

Religious Ideals and Responsible Leadership: The Shepherd Model and Lessons for Nigeria's Fledgling Democracy

Ogundiya Ilufoye Sarafa

Department of Political Science, Usmanu Danfodiyo University, Sokoto, Nigeria

Abstract: Nigeria is a country where religion thrives in the form of Christianity, Islam and African indigenous religion. Paradoxically, Nigeria is also a country where amorality thrives. At all levels of governance, amorality has been a prominent feature of Nigerian politics. This study discusses religion, morality and politics nexus in Nigeria. It argues that though religion has played indispensable roles in the authoritative allocation of values and distribution of political offices in Nigeria, it has failed to make positive impacts on political life and governance in the country. The study also demonstrates that the "shepherd model", an ideal biblical form of leadership, is the right solution to Nigeria's governance and perennial leadership crisis.

Key words: Religion, leadership, governance, corruption, shepherd

INTRODUCTION

Nigeria is a country where religion thrives in the form of Christianity, Islam and African indigenous religion. Both the governed and the governor claims to be an adherent of one religion and the other. Since most public officers claim to be either Muslims or Christians they are usually sworn with the Holy Quran or the Holy Bible as they subscribe to the Oaths of Office and Allegiance. In view of this, it is expected that the public officers and political office holders will be guided by a high ethical conduct and prudence in the management of state affairs. Paradoxically, Nigeria is also a country where amorality thrives. At all levels of governance, amorality has been a prominent feature of Nigerian politics. Therefore, that Nigeria paraded one of the worst governments in the developing world since 1960, when the country became independent, is not surprising. Hence, the country remains grossly undeveloped despite its huge resources. Official corruption, mismanagement of fund, favouritism, nepotism and all forms of amoralities remain the blight of Nigerian politics. Consequently, the level of poverty and insecurity has reached a high crescendo as the gaps between the rich and the poor continue to widen. Nigeria, undoubtedly, has paraded at all levels of governance corrigible, avarice, kleptomaniac and non-responsive leadership since her political independence in 1960. All these are reasons, not only for failure of governance but also evidence that Nigeria is a morally bankrupt society. This has prompted Omeregbe (2003) to raise a fundamental question that is yet to be satisfactorily answered- How come we have those three things, religious devotion, moral corruption and bad governments simultaneously in Africa?

The pervasiveness of religion in Nigeria's national political life has made some scholars to argue that religion

has subsumed and subordinated other primordial and class contradictions (Bako, 1995). Therefore, rather than been a socio-political asset, religion has become a millstone, a potential source of conflicts and instabilities (Ibrahim, 1997; Suberu, 1997; Muhammad, 2009). Political actors have turned religious terrain into battle grounds for contesting perceived marginalisation and to gain political recognition, ascendance and support from their communities but never as instrument of service. The politicisation of religion for group and individual gains has been a careful and calculated means of survival for some opportunistic politically ambitious elite. This study discusses religion, morality and politics nexus in Nigeria. It argues that though religion has played indispensable roles in the authoritative allocation of values and distribution of political offices in Nigeria, it has failed to make positive impacts on political life and governance in the country. Finally, the study recommends the "shepherd model", an ideal biblical form of leadership as a solution to Nigeria's governance and perennial leadership crisis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Religion, morality and politics: The linkage: One of the classical debates in political philosophy is whether religion, morality and politics are separable. The idea that the fusion of religion and politics is inevitable has been settled in the advanced democracies of the world. "The notion of separating religion from politics is a novel concept, particularly in Africa and the global south where there are clashes between tradition and modernity and heterogeneity and pluralism have defined social relations" (Usman and Shettima, 2010). Generally, there are three ways in which religion can influence politics, namely, by the direct involvement of religious men in politics, by fusing the two (religion and politics) together as one, and

by subjecting politics or government to the doctrine or laws of religion, thereby carrying out politics or governance along the line of religious doctrine, ideals or laws (Omoregbe, 2003). The third, that is, the application of religious principles, ideals by individual leadership in the governance process is the preoccupation of this study. Certainly, one would have a hard time equating religion and morality. Without getting bogged down in morality versus religion distinctions, it should be noted that the organization of states and the authority of governments rested upon certain beliefs, practices, institutional principles and social norms that are a subset of religion and can be loosely called morality. It was in this fashion that morality continued to play an essential part in politics (Yanpei, 2005). Within this framework, it could be said that religion ought to oil the wheels of good governance through the application of religious ideals in the allocation of societal resources or in the exercise of authorities. In this regard Omoregbe (2003) asserts that,

The only way religion can have a positive influence on governance is through the inculcation of a high sense of morality - honesty, sense of duty, selfless service, public accountability, respect for human lives, love of one's neighbour, sympathy, altruism, abhorrence of violence, love of peace, contentment with what one can legitimately have, abhorrence of greed, a sense of justice and fairness, etc- in the citizens, including the rulers. If a religion fails to inculcate a sense of morality in people it has failed as a religion, and is not in a position to help bring about good governance in a country where it has failed to raise the moral standard of the people.

However, while the place of morality in religion is less contentious, the position of morality in politics has been a subject of controversy from the time of the classical political thinkers like Plato, Aristotle, Locke, John Stuart Mill, Immanuel Kant, Machiavelli and Edmund Burke among others. While Machiavelli in his book, *The Prince*, undermined the place of morality in politics, Plato was so concerned about morality in politics that he took stringent measures in his *Republic* to encourage and enforce it. He even recommended that the rulers are required to own no private property, no families of their own and no personal money. To Plato (cf Lee, 2003);

The Rulers and Auxiliaries are to live a life of austere simplicity, without private property or family life, for private property was the chief temptation that led men to sacrifice public to personal interests. The happiness of both lies in their service to the community; for it is the happiness of the community as a whole, and not of any particular class, that is the objective.

Plato further demonstrated serious concern for morality when he recommends death penalty as punishment for leaders found guilty of the embezzlement of public fund. Like Plato, the place of morality was also paramount to the social contract political philosophers like Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Spinoza and David Hume. In his social contract theory, Thomas Hobbes for instance, tells us that prior to the advent of morality and political society, men were in the state of nature- a state where amorality thrives and where there is no sanctity for human lives neither was there respect for justice. A state of war of all against all characterised by chaos, conflict and insecurity, a state where in which human life was nasty, brutish and short. To terminate the state of nature, the ruler, the Leviathan, is given virtually unlimited power to enforce morality and with an iron hand. In short, the western tradition of political philosophy, from Plato to John Rawls, teaches that morality and politics are inseparable.

For Kant, morality is a universal concept. Hence, it is applicable to politics just as it is to everything else. To Burke, politics is not about what is right and what is wrong, but rather, the maintaining of an ordered state. According to Vernon (2001), political morality would just be what morality requires us to do plus any items that are special to the political domain (or else minus any item that do not belong there). More than this, the term is taken to refer to a set of distinct political principles, applying specifically to the mode of power acquisition and use of power, alongside the principles that we want to bring to bear on personal decisions. The former must be shared, or at least must overlap extensively enough to make political life possible, while the latter might differ between individuals or groups. Parekh (1993) argues that:

Morality...comes to centre around secondary and behaviourally orientated virtues, which tells human beings not what they should ultimately value and what ends they should pursue, but rather how they should pursue whatever ends they choose. The individual central concern is twofold, to maintain his or her personal independence and autonomy and to live peacefully with others by respecting theirs. Each leads to a complementary set of secondary virtues. The former call for such qualities of character as self-discipline, self-reliance, prudence, the ability to live within the limits of one's moral and emotional resources, planning, foresight moderation and self-control; the latter calls for such qualities as reliability, cooperation, the keeping of promises, the conscientious discharge of one's obligations, the spirit of compromise, civility, respect for the law and tolerance.

In the light of this, morality one can argue is a *sine qua non* for good governance. As it is impossible to

separate religion from morality so it is difficult to separate morality from politics. Omoregbe (2003) argues that, "religion without morality is not a religion; law without morality (immoral law) is no law, just as government without morality is no government". Therefore, any group of people that come together to form a government without morality is nothing but a gang of criminals on a large scale (Omoregbe, 2003). This indeed is the crux of governance problem in Nigeria. Religion has failed to influence the behaviour of Nigerian leaders. Put differently, Nigerian leaders at all level have refused to be influenced by ethics and principles of their various religious inclinations. For example, the bane of government in Nigeria is corruption and both Muslims and Christians form the majority among the corrupt officials. Even, some of the corrupt officials openly display their ill-gotten wealth not only in the public at social gatherings but also in mosques and churches across the nation through donation to the cause of religion, even in abhorrence to the injunction of God. For instance Amos (5:21-24) states that any worship rendered to God with morally unregenerate hearts is an abomination before God and is rejected by him. Definitely, something fundamental is wrong either with the religious leaders (for not emphasising high moral standards in their teachings) or the adherents (for the hardening of hearts toward moral teachings) of the major religions in Nigeria. In sum, religion (Christianity and Islam) have failed to promote good governance in Africa (Omoregbe, 2003).

Thus far, the argument is that since religion promotes morality, and morality oils the wheel of good governance, it is arguable that religion, morality and politics are interlinked. In the next section we contend that Nigeria presents a theatre of amoral familism where religion has failed to influence the behaviour of political office holders in the governance of the polity.

Nigeria: The theatre of amoral political leadership: It is incontrovertible that Nigeria is a theatre of political amoral familism. Amoral familism, according to Banfield (cf Osaghae, 1995) involves a tendency to become involved in politics only in so far as it promises material gain for self, family and possibly, the community (where there is a strong element of inter-community competition). According to Banfield (1967);

In a society of amoral familists, no one will further the interest of the group or community except as it is to his private advantage to do so. In other words, the hope of material gain in the short run will be the only motive for concern with public affairs.

The manifestations of amoral familism include the following:

- Only officials who are paid to do so are likely to concern themselves with public affairs and even

when they abuse their powers and are corrupt, the ordinary people will leave the task of checking them to other officials;

- Officials often see their positions as instruments of accumulation and as weapons to be used against others for private advantage;
- The law is not easily enforced and is often disregarded by both officials and ordinary people where there is no reason to fear punishment;
- An office holder will take bribes when he can get away with it; "But whether he takes bribe or not, it will be assumed by the society that he does";
- The weak, i.e. the ordinary people tend to favour regimes which will maintain order with a strong hand;
- Ordinary people do not trust politicians and hence take voting as the highest bidder's market and whatever group is in power is assumed to be self-serving and corrupt: "Hardly will an election be over before the voters conclude that the new officials are enriching themselves at their expense and that they have no intention of keeping the promises they have made".

All these attributes aptly fits into the Nigerian situation where political virtues have remained a mirage and dishonesty and avarice has become the trademark of the body politics. In Nigeria politics is money and money is politics. Expectedly, politics in the psyche of the insider and outsider elite is "a do or die affair". Undoubtedly, this explains the high level of political instability and insecurity in the country from 1999 when the country returned to democratic form of governance, particularly the electoral type. In Nigeria for instance, political assassinations, ethno-religious conflicts, abject poverty, acute youth unemployment and general economic and political decay have been the major dividends of democracy since 1999.

The National and States Houses of Assemblies are fraudulently constituted as many of the members won elections through unfair and unjust process. Hence it has become practically impossible for the Nigerian political leadership including the law makers to be responsible and accountable to the people. This is so because a fraudulently constituted legislative house can in no way be accountable to the citizens since they are not products of the peoples consent. And like Omoregbe (2003) concluded in his work, remove honesty and accountability from any National Assembly, and what do you have, but gangs of thieves and national treasury looters on a large scale. The behaviour and attitude of the members of the Federal and States Houses of Assemblies validates Omoregbe's conclusion. For example, "as soon as the National Assembly was inaugurated in 1999, the first thing the members did was to approve for themselves three Million Naira (about \$20,000 US) for furnishing their apartments.

To worsen the situation, the Revenue Mobilisation Allocation and Fiscal Commission, (RMAFC), for example, an agency mandated by the constitution to recommend the salaries and allowances of public officers, among other duties, has turned out to be a driver of corrupt and indecent salaries and allowances by the elected officials, in addition to being composed of corrupt officials. Partly as a result of its recommendations, the public officials earn salaries and allowances which would be the envy of their counterparts in even the most developed countries of the world. A member of the House of Representatives until 2007 goes home with more than 10 m (US\$67,000.) monthly or 120 m in a year. This translates to about \$850,000 per annum, more than twice the annual salary of the American president, Barack Obama, which is only \$400,000 (Yusuf, 2009).

The members of the Senate actually took more than that amount and so the looting exercise began” (Ogundiya, 2006). This author gave a vivid account of egregious looting in the National Assemblies elsewhere (Ogundiya, 2006);

The question bordering on corruption has created serious instability in the Senate between 1999 and 2007. Chief Evans Enwerem, Chuka Okadigbo (late), and Adolphus Wabara were impeached on account of mismanagement and corrupt enrichment. For instance, Senator Idris Kuta led panel that investigated the allegation of corruption against Chuka Okadigbo found out among others that he was involved in the inflation of the street light project to the tune of 173 million; authorized the payment of 37,211,570.00 to furnish the senate president’s residence, an amount above the approved 25 million; and installed and commissioned a 100KVA generating set at the senate president’s residence at an inflated price of 15 million. Adolphus Wabara (also an impeached senator) was also guilty of receiving a bribe of 55 million from Professor Osuji (the former education minister) to inflate the budgetary allocation of Federal Ministry of education. Madam Patricia Etteh, the first female Speaker of House of Representatives, resigned following her indictment over the misappropriation of public funds in multiple contracts of 628 m (US\$5 million) for the renovation of her official residence and the purchase of 12 official cars.

Undoubtedly, the States and National Assemblies are composed of opportunistic elites pre-occupied with their personal wellbeing. A breakdown of the 2009 National Budget shows that members of the National Assembly and the personnel of a part of the Presidency will be paid 47.8 billion as emoluments during the year. The 360 members of the House of Representatives will receive

26.67 billion while the 109 Senators will get 16.3 billion. When provisions for legislative aides, the National Assembly Service Commission and the National Assembly Office are factored in, the total allocation to the federal legislature stands at 61.6 billion. In its analysis, the editorial comment in the Tribune notes that “an infinitesimal percentage of the citizenry will be pocketing 2.9% of the total provision made for the recurrent expenditure of Federal Government”. The important inference that could be made is that the National Assemblies have failed to provide selfless, purposeful and democratic legislative leadership. The level of corruption at the level of the Executive is even worse. The report of the Auditor General of the Federation in 2003 was stunning revealing widespread financial irregularities, over-invoicing, scam and colossal waste of public resources in the 2001 Federation Account (Ibrahim, 2003). The Senate Committee also pronounced Vice-President Atiku Abubakar (1999-2007) guilty on the allegation that he diverted \$145 million Petroleum Technology Development Fund (PTDF) funds.

Since 1999 and even from independence, Nigeria has suffered from poverty of accountable, responsive and altruistic leadership. In essence, a responsible and accountable leadership that would characterise good governance in Nigeria is patently absent. The political elites, almost without exception, have an insatiable capacity to steal from the commonwealth and leave the people more impoverished. Unrestrained by any real accountability to the electorate, many of those elected officials who came to power in fraudulent elections have committed abuses against their constituents and engaged in the large-scale looting of public resources (HRW, 2007). Therefore, there is a very wide hiatus between the rich and the poor masses.

In Nigeria today, democratisation has failed to engender social, economic and political development. A democracy without accountability is nothing but a ruse. Between 1970 and 2000, the number of Nigerians subsisting on less than one dollar a day grew from 36% to more than 70% that is, from 19 million to a staggering 90 million people (Watts, 2007). Leadership in Nigeria is not service oriented. It is totally contrapuntal to biblical leadership—a responsible, caring, considerate and selfless leadership.

Governance and leadership in the Christendom; the “Shepherd Model”: The essence of leadership is to facilitate the achievement of societal goals. These goals are defined in the context of social, economic, and political development. Leadership is worthless if it fails to engender development or address the needs of the society. Essentially, it is the ultimate responsibility of leadership to ensure the realisation of the common good. To achieve this, leadership needs to mobilise, organise and direct the

path of the followers. Therefore, a leader is a mobiliser, organiser, enabler, negotiator, an institution builder, a power broker and a facilitator. Leading connotes an interpersonal relationship between the leader and the follower. It refers to a group of persons who manage, guide, direct, influence and control affairs. Among these affairs are those of the state and the action and activities of citizens and the subordinates. The nature of this control helps to distinguish between a good and functional leadership on the one hand and a dormant and bad leadership on the other hand. Leadership is a vital component of governance. There is inextricable connection between good leadership and good governance. Indeed, governance cannot be good in the absence of good leaders. In one word Nigeria has suffered from the poverty of good and responsible leadership culminating in the poverty of good governance. The question then is what lessons can we draw from the biblical type of leadership?

Leadership from the point of view of the Bible is not glamorous but service oriented. It is not lordship. The Bible states in 1 Peter (5:1-3) that;

The elders (leaders) I appealbe shepherd of God's flock that is under your care, serving as overseers-not because you must, but because you are willing, as God wants you to be ; not greedy for money, but eager to serve; not lording over those entrusted to you, but being examples to the flock.

True leaders are not lords. They function as servants to the people. Jesus demonstrated this in his days by washing the feet of the disciples (John 13 vss3-5). Washing feet was one of the basest tasks in the culture of Jesus day. It was a job usually done by a house slave. Therefore, washing feet was an undesirable responsibility.

A leader who is not ready to bear the burden of the people is not worth it at all. In essence, leadership is burdensome. Moses and Elijah regarded as the greatest leaders in the Old Testament presented a good example. In the book of Numbers (11:11-15) Moses said to the Lord;

Why pick on me, to give me the burden of a people like this? Are they my children? Am I their father? Is that why you have given me the job of nursing them along like babies until we get to the land you promised their ancestor? Where am I supposed to get meat for all these people? For they weep to me saying, "Give us meat" I can't carry this nation by myself! The load is far too heavy.

A leader is a burden bearer. Therefore, leadership in the Christendom is more of responsibility than authority. An anonymous writer was quoted as having said "If you

see a man reaching for authority, watch him- he will cause trouble. If you see a man reaching for responsibility, promote him- he will be a blessing (Mahoney, 1985). Therefore, a leader ought to reach for responsibility and not for position or authority. This is enshrined in the instruction of Jesus to Peter in the book of John 21(15, 16, and 17) and the examples of Jesus Christ that we have illustrated.

God refers to the Biblical leadership as shepherd. Christ in his teaching and in his atonement showed that the task of God's man of the New Testament is not to be a shepherd of physical sheep, as demonstrated by the Old Testament types, but God's man is to be a shepherd of a spiritual sheep, which is man himself (Camping, 1972). And even as the Old Testament shepherds cared for these sheep by using the products of this world to feed and shelter his sheep, so Christian leadership uses the available resources to care for the needs of his followers. This is what we have characterized in this work as the Shepherd Model- the ideal governance and leadership principle recommended by the Bible.

Shepherding was one of the more common occupations in Bible times (occupation synonymous to that of the Fulani herdsmen) and the Biblical writer often used sheep and shepherds as metaphors to communicate some very important truths about leaders and the led and importantly the nature and quality of governance. God is Israel loves shepherd, guiding them throughout their history. God's people therefore, are like sheep what citizen is to the president or governors-helpless, dependent, full of expectations, easily led astray, yet so precious to their owner. This is because without the sheep there can be no shepherd. In his mercy, God provided leaders to shepherd (direct, control, guide, provide, tender etc..) his people (citizen). Then, what are the characteristics and responsibilities of a good shepherd? The responsibilities of shepherd include:

- Shepherd guides the movement of his sheep to the greener pasture;
- Shepherd provide water for the sheep to quench their thirst and possibly drink from the same source with the sheep;
- Shepherd protects the flocks against danger, sets boundary for them and possibly give his life in the defence of any of his flock;
- Shepherd seeks for any lost sheep as each and every one of them are equal in importance;
- Shepherd cares for injured sheep and possibly carries it on his shoulder when it requires him to do so;
- Shepherd regularly account for the sheep in order to know their need, condition and promptly take necessary steps to ensure their wellbeing;
- Shepherd shears the sheep.

However it is important to note that human being are trickiest and not easily amenable to manipulation like the sheep. However, the shepherd image of a leader connotes some additional implicative requirements of character such as the guiding acumen, focused attention, obligation, justice, sympathy and empathy, righteousness, fairness, honesty, incorrigibility and moral infallibility as necessary conditions for excellent guidance, since the stereotype of a shepherd is one who walks in front of his flock. By leading the flock rather than pointing the way out, he shows the flock where and how to move. The absence of one or more of the attributes above can invalidate the image of a shepherd and thus his moral right to lead the flock may be subject to questioning. In essence, as there could be a good shepherd so the possibility of having a bad shepherd is not in doubt. In deed the Nigerian political experience as a nation depicted the theatre of a bad shepherd- corrupt, visionless, selfish, greedy, non-committed, unjust and inveterate Shepherd. These types of Shepherd are unproductive, described as cloud without rain and trees without fruits in the book of Jude (12) thus;

These men are blemishes at your love feasts, eating with you without the slightest qualm- shepherds who feed only themselves. They are clouds without rain, blown along by the wind; autumn trees, without fruit and uprooted-twice dead. They are wild waves of the sea, foaming up their shame; wandering stars, for whom blackest darkness has been reserved forever.

The above passage aptly describes the Nigerian political and bureaucratic elite. None of Nigeria's past leaders (military and civilian) could boldly stand in front of the people like Samuel did after he was asked to anoint a king by the Israelites in 1Samuel (1-5);

I have listened to everything you said to me and have set a king over you. Now you have a king as your leader. As for me I am old and gray, and my sons are here with you. I have been your leader from my youth until this day. Here I stand. Testify against me in the presence of the Lord and his anointed. Whose ox have I taken? Whom have I cheated? Whom have I oppressed? From whose hand have I accepted a bribe to make me shut my eyes? If I have done any of these I will make it right.

Samuel is a typical example of a good shepherd- selfless, committed, focused, corrupt free, just, honest, accountable and responsive to the need of the followers. Even when people grumbled and asked him to anoint a king for them because of his age, he voluntarily retired and consequently anoints Saul as king according to the wishes of the Israelites. Sit- tight syndrome was never in his agenda. He was not a power monger neither did he

have a hidden agenda. In modern times, Samuel could be regarded as a democrat to the core. He provided democratic leadership. Samuel did not destroy the economy of his society and then seek medical attention elsewhere nor send his children to other country for their education. He did not use any of his children to siphon the wealth of the state neither his wife was heard in the (mis)management of state resources. He said "I am old and gray and my sons are with you". With the benefit of hindsight, it can be said without fear of contradiction that no Nigerian leaders, past and present, could fit into the shoe of Samuel. Are there lessons for the contemporary political leadership in Nigeria?

CONCLUSION

Lessons for the contemporary political leadership in Nigeria: The Nigeria's political history has shown that the Shepherd style of political leadership has eluded the country. Contemporary leaders at the various levels of governance in Nigeria are nothing but profiteers, syndicateers and racketeers operating in formal circuits and whose activities do not promote the well-being of all citizens. In order to cover up their atrocities and shift the blame of the country's woes on the masses, successive Nigerian leaders have embarked on various mobilisation and moral regeneration programmes like National Orientation Movement (NOM), National Orientation Agency (NOA), Mass Mobilisation for Social and Economic Recovery (MAMSER), National Rebirth to mention a few. The idea behind all these programmes is to depict Nigerians as indiscipline, non-mobilisable and morally decadent. The programmes became "misguided missiles" because the failure of the Nigerian state is nothing but the failure of leadership.

REFERENCES

- Bako, S., 1995. Muslims, state and the struggle for democratic transition in Nigeria: From cooperation to conflict. Paper prepared for presentation at the Conference on Dilemmas of Nigerian Democracy, University of Wisconsin Madison (Undated).
- Banfield, E.C., 1967. The Moral Basis of a Backward Society. Free Press and Macmillan, New York and London.
- Camping, H., 1972. Feed My Sheep: A Scriptural View of the Christian Responsibility to the World Around Him. Family Stations Inc., Oakland California.
- Human Rights Watch (HRW), 2007. Criminal Politics: Violence, "Godfathers" and Corruption in Nigeria. Vol. 19, No. 16(A), October.
- Ibrahim O.F. 1997. Religion and Politics: A View from the North. In: Diamond, L., G.A. Kirk and O. Oyediran (Eds.), Transition Without End. Vantage Publishers, Ibadan.

- Ibrahim, J., 2003. Corruption in Nigeria: Transition, persistence and continuity. *Nigerian Soc. Sci.*, September, 6(2).
- Lee, D., 2003. *Plato: The Republic*, Translated by Desmond Lee, Penguin Classics. Penguin Books, London.
- Mahoney, R., 1985. *The Making of a Leader*. World Missionary Assistance Plan, Burbank USA.
- Muhammad, G.B., 2009. Religion, Politics and the Nigerian State: Reflections on the Experience of the north West Zone. In: Olutayo, A.O., I.S. Ogunnya and J. Amzat, (Eds.), *State and Civil Society Relations in Nigeria*. Hope Publications, Ibadan, pp: 140-168.
- Omogbe, J.I., 2003. Religious Ideals and the Question of Governance in Africa. In: Oguejiofor, J.O. (Ed.), *Philosophy, Democracy and Responsible Governance in Africa*. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick and London, pp: 309-332.
- Ogundiya, I.S., 2006. On democracy, legitimacy and accountability: Lessons for Nigeria. Paper presented at National Conference of Nigeria political science association, held at Port-Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria, August 26-31.
- Osaghae, E.E., 1995. Amoral politics and democratic instability in Africa: A theoretical explorations. *Nordic J. Afr. Stud.*, 4(1): 62-78.
- Parekh, B., 1993. The Cultural Particularity of Liberal Democracy. In: David, H. (Ed.), *Prospects for Democracy, North, South, East, West*. Polity Press.
- Suberu, R.T., 1997. Religion and Politics: A View from the South, in Larry Diamond. In: Kirk-Green, A. and O. Oyediran (Eds.), *Transition Without End*. Vantage Publishers, Ibadan.
- The Holy Bible, New International Version Topical Study Bible.
- Usman, T. and A.G. Shettima, 2010. Endangered Democracy? The struggle over secularism and its implications for politics and democracy in Nigeria. Nordiska Afrikainstitutet, Discussion Paper No. 49.
- Vernon, R., 2001. *Political Morality: A Theory of Liberal Democracy*. Continuum, London and New York.
- Watts, M., 2007. Crisis in Nigeria. Retrieved from: www.counterpunch.org. (Accessed date: February 1, 2007).
- Yanpei, C., 2005. Morality and Political Discourse, Leslie Lipson Essay Contest 2005. Retrieved from: <http://www.eecs.berkeley.edu/~ychen2/professional/MoralityAndPoliticalDiscourse.pdf>. (Accessed date: February 20, 2010).
- Yusuf, A., 2009. How the National Assembly Robs Nigerians. *Tell Magazine*, Thursday, 19 February. Retrieved from: <http://www.saharareporters.com/interviews/interview-political/783-how-the-national-assembly-rob-nigerians-prof-sola-adeyeye.html>. (Accessed date: July 4, 2010).