league) of medieval



German towns and cities. The League was a very large one comprising merchant guilds and town associations. The essence of the League was primarily the provision of security for the members and their trading ventures. It equally secured for them trading rights and monopoly. The league grew fast in the 13th century. The ports and inland towns from Holland to Poland joined and the membership expanded from 80 to 165. In spite of the growth and expansion of the league, the system collapsed in the 16th century, due to obstruction by German princes, internal dissention and general poor management.

Other significant traditional international organizations that emerged to address some pertinent and peculiar problems of the time include: the European concert of pre-World War I. The concert took the form of congresses and diplomatic exchanges. The parties of the congresses were interested in preserving peace among themselves through negotiations. Several conventions were held. They saw to the development and modification of the rules relating to war and peace. A typical example of this congress was the congress of Vienna of 1815. Others include the London Protocol and Conference of 1830 and the Congress of Paris of 1856. There was also the Congress of Berlin of 1878. The congress marked the end of the war between Turkey and Russia and sealed the partition of African territories among the European states.

A leading feature of traditional international organization was its ad hoc status. Essentially, most of the traditional international organizations withered away after certain known aims and objectives have been accomplished.

## Modern International Organizations

International organizations today can be said to be the products of traditional international organizations. This is so because the modern international organizations have emerged in such a way as to make them reflect the modern state system whilst leaning on lessons from its traditional past. The founders of modern international organizations having taken cognizance of the gap that existed in the traditional international organizations conceived the idea of new structures that would bridge the gap with a view to addressing the problems of modern states.

Modern international organizations generally, emerged in various forms but specifically took two dimensions. These are: the inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations. An inter-governmental organization, in its modern approach is an institutional structure which according to Jacobson (1979, p.8) was created by "agreement among two or more sovereign states for the conduct of regular political interactions". The inter-governmental organizations have basic structures and features. Among them are: permanent structures which implies that they are not ad hoc in nature. Secondly, they have regular meetings which are attended by the representatives of the various members-states. Thirdly, they have specific procedures for making decisions. They equally have permanent secretariats which are referred to as their headquarters with permanent staff to administer the affairs of the secretariats.

Inter-governmental organizations also function in certain manner that is similar to national governments of various member states. For instance, they pass resolutions and follow such up along with their programmes of action which in a way are their basic policies. Again, they have laid-down objectives that are spelt out in their constitutions or charters. Inter-governmental organizations function as network for

linking various states or countries, irrespective of their levels of development and ideological differences. Through their activities, the practice of multilateral diplomacy is made easy among the member states.

The first modern international governmental organization could be said to be the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine. It was created at the Conference of Vienna in 1815. The essence was to ensure that there was free navigation and that the vessels plying the Rhine were given equal treatment. The vessels belonged to different countries. The Central Commission had a small secretariat where delegates of member states met from time to time to deliberate on issues and affairs of the commission. The birth of this central commission as an international governmental organization gave rise to several similar organizations.

By 1865 for example, membership of these international governmental organizations expanded due to the outbreak of certain violence across the globe. The Franco-Prussian war, World War I and World War II have all produced certain inter-governmental organizations. Notable among them were the Leagues of Nations of the post-world war I and the United Nations Organization that emerged after World War II. Today, these organizations numbering over two hundred which cut-across regional, like the European Union (EU), African Union (AU), and inter-continental like the United Nations Organization with its specialized agencies, usually come together to review certain common problems with a view to gathering strength so as to surmount such problems.

The international non-governmental organizations on the other hand are composed of individuals or private citizens. Individuals, otherwise known as natural persons and group of individuals or juridic persons. The juridic persons generally refer to corporations. Sometimes, they could be a



combination of both from a number of countries. In other words, their members are not states and they are usually created on an agreement among the members sometimes without the consent of government. The groups of which they are members constitute important element in the international political system.

In terms of characteristics, the international non-governmental organizations have features similar to that of international governmental Organization. This is because, they have regular meetings of the representatives of members. Secondly, they have certain procedures on which they base their decisions and policies. They equally have permanent secretariat. The international non-governmental organizations like the international governmental organizations have their own networks. They have purposes to serve as well as functions to discharge. Their functions mostly are non-political.

International non-governmental organization became very popular after the First World War. Today, some of the international non-governmental organizations are becoming increasingly active politically, to the extent of having consultative status with the UNO and other regional organizations like the African Union and European Union. It is through this, that they submit their views in various ways to the world. They function as interest groups and they get involved in lobbying member-states on certain positions on which they would like to see some policies adopted which are in tandem with their aspirations.

### The Bretton Woods System

International Organizations as earlier demonstrated cut-across political and economic echelon. The idea of international economic relations can be said to have been conceived in Bretton Woods. Bretton Woods is a major

phenomenon in international economic relations. It was the venue where the countries of the Allied Forces convened in 1944 to establish a new international monetary order. This followed the Great Depression and the devastation of World War II which tore the world economy apart. The intention was to create a new monetary order at that time in order to address the consequences of the collapse of the monetary system in the 1930s. As a result of the unnecessary and unhealthy global competition of that era resulting in the devaluation in the exchange rates, it became necessary for the Allied Forces to devise means to confront the global economic threat.

However, the problem became more complex by schemes and activities of the various monetary blocs as there was no international co-operation. In a bid to solve the problem that contributed to a worsening of the world economy and the overall relations among states, it was deemed right to put in place international economic system which would prevent any future economic crisis and collapse. Subsequent upon this, therefore, the allied forces decided to put on ground the structure that would co-ordinate their monetary policies so as to prevent political crises and military conflicts among them. The governments were to arrange a system that would standardize the currencies of the various states involved. This arrangement laid the foundation for the Bretton Woods System.

In terms of origin, the Bretton Woods System dates back to the 1930s. Here, the United States, the French Government and the British Government met and undertook a tripartite agreement at Bretton Woods for cooperation on monetary issues. This co-operation was solidified during the Second World War. The focus of the agreement was to ensure the institutionalization of the various monetary policies in such a way that would become an international monetary order.

The aim of those who met in Bretton Woods was to have a structure which could address the immediate demands of the countries involved and provide them with a much needed institution to monitor and control the flow of money and general transactions among states at that time.

Fundamentally, Bretton Woods was conceived as a system of monetary arrangement that would guarantee the valuation of world currencies in relation to gold and the American dollar which was to be "pegged at the rate of thirty-five dollars per ounce of gold" (Adeniran, 1983 p.152). The immediate outcome of the decision at the Bretton Woods was the adoption of the United States' dollars as the world's central currency instead of the British pound. The currencies of the European countries and some from the Third World were also to be pegged in relation to the dollar. Thus, the Bretton Woods system was to provide a monetary and financial base for international co-operation and effective management of world transactions.

Following this development, two Bretton Woods institutions were created. These are: the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), known as the World Bank. These institutions were saddled with the responsibility of performing Central Bank functions for the international system. By December 1945, the required number of states (governments) had ratified the treaties creating the two as public international organizations and by 1946, they had begun operation.

At Bretton Woods, the multilateral agreement as designed by the framers of the treaties was to have a fixed exchange rate. All countries were expected to establish the parity of their currencies in terms of gold and in relation to the dollar and they were also expected to make nothing less or more than



one percent of parity. The arrangement was expected to be an open system which would induce members and commit them to the convertibility of their currencies into the currencies of the international monetary system. The two major institutions - the IMF and the World Bank were charged to perform specific functions.

The International Monetary Fund was to serve as the monitor or the overseer of the operations of international management of the monetary system. The fund, which was provided for the IMF, represented contributions in gold of member-states in their own currencies. It was made to grant credits or advance to countries that have balance of payments deficit. The fund was also expected to function as an agent for monitoring the monetary activities of some of the states, especially from the Third World and Europe. From the forgoing, it is crystal clear that the essence of the Bretton Woods System was on national and market sales to monetary problems arising from balance of payments deficit. Therefore, it was expected as earlier indicated that the IMF credits would go a long way in helping the poorer countries overcome their balance of payments problems.

The World Bank on the other hand was established specifically to address the reconstruction work that was needed after the devastation of World War II. The bank on its creation was given an authorized capitalization of 10 billion American dollars and was expected, out of this, to grant loans and under-write private loans as well as issue of security to raise new funds especially for the rapid recovery of the European states. The provision that led to the establishment of the two Bretton woods institutions was to ensure better management of the world's monetary system.

# Chapter

## 9

### *The Concepts of Power and Elitism*

Power and elitism occupy unique positions in the lexicon of political science. This is because they function as institutional guides as well as framework of analysis in the discourse of political ideas. Thus, the exclusion of both in the development of political ideas could amount to serious omission. So, the major task in this chapter is to examine the two concepts and to appraise their stand as framework of analyses so as to underscore their relevance in political ideas. The question at this juncture therefore, is: what is power? And what constitutes the components or the resources of power.

Conceptually, power has been defined as man's control over the mind and actions of others, and can be determined by examining the relationships between actors (Morgenthau, 1954). It is the ability to influence one's behaviour in order to conform to the whims and caprices of the stronger. In power theory, relation among states is usually determined by national interest, hence, a doyen of this theory once asserted that "national interest requires constant accumulation of power for survival and security" (Morgenthau, 1954 p.9). The accumulation of such power the scholar reveals has to do with three basic patterns which include: (a) a foreign policy seeking either to keep power (b) a foreign policy seeking to increase power or (c) a policy seeking to demonstrate

power. To this author, power has behavioural relationship – observable manifestation. That is, overt behavior that can be seen, equally possessing psychological relationship, which Morgenthau indicated operates at the level of the mind.

Power is used as a means to an end. Morgenthau described it this way: whatever is the ultimate end of the state is power, hence, the assertion that international relations like all politics is a struggle for power. Any state, whose objective tends towards any of the basic patterns earlier enunciated, pursues a policy of status quo, imperialism, and status and prestige.

From the foregoing, it is crystal clear that power manifests between two conditions – strong and weak. The strong possesses power and uses it to influence the behavior of the weak, with a view to achieving some desired goals. Power, therefore, exists at the levels of the individual persons and states or countries. This implies that as there are powerful persons, there are also powerful nation-states. It is on this premise that international politics for instance, is characterized by the domination of weaker states by the stronger ones. From this perspective, Wight (1978 p.208) classified power into four taxonomy:

1) The dominant power: This is referred to as the powers that dominate Europe in the thirteenth century. For instance, England was supreme power between 1337- 1451, and Habsburg dynasty with its axis in Spain and Australia.

2) The great powers: These powers emerged as world powers after the Second World War. They include: America, Russia, Great Britain, Germany, Japan and potentially, France and China. He used potentially great powers for some



countries, because France for instance, was defeated in the war between her and Germany in 1940.

3) World Powers: They are the countries which Wight referred to as the ones that could effectively preserve or defend their interests inside Europe with military strength, and power derived outside Europe – colonial territories.

4) Small Powers: These are states that have limited means to defend only limited interests. They are the third world nations of the world.

Contributing to the concept of power and power politics in international relations, Rosen and Jones (1980) demonstrated that power is the ability of an actor in the international stage to use tangible and intangible resources and assets in such a way as to influence the outcomes of international events to its own satisfaction. The tangible resources according to them include:

(i) Human Resources: Persons who are knowledgeable in scientific fields, highly skilled, politically conscious, awareness of their common interests and are organized and possess a common ideology.

(ii) Natural Resources: Those resources that are highly valued by international community and are therefore, in great demand in a particular period of time by other actors. Examples: oil, gold, diamond etc.

(iii) Technology: Capacity to transform nature into high form through the application of science.

(iv) Military Capacity: This embraces the possession of modern military weaponry as well as highly trained personnel.

(v) Industrial Capacity: The ability to produce manufactured goods. That is, to transform raw materials into more sophisticated forms as well as in large quantities.

(vi) Diplomatic Skills: This refers to the management of international affairs by peaceful means, particularly, the ability to negotiate or to bargain.

Most power is gained in a process of competition and rivalry and often maintained by the same means. This explains why Rosen and Jones maintained that power is not a natural political attribute but a product of material (tangible) and behavioural (intangible) resources, each of which has its unique place in the totality of the calculations of the actors of power.

Power in international relations is therefore, politics itself, just like Fredrick (1963 p.17) rightly pointed out that "perhaps, of all human activities involving relationship with others, politics imposes more complex situations on its practitioners than any other. Power-politics is not just a matter of structure and process, but rather a drama of human beings, responding to, and attempting to affect the behavior of one another".

Fundamentally, functional relationship exists between power and elitism. Elites stand out in the society because of their possession of power. Conceptually, elite constitute group of persons that hold positions of influence in any society. It is a descriptive concept that denotes those who possess power resources, thus Patrick Dunleavy and Brendan O'Leary captured it vividly when they asserted that elite constitutes the noble, the best and the excellent in a society.

In every society, there are several political elites as far as there are values widely cherished in that society. Such values are found among academics or those popularly referred to as the intelligentsia; captains of industries and public office holders usually classified as bureaucrats including the wealthy class in the society usually referred to as the plutocrats. Those with large elective or appointive offices are designated the political elite.

In politics generally, the term political elite refers to those who exercise preponderant political influence in a society. A society may have a number of distinct but overlapping elites, whose membership span through various dimensions like aristocratic birth, the art of sciences, business, politics and war. Given the above, the elites are differently designated as the power elites, the ruling class, and business elites and / or entrepreneurs to mention but three.

#### Exponents of the Elite Theory

Among the outstanding exponents of the elite theory are: Wilfredo Pareto (1935) and (1963), Gaetano Mosca (1939) and Robert Michael (1958). To Pareto, the elites are substantives which designate what society respects and supports at any time. Pareto divided the elite into those who directly or indirectly play an important part in government - the governing elite and those, like top chess-players, whose activities are latent in politics, that is, non-governing elite. He therefore, defines both groups as those who regardless of ability occupy the leading positions. In some clans, they are referred to as the "political machines". In some others, they are the stakeholders who decide who gets what among the political gladiators. In the bid of the political contest, this group restlessly suppresses opposition. However, Pareto made a strong case for a balance of the qualities of lion and fox for a stable polity. In the Machiavellian thought, the qualities of the fox and lion denote the character of being



cunning and clever to subdue an opponent or opposing camp.

Pareto's disposition logically reflects the anthropological and sociological purviews that nature and nurture do not allow vacuum. Thus, he opined that: "history of men is the history of the continuous replacement of certain elites, as one ascends, another declines. Such is the real phenomenon, though to us it may often appear under another form" (Pareto, 1963 p.36)

Mosca (1939) emphasized the sociological and personal characteristics of elites. He opined that elites are organized minority and that the masses are an unorganized majority. The ruling class is composed of the ruling elites and sub-elites. Mosca therefore, popularized the concept of sub-elite. He demonstrated that the ruling elite are connected to the masses through the sub-elite who consist of civil servants, managing directors, scientists, engineers, scholars, among others.

Mosca maintained that the role of the sub-elite is so essential that the stability of any political organism depends on the level of morality, intelligence and activity that this second stratum has attained. This implies, that the middle class determines the effectiveness of elite politics.

Mosca further classified the political class into higher and lower stratum. Below the highest stratum in the ruling class, there is always another that is more numerous and comprises all the capacities for leadership in the country. The upper stratum of political decision-makers is insufficient in strength and numbers to perform the wide range and variety of leadership functions necessary in a society. The opinion leaders who perform the task of explaining and justifying decisions and legislation issued by the leaders are drawn

from the second stratum, which Mosca identifies with the middle class. The middle class is also the source of recruitment for the upper stratum. At this juncture, Mosca concluded that the key to the stability of any political system lies more in the quality of the lower level of the elite than in the few persons who control the state machine.

Michael who coined the phrase "the iron law of oligarchy" believes that, it is organization that gives birth to the domination of the elected over the electors; of the mandatories over the mandators; of the delegates over the delegators. Michael stated that in general the masses, even when organized within a political party were apathetic about the running of the affairs---preferring instead to go and listen to their heroes speak.

To Michael (1958) the dominant minority cannot be controlled by the majority in the society, hence, he opined that, historic evolution mocks all the prophylactic measures that have been adopted for the prevention of oligarchy. If laws are passed to control the dominion of the leaders, it is the laws which gradually weaken, and not the leaders.

Meisel (1958) described the above features as the three Cs Group Consciousness, Coherence and Conspiracy (the last term meaning a "common" will to action rather than secret machinations).

The elites constitute themselves, into a caste. Little wonder Marx, referred to these few individuals as the bourgeoisie that owns the means of production and controls socio-political and economic process of the society.

Essentially, the outstanding qualities of the elites that placed them at the advantageous position to influence events in the society include:

1) Easy communication: They have transport and other assets that facilitate their mobility from one destination to another any moment any time.

2) Adaptability: They are usually, clever enough to understand the mood of the moment. They easily discern the times and switch themselves onto the current. They are pliable, pragmatic and progressive, hence, they live to reckon with all circumstances and get adjusted to every eventuality.

3) They have common consciousness: This makes them alert to the same problems and issues in politics and thus, tend to seek solutions in a common approach.

4) The elites are coherent and united in purpose and action: Taking cognizance of these features, the elites soon sell and transform themselves into cabals, leaders of thought, opinion leaders and substantive decision-makers. Even in the presence of mass participatory democracy, consensus is generally brought about by these few domineering individuals and supported by a few people who constitute an informal exclusive group. So, elitism is discriminatory, pre-emptive, and preventive and savours of a divine right to say what politics ought to be and how the society generally should be organized and run. The elite class claims therefore, the political offices and tends to disregard and snob mass opinion and competence.

The concepts of power and elitism as demonstrated in this chapter contain, therefore, normative attributes in explaining issues of political ideas – the ideas that shape the world.



# Chapter

# 10

## *Integration and Globalization*

### Integration

Following the universalization of socio-economic and political phenomena in our contemporary society, the ideas of integration and globalization appear germane in explaining modern development. While integration seems to lay down the necessary framework for universalization process, globalization on the other hand appears to be the product of the entire process. So, this chapter sets out to explore the linkage pattern between integration and globalization as the political ideas that strive to explain the present issues and concerns of the emerging global system.

Integration in principle is synonymous with functionalism. The major exponents of the theory are Karl Deutch (1957), Ernest B. Haas (1958), and Lindberg (1963).

Conceptualizing integration for instance, Deutch argued that, it is a condition. It is a situation which a people have attained within a territory. It is manifested by a sense of community and a growth of institutions and practices strong enough and widespread enough among the people involved to ensure a long time dependable expectation of peaceful change.

To Ernest B. Haas, integration can be viewed as a phenomenon reflected by transactions coupled with co-operative decision-making among states. It could therefore, be taken as a process as well as an outcome. This implies, a process of linking an existing system with a future system. If the present international scene represents a series of different nations with their different political environments, the future of these nations, if involved in integration, would be the type that would lead to greater integration and co-operation. The nation-states, through integration are brought together for common purposes within the same institutional structures.

In a related development, Lindberg captured integration as the process whereby nations forgo the desire and ability to conduct foreign and key domestic policies independent of each other. Instead of doing them independently, they seek to make joint decisions or to delegate the decision-making process to a new central organization. He goes further to demonstrate that integration is the process whereby political actors in several distinct settings are persuaded to shift their expectations and political activities to a new centre.

What the on-going definitions underscore is that integration encourages sovereign states across national boundaries to give up their loyalties and submit same to a central body for purposes of achieving one aim or the other. Such aim may range from political and economic to security and education. This means that unification is a product of integration. Thus, Integration is facilitated either legally, associational and organizational, among others.

It is important, however, to note that integration is a product of voluntary movements or voluntary acts by nation-states. This is to say, that the whole activities in international relations whether bilateral that is, when two nation-states are

involved or multilateral when more than two states are involved find their expression within the premise of integration. So, issues in international institutions and organizations like UNO or regional ones like EU and AU are all manifestations of integration process.

### **Globalization**

Globalization as a phenomenon in the contemporary international political system has become the defining process of the present age. Logically, it is a product of integration. Etymologically, globalization entered into the lexicon of international affairs in 1961. However, its present status gathered momentum on January 1, 1995 at the Uruguay Round/Conference. At the Conference, World Trade Organization (WTO), was adopted to replace General Agreement on Trade and Tariff (GATT), as the institution that will propagate the globalization agenda. WTO emerged therefore, to pursue relentlessly the policy under the Uruguay Round Agreement which focused on the establishment of a globalized economy.

The major functions of WTO include:

1. To help the free flow of trade across the international communities.
2. To achieve further and wider liberalization through negotiations.
3. To act as the arbiter and thus, settle disputes between countries of the world, that is, disputes that may emanate from bilateral and multilateral interactions.

Conceptually, the phenomenon (Globalization), has been seen as all those processes by which the peoples of the world are incorporated into a single world or global society. It has been seen further as the "intensification of worldwide social



relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring thousands of kilometers away and vice versa" (Khor, 1995). Thus, we talk today of global markets, global communication, global threats, global village etc.

Globalization by way of categorization can be discussed/viewed from various perspectives like economy, communication and politics/democracy.

### **Economic Globalization**

Economic globalization has gained ground in the contemporary global system through technological acceleration and liberalism. It dwells extensively on the breakdown of national economic barriers through the reduction of policies like tariff and all forms of obstacles that impede free flow of trade and Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), across national boundaries. So, through the principles of economic liberalism, trade, FDI, and finance, can easily flow without hindrance across the globe. Through this process, the world has become increasingly inter-dependent than ever with free flow of trade, FDI, and finance.

### **Communication**

In the area of communication, globalization has been occurring through computer networks, telephone, and electronic mass media. Such technological advancement enables persons to have almost immediate contact with each other irrespective of their location. This has gone a long way in solving the problems that are associated with international links which require people to make long journeys at frequent intervals. Today, it is common to see the global cell-phone connections, internet, satellite, newscast, overcoming the distance problems and challenges.

In globalization, socio-economic and political events seem to be shrinking and people are increasingly aware of this. The worldwide web (www.com) is but the most graphic example of this. Following the dearth of distance, as a result of the modern communication link therefore, decision about where people live and work will be altered, as well as the concept of borders and patterns of inter-trade. Rapid and unrestrained communication is a hallmark of the "global village" and image, hence, it has widely been acclaimed that this phenomenon of borderless society is a pathway to a more peaceful world and co-existence.

Certainly, computers and internet services are the most visible symbols of globalization. There is no area of the world, no area of politics, economic, society and culture that cannot be accessed by this great leap in information technology. The freedom people enjoy with personal computers and their ability to tap into emerging technologies without government interference is most visible in the internet.

#### Politics/Democracy

In today's global phenomenon, the state and global governance appear to be deficit of democratic norms and values. Many governments violate human rights and principles of good governance. Instances abound in the world political institutions and organizations where the citizenry are ignorant of the workings of the world institutions – IMF, World Bank, United Nations Security Council, WTO. The reservation of seats to five permanent members in UNO is highly undemocratic and unjustifiable. Quota based votes in IMF and World Bank clearly demonstrate the undemocratic character of global governance and these run contrary to the philosophy of globalization and its liberal perspective.

Nevertheless, political participation through democratization process has remained the watch word of the modern political globalization process. The Millennium Development Goal (MDG), captured it right when it underpinned democracy as one of its essential objectives that must be embraced by the contemporary global society. Thus, it is not uncommon today to see the UNO through its Security Council compelling any country that inclines towards dictatorship rather than the ethics of democracy to reverse it within 48 hours of such development. On this posture, clarion call has been made on UNO to democratize the membership of the Security Council with a view to granting equal participation among the member states.



## References

- Agbu, O. (2006). Globalization and Nigeria's Economy. *Nigeria Journal of International Affairs*. Vol.32 No. 1.
- Adeniran, T. (1983). *Introduction to International Relations*. Nigeria: Macmillan Publishers Limited.
- Akinyemi, B. (ed) (1978). *Nigeria and the World: Readings in Nigeria Foreign Policy*. Ibadan: Oxford University Press.
- Alan B. (1952). *Hitler: A Study in Tyranny*. New York: Penguin
- Alpha History. "What is Revolution? Retrieved from <http://alphahistory.com/vcehistory>
- Anugwom, E.E. (2001). Uneven participation: Africa and the Unfolding Realities of Globalization. *Nigerian Journal of International Affairs*. Vol. 27. No. 1 and 2.
- Appadorai, M. A. (1975). *The Substance of Politics*. Madras: Oxford University Press.
- Aristotle (1962). *Politics*. Ernest Barker (ed). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bull. H. (1977). *The Anarchical Society: A study of Order in World Politics*. London: Macmillan.
- Burns, C.D. (1929). *Political Ideas*. New York: Oxford University Press. 4th Edition.

- Chengte, P.V. (2016). The Concept of Revolution. *International Journal of Political Science (IJPS)*, Volume 2, Issue 4
- Cranston, M. (2019). Ideology. Encyclopedia Britannica.
- Dahl, R. A. (2005). *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*. New Haven: Yale University Press
- Dahl, R. A. (1963). *Modern Political Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs: N.J. Printice Hall.
- Diamond, C. et al (ed) (1997). *Consolidating the Third wave of Democracies*. London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dicey, A.V. (1939). *Introduction to the Study of Law of the Constitution*. London: Macmillian.
- Encyclopedia.com Content.
- Engels, F. (1951). *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.
- Finen, H. (1935). *Mussolin's Italy*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Fredrick, C. (1963). *Man, and His Government*. New York: Macgnaw Hill.
- Gale, T. (2008). Bureaucracy. International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. Retrieved from <http://www.encyclopedia.com/social-sciences-and-law>.

Hobbes, T. (1968). *Leviathan*. Everyman Library Dent. First Published (1651).

Holsti, K.J. (1995). *International Politics: A Framework for Analysis*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc. Seventh Edition.

Jacobson, H.K. (1979). *Networks of Interdependence: International Organizations and the Global Political System*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Kaplan, M.A. (1957). *Systems and Process in International policies*. New York: John Wiley.

Katz, M.N. (1997). *Revolutions and Revolutionary waves*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kegley, C.W. (2007). *World Politics: Trend and Transformation*, USA: Thomson Wadsworth. Eleventh Edition.

Khor, M. (2000). *Globalization and the South: Some Critical Issues*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books.

Laski, H. J. (1938). *Parliamentary Government in England*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Lenin, V.I. (1918). *The State and Revolution*. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.

Lenin, V.I. (1939). *Selected Works*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Lenin, V.I. (1975). *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*. Peking: Foreign Languages Press (First Published in Petrograd 1919).



- Lindsay, A.D. (1935). *The Essentials of Democracy*. London: Oxford University Press, 2nd edition.
- Locke, J. (1924). *Two Treaties on Government*. New York: Everyman Library. First Published 1689.
- Machiavelli, N. (1532). *The Prince and the Discourses*. London: Penguin Books
- Mahajan (1988). *Political Theory*. New Delhi: S. Chard & Company Ltd.
- Marx, K. (1961). *Capital*, Vol. 1 (ed) F. Engels, Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, First Published in German 1867.
- Marx, K. (1957). *Capital*, Vol. 11 (ed) F. Engels, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House. First Published in German 1885.
- Marx, K. (1962). *Capital* Vol. 111 (ed) F. Engels. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House. First Published in German 1894.
- Marx, K. (1976). *Preface and Introduction to a Contribution to the Critiques of Political Economy*. Pekin: Foreign Languages Publishing House. First Published in German 1859.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1848). *The Communist Manifesto*. Mosco: Foreign Languages: .
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1932). *The German Ideology*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

- Merton R.K.(1957). *Bureaucratic Structure and Personality in Social Theory and Social Structure*. Glencoe, 11: Free Press.
- Michael, F. *Ideology*. Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy. London: Informa UK Limited.
- Michels, R. (1958). *Political Parties*. New York: Free Press.
- Miesel, J. H. (1958). *The myth of the Ruling Class USA*: University of Michigan Press.
- Mills, C. W. (1959). *The Power Elites*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Montesquieu, C.L (1949). *The Spirit of Laws*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Morgenthau, H. (1954). *Politics Among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York. Alfred A. Knopf
- Mosca, G. (1939). *The Ruling Class*. New York: Mccraw Hill.
- Mussolini B. (1956). *Twilight and Fall*. English translation by H.C. Steven. New York: Dombrowski, R.
- Nzimiro, I. (1972). *Studies in Ibo Political Systems, Chieftaincy and Politics in Four Niger States*. London: Cass.
- Ofoegbu, R. (1980). *Foundation Course in International Relations for African Universities*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Pareto, W. (1935). *The mind and society*. New York: Harcourt – Brace.

- Pareto, W. (1963). *The Mind and Society: A Treatise on General Sociology*, New York: Dover Press.
- Plato (375 BC). *The Republic*. Translated by A.D. Lindsay, 1976. London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd.
- Rockman, B. (2019). *Bureaucracy*. Encyclopedia Britannica.
- Rosen, S and Jones, W. (1974). *The Logic of International Relations*. Cambridge: Winthrop.
- Rosow, S. (2001). Globalization as Democratic Theory. *Millennium Journal of International Studies*. Vol. 29. No. 1.
- Rousseau, J.J. (1950). *The Social Contract*. Translated by G.D. H. Cole. Everyman Library, New York: First Published 1762.
- Sabine, G. H. and Thorson, T.L (1973). *A History of Political Theory*. New Delhi: Oxford and IBH Publishing Co. Fourth Edition.
- Sanda, J.G. (2004). *Governance and Regional Security in Africa*. Lagos. Frankad Publisher.
- See, J.W. (2019). *Ideology*. Retrieved from Encyclopedia.com
- Tanter, R. and Midlansky, M. (1966). "A Theory of Revolution" *Journal of Conflict Resolution* Vol xi, No 3.
- Todd, A. (1998). *Revolutions, 1789 – 1917*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.



- Varma, S.P. (1975). *Modern Political Theory*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House
- Vedung, E. (1975). "The Study of Contents and Functions of Political Ideas". *Scandinavian Political Studies*, Bind 10 University of Uppsala.
- Venter, J.C.M and Bain, E.G. (2015). A Deconstruction of the Term Revolution. *Koers Bulletin for Christian Scholarship*, 80(4)
- Washington, J.M. (ed) (1991). *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King Jr.* New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. New York: Martino Fine Books.
- White, S. (1990). *Gorbachev in Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wight, M (ed) (1978). *Power Politics*. England: Middlesex
- Wood, J.R. and Serres, J. (1971). *Diplomatic Ceremonial and Protocol: Principles, Procedures and Practices*. London: Macmillan

