



Challenges of Political Parties Internal Democracy in Nigeria: A Comparative analysis of the Ruling APC and the PDP

By

Tukura Nashuka Tino

tukura.tino88@gmail.com, 08026504155

Department of Political Science Federal University Wukari, Taraba State,

Ibrahim Nuaimu Danbala

ndanbala223@gmail.com, GSM: 08069531147

Department of Political Science Federal University Wukari, Taraba State

&

Tukura Daudu Fwaje

fwajetukura@gmail.com, 0803810965

Department of Political Science Federal University Wukari, Taraba State

Abstract

Nigerian political parties in the Fourth Republic are characterized by a lack of internal democracy thus leading to the factionalization of some major political parties and the consequence defection of party members to other political parties to actualize their ambitions. This paper is attempts an analysis of the problem of internal democracy in both the ruling All Progressive Congress (APC) and the opposition People's Democratic Party (PDP) to determine the extent to which each has succeeded or failed in this regard. It employed the theory of relative autonomy of the state and argues that the APC and the PDP authoritarianism intensified the challenge of internal democracy in Nigeria and that this authoritarian character of the ruling APC and the opposition PDP is a reflection of the authoritarian character of the Nigerian state. The paper is qualitative and utilizes the content analysis. It is discovered in this paper that the ruling APC did not fare better than the opposition PDP in terms of internal party democracy and concluded that this lack or absence of internal party democracy in Nigerian political parties generally does not only undermine the credibility of the electoral process but also makes the entire process undemocratic. This paper recommended among other things that the APC and the PDP leaders should adhere to internal democracy within their internal structures and dynamics especially in the selection of candidates for general elections which could be achieved by subordinating personal interests of party members to the larger interest of the political party.

Keywords: Political Parties, Internal Party Democracy, APC, PDP, Internal Party crisis.

Introduction

Contemporary democracy works with party politics because democracy requires the active participation of political parties for its maintenance. Political parties, as democratic institutions are expected to be the carriers of democratic principles through which democracy can be properly actualized in Nigeria. Therefore, a critical analysis of political parties revealed that they are crucial tools for promoting democracy. Accordingly, Omotola (2009), argues that political parties are not only promoters of democratic principles, but are also “makers” of





democracy, of which their absence also translates to an absence of democratic principles or structures. What this therefore means is that political parties are the sine qua non for the entrenchment of democracy. Aleyomi (2013), submits that political parties are also expected to perform 'institutional guarantees' through which effective discharge of their democratic duties can be properly carried out. Within this context, therefore, political parties are expected to be internally democratic in order to ensure democratic governance.

Therefore, since political parties are essential tools for democracy, internal party democracy is one of the institutional requirements for effective democracy. This is why Scarrow (cited in Momodu & Matudi 2013, p.7), argues that internal democracy describes a wide range of methods for including party members in intra-party deliberation and decision-making. Momodu and Matudi (2013) argued that internal democracy articulates the basic tenets of democracy within political parties and the extent to which political parties subscribe to the basic democratic values within their internal structures and the conduct of party members.

Furthermore, internal party democracy is the creation of a permissible atmosphere within a political party which guarantees the participation of all party members in decision-making as well as the general administration of the party. Such an atmosphere according to Momodu and Matudi (2013), fosters the active involvement of every party member and not a few powerful rich. Therefore, internal party democracy is aimed at creating a level playing ground for the active participation of all party members in the party affairs and to build a cohesive party that is vibrant to win elections and to also provide a government that is committed to quality service delivery and democratic dividends. Most importantly, internal party democracy is required in the process of candidates' selection for a general election because the lack or absence of it often results in crisis, factionalization and consequence defection of party members in most political parties (Momodu & Matudi, 2013). In light of this, the internal democracy of political parties is necessary because democracy is expected to be competition between and among political parties and not within them (Disch, 2012). Therefore, the specific objective of this paper is to determine whether the ruling All Progressive Congress (APC) succeeds where the People's Democratic Party (PDP) failed in terms of internal party democracy.

Statement of the problem

In Nigeria, party politics has been characterized by incessant intra-party conflict and attendant factionalization and defection of party members to other political organization as a result of not only disinclination to democratic principles, flaunt of party's constitution, lack of free, fair and credible election, politics of godfatherism and imposition of candidate for general election, but also and most worrisomely absence of internal party democracy thus undermining political parties leadership recruitment function. The problem of lack of internal party democracy associated with party politics in the Nigeria's Fourth Republic which started in May 1999 is borne out of the notion that politics is about contestation for political power between and among the political elites. Therefore, many political parties in Nigeria find it difficult to adopt an open system that will not only allow for inclusive decision making but also give the members open





opportunity to contest in elections under the party's platform. This kind of political restraint and limitation has progressively resulted in party squabbling, war of attrition, accusation, bitterness, coordination problem, factionalization, and defection in various Nigerian political parties.

This scenario of such restricted politics as captured by Awosika (cited in Ojukwu & Olaifa, 2011), is poisonous. Oyediran (in Ojukwu & Olaifa, 2011) affirmed that it is a politics of war not of peace, of acrimony, hatred and and mudslinging not of love and brotherhood, of anarchy and discord, not of orderliness and concord of division and disunity and not cooperation, consensus and unity, not of integrity and patriotism; it is a politics of rascality, not of maturity, of blackmail and near gangsterism, not of constructive and contribution. This explains why Egboh and Anichie (2012) posited that internal party democracy is an issue that has consistently eluded Nigerian democracy because political parties have always been hijacked at all levels by powerful individuals who impose loyalists as candidates for election. The pervasive level of the problem of internal party democracy in Nigeria's democratic system can be attributed to the mindset and perception that politics is the most lucrative industry in the country. This belief is intensified by the growing culture of impunity and blatant disregard for the rule of law exhibited by the Nigerian political elites who see political parties as veritable platforms to capture power by all means and at all costs. This is because the occupancy of political power gives the political elites the direct access to primitive accumulation of public wealth for their selfish gains which has heightened the desperation for the acquisition of political power among the political elites (Momodu & Matudi, 2013).

The persistence problem of internal party democracy in Nigerian political parties and the attendant factionalization and defection of party members prompted Okoli and Ali (2014) to attribute it to desperate ambitions, lack of ideological attachment to the party system, and materialistic partisan opportunism. This is why Iyare (2004) observes that there is almost nothing to choose between the PDP and other political parties in terms of ideological leaning and that until poverty of ideology is addressed, the problem of internal party democracy will continue to linger in PDP and other political parties in Nigeria. Momodu and Matudi (2013), further posited that intra-party conflicts arising from crisis of internal democracy is a threat to democracy in Nigeria's Fourth Republic. Obah-Akpowoghaha (2013) in his study of 'party politics and the challenge of democratic consolidation in Nigeria' submits that lack of internal democracy within political parties is a limiting factor in Nigeria's effort to deepen, sustain and consolidate democracy. Similarly, Ikeanyibe (2014) argues that lack of internal democracy in the nomination of party candidates for general elections weakens party unity and institutionalization of Nigerian political parties, and also negatively affects democratic consolidation in Nigeria's Fourth Republic. It is based on this observed problem that this paper raises the poser: Has the All Progressive Congress succeeds where the People's Democratic Party failed in terms of internal party democracy?



Theoretical Framework

This paper is anchored on the theory of relative autonomy of the state developed by Hamza Alavi in 1972 and popularized by third world scholars like Ake (1981), Ekekwe (1986), Ibeanu (1988), Nnoli (1986), Idode (1989), and Mbah (2011) among others. An outstanding tenet of the theory of relative autonomy of the state is its assumption that nature, character and institutional framework that has informed and characterized the state has its foundation in a colonial state and its associated concept, imperialism. The theory assumes that in connection with the dwindling capital penetration in the economy is intense political competition to control the bureaucratic or administrative state apparatus. To this theory, the intensifying political competition for state power coincides with the socio-economic competition. Ifesinachi (2006) argues that the relative autonomy of the state depends on the management of government institutions of the state by the political leadership.

Ake (cited in Aniche, 2017) submits that a relative autonomy state does not limit itself to the supervisory or regulatory role and is thus compromised to an extent that instead of rising above class struggle, it is deeply immersed in it. Again, Ake (quoted in Aniche, 2017) also argues that by involving the state so intimately in the class struggle and by increasing the state power, the blurring of the distinction between the ruling class and the state is reinforced, and the government collapses into the ruling class reinforcing the authoritarianism of the hegemonic faction of the bourgeoisie. Therefore, elections are merely a system for political-ideological reification of the hegemony and power of the dominant class or a system of acculturation through which dominant ideologies, political practices, and beliefs are reproduced (Adejumobi, cited in Anichie, 2017). Consequently, Ake (1995) stated that the implication of this is a dissociation of voting from choice and rights from the exercise of political power. What this means, therefore, is that elections cannot facilitate or foster political accountability, responsiveness, and democracy, which is why Ogban-Iyam (quoted in Anichie, 2017) argues that this form of electoral democratic practice in Nigeria does not translate to popular democracy and hence could only be termed 'electocracy'.

The theory also posited that because of the weak and fragile economic base of the class that inherited the post-colonial state, the state invariably became a major instrument of capital acquisition, investment, and development. Hence, the acquisition and exercise of state power serve as a means of investment for those who control the state (Ake, 1981, Mbah, 2011). Ake (1981) further argues that the very limited autonomy character of the state means that the state is institutionally constituted in such a way that it enjoys limited independence from the social classes, particularly the hegemonic class, and therefore, is immersed in the class struggle that goes on in the society. The theory also assumes that power contest in the state is akin to life and death which is seen as a zero-sum game where the winner takes all. To this end, power is everything even life and death. Therefore, governance in a relative autonomy states is marred by corruption, nepotism, tribalism, among others (Ibeanu, in Aniche, 2017).

The fundamental of the theory of relative autonomy of the state is on understanding the nature, structure, history, composition, and character of the Nigerian state in order to ascertain





the dynamics of political development and processes within the state and these dynamics include political parties and the challenge of internal party democracy in the All Progressive Congress and the People's Democratic Party. Within this context, therefore, it is not out of place to submit that the struggle for state power is very high and often assumes a zero-sum game approach. The very limited autonomy of the state leads to an exclusive politics articulated in the struggle for power based on efficiency norms rather than legitimacy norms, democratic principle, the triumph of the vicious over virtuous circle, centralization of power; imposition of domination and political control and alienation of leaders from their masses; and the deployment of thugs in the exercise of power is the hallmarks of the relative autonomy state.

From the foregoing, the nexus between party politics and internal crisis in the PDP is better explained in light of the theory of relative autonomy of the state. This framework explain how the unproductive, weak, limited autonomy, and the quest for power character of the APC and the PDP members with a high degree of absence of democratic principle is responsible for the problem of internal democracy. This is fundamentally so because the struggle for power is regarded as a means of primitive accumulation of wealth for those who control the parties. By this weak, corrupt and unproductive nature of the ruling class which manifests in a high degree of indiscipline and embezzlement of public funds, the relative autonomy state leaders see and utilize every opportunity for personal gains. Most members (both appointed and seemingly elected members) of the APC and the PDP are highly involved in politics of wealth accumulation and hardly engage in issues such as articulation of common interests of party members, harmonization of divergent interests, adherence to party constitution, compliance to rule of law, inclusion of party members in decision making, adherence to democratic principle and management of internal crisis in the party. Consequently, interest aggregation, articulation, and harmonization of members' objectives of the APC and the PDP which generally aim at uniting and stabilizing the party are relegated to the background, thereby leading to the crisis of internal democracy in the APC and the PDP.

Secondly, the weak, limited party autonomy, lack of party institutionalization, party personalization character of the APC and the PDP has resulted in the crisis of internal democracy leading to imposition and substitution of candidates. Consequently, a state institution like the PDP has ultimately become an instrument of domination and exploitation by the party stalwarts at the expense of members' interests. In other words, the members of the ruling class in the state are engaged in the acquisition and exercise of state power as a means and also an opportunity to further their wealth accumulation interest. The result of this is the primitive accumulation of wealth by party leaders who are ultimately expected to serve the interests of the members; hence the APC and the PDP have become tools for exploitation in the hands of those who constitute party leaders and stalwarts and this has ultimately increased crisis of internal democracy in the parties.

Challenges of Internal Party Democracy in the Ruling APC and the PDP in Nigeria

In Nigeria, party politics is hampered by a lack of internal party democracy and the absence of credible polls. The ruling All Progressive Congress (APC) and the People's





Democratic Party (PDP) have suffered internal crisis leading to factionalization and defection of party members as a result of not only the APC and the PDP disinclination to internal party democracy, but also dictatorial leadership, neglect of democratic principles, presidential pressure on the party structures, disregard to rule of law, lack of party supremacy, party indiscipline, lack of party institutionalization, non-adherence to party constitution and politics of exclusion at the federal, state and local levels. The ruling APC and the opposition PDP have been characterized with some challenges of internal democracy which include but not limited to paucity of party ideology, conduct of party primaries and congresses, party and campaign funding, selection of candidate, zoning arrangement, incumbency factor, politics of godfatherism and party executive arrogance.

Paucity of Party Ideology

The ruling APC and the opposition PDP are bereft of clear-cut party ideological commitments because other forces of identity particularly ethnicity, tribalism, regionalism and religion have taken the place of ideology. Omotola (2009) stated that at the heart of the success or otherwise of every political party is the crucial question of political ideology. The issue of party ideology has been central to the activities of political parties across time and space which prompted Morse (in Aleyomi, 2013) to argue that ideology being the durable conviction held in common by party members in respect to the most desirable form, institutions, spirit and course of action of the state, determines the natural attitude of a party towards every public question. Stricker and Davies cited in (Aleyomi, 2013) also argued that ideology functions as planks; that is, it is a single issue statement within a platform, the exact ideological orientation of which is often used as a bargaining chip in seeking party unity. This is why Nnoli (2003) affirmed that ideology is a very vital aspect of politics, not only by serving as a cognitive structure for looking at society at large and providing a prescriptive formula that serves as a guide to party members action and judgment, but also as a powerful tool for conflict management, self-identification, popular mobilization and legitimization.

Conduct of Party Primaries and Congresses

The conduct of party primaries and congresses is the best way to test the tenacity of any party's internal democracy because several studies have shown that some primaries and congresses conducted in some political parties in Nigeria especially the APC and the PDP are sheer promotional agenda as they do not contribute positively to empowerment⁶ of all party members. Therefore, internal party democracy is grossly challenged and questioned if party members are not aware of the choices they face and made. For example, the PDP's presidential primary election in December 16, 2006 that produced late president as the party standard bearer and the 2013 PDP special national convention were widely rejected and questioned. Similarly, the ruling APC suffered a great setback due to the conduct of the party congress and primaries in 2018 and 2019 respectively. For instance, in 2018, the failure of the ruling APC to conduct valid primaries across states of Nigeria by not allowing level playing ground resulted in the defection of thirty-seven (37) APC Senators and two (2) APC Governors to the opposition PDP and other



political parties. Similarly, in 2019, the APC suffers from a lack of internal party democracy arising from the conduct of primaries leading to the exclusion of APC candidates from contesting for any elective position in some states by the Supreme Court judgment.

A typical example is the case of Rivers and Zamfara State (Inuwa, 2019). In the case of Rivers State, the Federal High Court, in Port Harcourt on January 7, 2019, presided over by Justice ChiwenduNworgu nullified the primaries conducted by the two factions of the All Progressive Congress (APC); Rotimi Ameachi-led faction and Senator Magnus Abe-led faction of the APC. In Zamfara State, the Court of Appeal Sokoto division in its March 25, 2019 ruling, led by Justice Tom Yakubu invalidated the APC's primaries elections in the state arguing that the APC did not conduct a valid primary elections for the 2019 General Elections, and as such has no candidates for any of the polls in the State (Ikhilae et al, 2019).

Party and Campaign Funding

The core of party funding and campaign financing against the backdrop of the institutional designs guiding such activities in the ruling APC and the opposition PDP is another fundamental challenge of internal democracy in the parties. Fisher and Eisenstadt (2004) asserted that studies on all aspects of parties' financial issues seem to have eluded and escaped the attention of many scholars. For them, effective functioning of any political party rests solidly on financial backing it enjoys from all members. This partly explains why Kuka (2011) averred that the important of party funding is underscored by the contribution money can make in democracy and especially in developing economies like Nigeria where few elites control both the sources and distribution of money. What this means therefore, is that money more than anything, is a source of political power and political power in turn is a source of economic power. This scenario has created a situation whereby in the ruling APC and the opposition PDP party financiers capture party structures by imposing their whims and caprices on the party. This again is why Karl Marx quoted in (Olaniyi, 2001) argued on the 'materialist conception of history' that it is the economy that serves as the foundation upon which is erected the superstructure of culture, law and government.

Selection of Candidate

Recruiting and selection of candidate is a crucial task for political parties because parties' profiles during elections and while in power are largely determined by which candidates are chosen and where their loyalties lie. Although it is the responsibility of a political party to decide who is eligible to contest in an election whichever procedure is adopted, and the general assumption is that selection should be based on good standing of members and should not be devoid of prejudice, class and ethnic chauvinism. However, this is a serious challenge in both the APC and the PDP. Anyaoku (2010) submits that to ascribe undue influence, especially self-serving influence to the parliamentary group of a party in the selection of candidate would seriously undermine democratic process. A typical example was the imposition of Charles Soludo as the governorship candidate of Anambra state in 2006 by the PDP National executive. In the same vein, JibrilaBindow was imposed in 2019 as the APC governorship candidate in

Adamawa state by the party National executive which eventually led to the defeat of the party in the state.

Politics of Godfatherism

The Nigerian political parties especially the ruling APC and the opposition PDP are characterized by political prebendalism, whose mode of operation is patron-client relationship or “patronage politics” which, to Igwe (2005) is a type of government and political society characterized by condescending autocratic rule and the arbitrary exercise of power in favour of friends, relations, allies and other persons whose loyalties have to be purchased with money, position of privilege, without a due legal process and often in violation of constitutional provisions. Okolie (2006) observes that while godfathers in some countries are driven by their resolve to control public policies in favour of their concerns, in Nigeria, the primary inspiration is to control the treasury of the state. The godfathers in Nigerian politics are primarily concerned with appropriation of government contracts, political/public appointments and plundering the coffers of the state. They are in privileged positions to decide the political faith of aspirants to political offices and as such those that are not only seen, but confirmed to be “loyal” cannot be “given” ticket to be the standard bearer of the parties. This is to ensure that the godsons will be accountable to them when they get into the office. As a result of the foregoing, some aspirants defect to other parties where they do not have such powerful figures that would frustrate them from their political aspirations.

Zoning Arrangement

The idea of zoning and rotation of the office of the presidency in both the PDP and the APC has not only undermine the issue of open candidacy and deny eligible and qualified individual right to contest for any elective position in Nigeria, but also has increasingly divided members of the parties especially between North and South thereby creating the North-South dichotomy. For instance, following the demise of president Umaru Musa Yar’Adua in May 2010, PDP members from the North argued that it was still the turn of the geopolitical zone to produce the president of Nigeria in 2011 general elections under the party platform; while other members from the same North and virtually all members from the South held that the demise of Yar’Adua marked the end of zoning arrangement. This scenario threw up a lot of controversies and debate on various constitutional interpretations between supporters of zoning and those of open candidacy which affected national governance because a lot of time was spent on deciding Jonathan’s eligibility to contest in the 2011 presidential election. Although Jonathan contested and won the election amidst post-election there was violence in some parts of the north notably, Zamfara, Bauchi, Kano and Gombe which led to loss of lives and property. Similarly, many political observers and analysts have argued that the lingering internal crisis in the ruling APC is not unconnected to the quest to retain power in the north beyond 2023 as other members especially from the south advocate for power shift. Consequently, the issue of zoning in both the PDP and the ruling APC has not only succeeded in heating up the polity and fanned embers of ethnicity but has also portrayed some lacunas in the APC’s and the PDP’s internal democracy which has generated a lot internal crisis and un healthy competition among party members.



Party Executive Arrogance

The problem of internal democracy in both the ruling APC and the opposition PDP took its root in party executives which affirms the common saying that when the head of the fish is bad, the whole body is bad as well. This is because some APC and the PDP executives especially at the National level always feel that they have the latitude to turn things around as they wish in the party. For example, between 1999 and 2007 the then president of Nigeria Olusegun Obasanjo took control of the PDP and the running of the affairs of the National Assembly which account for the instability in the leadership of the party between those periods and beyond. Again, the influence of some powerful individuals in the APC like senator Ahmed Bola Tinubu and the overbearing attitude of Adam Oshiomhole has led to continuous crisis in the party which eventually resulted to the removal of Oshiomhole as the APC National chairman. This paper found out that the ruling APC does not fare better than the now opposition PDP in terms of internal democracy.

Implications of the Challenges of Internal Democracy in APC and the PDP

The first implication is the issue of internal or intra-party crisis which has been the hallmark of Nigerian party politics in the Fourth Republic. It entails disagreement among members of a political party. This scenario often comes to play when members of the same political party pursue incompatible political goals or attempt to influence the decision-making process of the party to their advantage (Momodu & Matudi 2013, P. 3). This means that internal party crisis often occurs when members are entangled in the pursuit of divergent goals most especially in the fielding of candidate for both elective and political positions. The consequences of these crises the factionalization of some parties and the defection of members from one party to another in addition to anti-party activities. Intra-party conflicts have been caused by the absence of internal democracy and party ideology in which the elite look for power for their personal greed and not for the purpose of the promotion of party ideals and interest (Jude & Ika, 2013). Momodu and Matudi (2013, p.8) identified factors responsible for internal party crisis to include, God-fatherism, lack of internal democracy, the imposition of candidates, injustice and oppression within the party, and leadership tussle between and among party members. Other scholars like Aleyomi (2013), Ojukwu and Olaifa (2011), have identified the reasons for internal crisis in the PDP to include poverty of ideology, absence of internal party democracy, incumbency factor, goal incompatibility, godfatherism, and politics of self-interest. Both the ruling APC and the PDP have suffered internal party crisis resulting in several political setbacks such as factionalization, defection, anti-party activities and political violence.

The second implication is party factionalization where a group of individuals within a political party united by a particular common political purpose that differs in some respects to the rest of the party members forms a faction of the party. A party faction may include fragmented sub-factions, 'parties within a party' which may be referred to as power blocs, cabals or voting blocs. It also refers to members of factions bind together as a way of realizing a particular political goal and advancing their agenda and positions within a party. Factionalization within political parties exists because members hold different preferences and conflicting views about party platform. Eventually, factionalization within political parties creates the incentive for





the political elites to align and re-align their political interests. The consequence of factionalization is divided loyalty among party members, anti-party activities as well as decamping of party members to other political parties. For instance, problem of internal democracy has resulted in factionalization in the PDP (New-PDP or n-PDP) and later defection of some members to the then opposition APC between 2013 and 2014. Similarly, the ruling APC was factionalized (Reformed APC or R-APC) and some members defected to the main opposition PDP in 2018.

Party Defection

Party defection remains another implication of the challenge of lack of internal democracy in political parties. The issue of party defection, where politicians crossing from one political party to the other, is rampant in Nigeria which cut across all levels of government from federal to local government. Nigeria's democracy has witnessed series of political defections since the return to democratic rule in 1999 with politicians decamping from one political party to the other. Party defection refers to an act of swapping political parties. It is an act of changing party allegiance or moving from one political party to another. This development is also referred to as cross-carpeting, party-switching, floor-crossing, party-hopping, canoe-jumping, decamping and party-jumping among others (Mbah, 2011). The PDP and the ruling APC have both experience mass defection of members between 2013 and 2019 as a result of lack of internal party democracy. In Nigeria for instance, the former Vice President, Alhaji Atiku Abubakar seems to be the most defected PDP politician in recent times, he defected to Action Congress of Nigeria (ACN) from Peoples' Democratic Party (PDP) in 2003, then returned to PDP and then moved to the All Progressive Congress (APC) in 2013 but now back to PDP (Edeit, 2017). This is why Mbah (2011) averred that the desperation to hold public office as means of accumulating wealth make Nigerian politicians to cross-carpet without justifications. This act erodes the efficacy of democratic sustenance through party processes because politicians in Nigeria, especially in the ruling APC and PDP only defect from one political party to another to contest elections or get favor not on the basis of party ideological differences.

A tabular representation of some decampees in Nigerian political parties is reflected in Tables 1.1 and 1.2 below.

Table 1.1 Shows Some Members of the Factional New PDP(N-PDP) in 2013

S/N	NAME	POLITICAL DESIGNATION	ROLE/POSITION IN THE N- PDP
1	Atiku Abubakar	Former Vice President (1999-2007)	Party Leader, Interim
2	Abubakar Kawu Baraje	Former acting National Chairman of the PDP	Party Chairman, Interim
3	OlagunsoyeOyin lola	Former Governor of Osun State and National Secretary of the PDP	Party Secretary, Interim



4	Rotimi Amaechi	Former Governor of Rivers State	Member
5	RabiuKwankwaso	Former Governor of Kano State	Member
6	SuleLamido	Former Governor of Jigawa State	Member
7	Murtala Nyako	Former Governor of Adamawa State	Member
8	Aliyu Wamakko	Former Governor of Sokoto State	Member
9	Babangida Aliyu	Former Governor of Niger State	Member
10	Abdulfatah Ahmed	Former Governor of Kwara State	Member

Source: Okoli and Ali, (2014)

Table 1.2 Shows key National Officers of the Factional Reformed All Progressive Congress (R-APC) in 2018

S/N	Name	State	Position in R-APC
1	Alhaji Buba Galadima	Yobe	National Chairman
2	Alhaji Bala Mohd Gwagwarwa	Kano	Deputy National Chairman (North-West)
3	Chief Theo Nkire	Abia	Deputy National Chairman (South-West)
4	EkoOlakunle	Ondo	National Vice-Chairman (South-West)
5	HussainiDambo	Kaduna	National Vice-Chairman (North-West)
6	Mahmud Mohammed Abubakar	Kogi	National Vice-Chairman (North-Central)
7	Dr. FataiAtanda	Oyo	National Secretary
8	Godwin Akaan	Benue	Deputy National Secretary
9	Kazeem Afegbua	Edo	National Publicity Secretary
10	Daniel Bwala	Adamawa	Financial Secretary
11	Abba Malami Taura	Jigawa	Deputy National Auditor
12	Kayode Omotosho	Kwara	National Treasurer
13	Barr. Nicholas Asuzu	Anambra	National Youth Leader
14	Barr. Baride A. Gwezia	Rivers	Legal Adviser
15	Hajiya Aisha Kaita	Katsina	National Women Leader
16	Mrs. Fatima Adamu	Bauchi	National Welfare Secretary
17	AlhajiIsiakAkinwumi	Ogun	Deputy Financial Secretary
18	Alhaji Bashir Mai Mashi	Zamfara	Deputy National Treasurer
19	Hauwa Adam Mamuda	Abuja (FCT)	Deputy Welfare Secretary
20	ShuaibuGwandaGobur	Sokoto	Deputy National Publicity Secretary
21	Liman M.T	Katsina	National Organizing Secretary

Source: Authors with data generated from Uwugiaren et al (2018)

Conclusion and Recommendations





The challenge of internal party democracy associated with party politics in the Nigeria's Fourth Republic which started in May 1999 is borne out of the notion that party politics is about contestation for political power between and among the political elites. This paper basically studies some of the hindrances of internal democracy in Nigeria's political parties especially in the ruling All Progressive Congress (APC) and the People's Democratic Party (PDP) to include but not limited to poverty of ideology, imposition of candidate, incumbency factor, non-adherence to the code of conduct document which all political parties assented to and endorsed to guide their conduct and performance particularly during elections, non-level playing field of selecting candidates in primary elections as well as party executive leadership positions, godfatherism, and the party executive arrogance which have not only led to internal party crisis but also induced the factionalization with the attendant defection of party members to other political parties. Based on the strengths of the findings, to check some of these undemocratic practice among Nigerian political parties, the paper recommended that:

- i. To ensure internal democracy in both the ruling APC and the opposition PDP is to have highly institutionalized party structure that will guarantee party's' autonomy from other actors or anointed leader.
- ii. There should be ideological commitments and transparency in party financial administration because ideology often plays crucial role in shaping parties' organizational decisions which will in turn prevent kleptocrats from hijacking the party.
- iii. The imposition of candidates in any elective position should be stopped and candidate selection should be based on good standing of members and on level playing field.
- iv. There should be regular meetings of parties' National Executives to checkmate the activities of the party in order to ensure compliance with party constitution.
- v. There should be measures to limit the role of godfathers and kingpins in party politics.
- vi. The ruling APC and the opposition PDP should embrace the idea of reforms and review the zoning arrangement since the Nigerian 1999 constitution (as amended) does not make provision for zoning.

References

- Adejumobi, S. (2000) Elections in Africa: A Fading Shadow of Democracy? *International Political Science Review*, 21(1), pp.59-73.
- Agbaegbu, T. (2008) PDP A Divided House: We are Fighting Fraud in the Party by Ken Nnamani. *NewsWatch*, February 25, 47(8)
- Ake, C. (1973) Explaining Political Instability in the New States, *Journal of Modern African Studies* 2 (3), pp.351-359.
- Ake, C. (1981) *Political Economy of Africa*. Ibadan: Longman Nigeria Ltd.
- Ake, C. (1995) Is Africa Democratizing? in Mimiko, O. (ed) *Crises and Contradictions in Nigeria's Democratization Program, 1986-1993*, Akure: Stebak Ventures.
- Akubo, J., Adaku, S., Yakubu, I., and Adejo, M. (2014) Political





- Parties and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria's Fourth Republic. *Global Journal of Political Science and Administration*, 2(3), pp.79-108
- Alavi, H. A (1972) The State in Post-Colonial Societies Pakistan and Bangladesh. *New Left Review*, 1 (74), pp.59-81
- Aleyomi, M. (2013). Intra-Party Conflicts in Nigeria: The Case of PDP in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 15(4), pp.281-296.
- Aniche, E.T. (2017) The 'David and Goliath' and the 2015 Elections Outcome in Nigeria. From the Opposition to the Ruling Party. *Journal Indexing and Metrics*, 10(1) Google Scholar
- Eboh, E. & Anichie, E. (2012). The State, Political Parties and Crisis of Internal Democracy in Nigeria: A study of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP), *Journal of Nigerian Government and Politics* 4(1), pp. 24-30
- Edeit, L.I. (2017). Politics of Defection and its Implications on Nigeria's Democracy. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science*, 17(1), pp.1-6
- Ekekwe, E. (1986) *Class and State in Nigeria*. Lagos: Longman. European Union Election Observation Mission (2015) Report on Nigeria General Elections March 28 and April 11. Brussel: European Union. Google Scholar
- Fisher, J. and Eisenstadt, T.A. (2004). Introduction: Comparative Party Finance. *Journal of Party Politics*, 10(6)
- Ibrahim, B.S and Abubakar, Y. (2015) Political Parties and Intra Party Conflict in Nigeria's Fourth Republic: The Experience of the People's Democratic Party. Patterns and Dynamics of Party Politics in Nigeria's Fourth Republic, pp.113-131. Google Scholar.
- Ifesinachi, K. (2000) Military Rule and the Crisis of Development in Nigeria in Anugwom, E. et al (eds) *The Social Science Issues and Perspectives*, Nsukka: Fulladu Publishing Company.
- Ikeanyibe, O. (2014) Internal Party Democracy and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria's Fourth Republic. *Politics and Policy*, 4(2), pp.769-804.
- Ikechukwu, G. (2015) Parties Parallel Primaries and its Implication to Political Development in Nigeria. *Developing Countries Studies*, 15(10), pp.109-121.
- Ikhilae, E., Ojiabor, O. and Ogunwale, G. (2019) 2019 Polls: APC Suffers Reverses in Zamfara. *The Nations*, May, 25
- International Crisis Group (2014). Nigeria's Dangerous 2015 Election: Limiting the Violence. *Africa Report No 220*, November 21. Brussel: International Crisis Group.
- Inuwa, A. (2019) APC and the Zamfara Conundrum. *Leadership*, April 19.
- Iyare, T. (2004). "An Overview of Political Parties in Nigeria", in Odion-Akhaine, S. (ed.) *Governance: Nigeria and the World*. Lagos: Center for Constitutionalism and Demilitarization (CONCORD)
- Kuka, S.Y.B. (2011). Political Parties and Democracy in Nigeria. Candidate Selection, Campaign and Party Financing in People's Democratic Party. *Journal of sustainable Development in Africa*, 13(6), pp. 268-298



- Mbah, P.O. (2011) Party Defection and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria, 1999-2009. *Afro Asian Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(2), pp. 1-21.
- Momodu, A.J. and Matudi,G.I. (2013). The Implications of Intra-Party Conflicts on Nigeria Democratization.*Global Journal of Human Science*, 13(6) pp.1-13
- Nnoli, O. (1986) *Introduction to Politics*.Lagos: Longman.
- Obah-Akpowoghaha, N. (2013) Party Politics and Challenges of Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(16), pp. 71-82.
- Ogban-Iyam, O. (2005).Social Production and Reproduction, Societal Conflicts and the Challenge of Democracy in Nigeria. *University of Nigeria Journal of Political Economy*, 1(1), pp.1-51.
- Ojukwu,C and Olaifa, T. (2011). Challenges of Internal Democracy in Nigeria's Political Parties: The bane of intra-party conflicts in the People Democratic Party of Nigeria.*Global Journal of Human Science*, 11(3). Pp.25-34
- Okhaide, P. (2012). Quest for Internal Party Democracy in Nigeria: Amendment of Electoral Act 2010 as an Albatross. *International Journal of Peace and Development Studies*, 3(3), pp.57-75 Google Scholar
- Okoli, H. & Ali, M. (2014). Dialectics of Intra-Party Opposition in Nigeria's Fourth Republic: Insights from the ruling PDP. *European Scientific Journal*, Vol.3, 2.
- Oladesu, E. (2017). PDP Chairmen: From Lar to...? *The Nation*, December 7
- Olaniyi, J.O. (2001). *Introduction to Contemporary Political Analysis*. Lagos: Fapsony Nigeria Ltd
- Omotola, J.S (2009). Nigerian Parties and Political Ideology.*Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences*, 1(3), PP.612-634
- Sahara Reporters (2019) Breaking: Supreme Court Upholds Judgment Nullifying Rivers APC Primaries, February 8.
- Scarrow, S. (2005) *Political Parties and Democracy in Theoretical and Practical Perspective: Implementing Intra Party Democracy*. Washington: NDI.
- Sobechi, L. (2018) APC, PDP Still in Trouble by Violation of Democracy Tenets. *The Guardian*, September 17.
- Thurston, A. (2015) Background to Nigeria's 2015 Elections. Report of the CSIS Africa Programme. Washington DC: Centre for Strategic and International Studies.
- Uwugiaren, I., Elumoye, D., Ogunmade, O. and Ezigbo, O. (2018) Nigeria: Finally, Ruling Party Breaks as Reformed APC Emerges. *This Day*, July 5.