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Abstract

Some scholars tend to focus attention on ‘good governance’ as a panacea for enduring peace, security, and sustainable development in society. This paper focuses on the other side of the coin: ‘bad governance,’ here-with positioned as the bane of enduring peace and security and sustainable development of Nigeria. Bad governance tends to frustrate the institutionalization of both peace and security on the one hand, and on the other, creates a stunted, rentier, disarticulated, and grossly underdeveloped Nigerian society. To exemplify the nexus among bad governance, the lack of peace and security with sustainable development in the country, the researchers adopted a survey research method to generate the necessary data to remonstrate that each of the variables is conversely and inversely related; that is: bad governance, lack of peace, lack of security and unsustainable development in their interactions systematically generates and reproduce each other. Out findings shows that lack of adequate security tends to frustrate peaceful empathy among the collectivities; disinvest the most fainthearted efforts at generating sustainable development in the country; and, promote economically unsustainable environment. Consequently, we suggest that all forms of corrupt practices, and related vices should be abhorred; and, defaulters apprehended and comprehensively punished; Leadership should not only be very responsive to the yearnings and aspirations of the people, but should be committed, accountable and transparent in all its activities. The strengthening of the political, economic, social and other institutions of governance in order to sustain effective policy making and implementation; and, an enlightened followership is an imperative force if good governance, peaceful, developed and non-violent society is desired in Nigeria. Above all, sycophancy should be discouraged in the nation’s statecraft as it promotes bad governance in Nigeria.
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1. Introduction

The study under review attempts to examine the extent to which bad governance has impacted negatively on the overall achievement of sustainable peace, security and development in Nigeria. Most literature focuses on good governance being the panacea for achieving the above listed cherished values (Genyi-George, 2013). However, this study opines that these variables are interrelated and intertwined, as each generates, sustains and reproduces one another. Hence, it becomes necessary to undertake a study of their interface, and their impact on Nigeria.

Good Governance is a qualitative form of the concept ‘Governance’; which according to the World Bank Institute (WBI)

\[\text{It consists of the traditions and institutions by which authority is exercised. This includes the process by which governments are selected, monitored and replaced, the capacity of government to effectively formulate and implement policies; and the respect of citizens and the state institutions that govern economic and social interactions among them. (Owoye & Bissessar, 1992:1)}\] [retrieved from World Bank Institute: http://info.worldbank.org/governance/egi/idex.asp: June 4, 2012]

Indeed, the diminution or the absence of the qualities mentioned above reflects the institutionalization of bad governance in the society. Good governance, peace, security and development that are sustainable are veritable values every nation desires to cultivate. The cultivation or achievements of these objects have apparently been the desire of sundry governments in Nigeria since independence. In fact, it is interesting to observe that since the Nigerian state returned to civil administration in 1999 during the era of what Samuel Huntington (1991) called the “third wave of democratization”; “the nature of governance in the country has been the subject of intense debate by scholars of all persuasions” (George-Genyi, 2013). For George-Genyi,

\[...\text{the rising concern about the governance project in Nigeria cannot be explained outside the country’s historical experience, one that has laid the “solid” foundation for the current wave of ethno-religious and politico-economic crisis in the land. This state of affairs importantly raises some serious concerns about the question of good governance in Nigeria where the politics of deprivation and mismanagement of resources appears to be taking over the principles of accountability, transparency and responsibility (2013: 57).}\]

Apart from attempting answering the following questions posed by George-Genyi (2014): “what is the explanation for bad governance in Nigeria? How can these governance deficits be corrected? The study hopes to expatiate further by attempting questions such as: Does governance reside only with the leadership? Has the followership any role to play in good governance delivery? The other question is to what extent has bad governance impacted upon the peace, security, and sustainable development in view of the apparently gargantuan socioeconomic and political crises Nigeria is facing? Attempt is made to recommend a way forward.
2. Methodology

The study adopts the Survey approach since it would enable the researchers to understudy the issues involved from multiple sources of information. These include personal experience, case studies, observations, computer generated documents and records. Data generated is subjected to systematic analysis with a view to making inferences on the interface among the substantive variables of study. Conclusion and recommendations of the way forward are made.

3. Review of literature and conceptual clarification

To demonstrate the extent to which our major variables have interacted with the environment to create the synergetic scenarios or environments we are interested in; we attempt their clarification within the contexts which they are adopted. Consequently, we conceptualize the following: bad governance, good governance, peace, security, and sustainable development.

3.1. Governance and good governance

Apparently deriving from the World Bank Institute (2012) conceptualization, governance can be said to refer to the way power is exercised in the management of the country's economic and social resources to the development of a society (United Nations Report, 1977; World Bank, cited in Obadan, 1998:24). Citing Wai (1975), Obadan (1998), agrees with the above conceptualization and states “that governance encompasses the state's institutional and structural arrangements, decision-making processes, and policy formation and implementation capacity. Other indices include development of personnel, information flows and the nature and style of leadership within the political system” (George-Genyi: 56). It is the ability of the government to efficiently and effectively promote the economic well-being of its people.

Contributing to the debate, Ndehfru (2007) sees governance as a fundamental process through which the lives and dreams of the citizenry are collectively pursued by deliberate and systematic strategies and policies, for the realization of their maximum potentials. Ndehfru went on to argue that this process is a combination of responsible leadership and enlightened public participation. Adopting the UN Report (1977), George-Genyi (2012) which sees good governance as “the complex mechanisms, processes, relationships and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their rights and obligations and mediate their differences” (Monga, 2008; citing Ndehfru, 2007:64;). Olowu and Akinola (2000) identify good governance as an approach or view which focuses on the state and institutions crafted by the people, the relationship between them and how rules are made in societies which are accepted as legitimate by individuals and organizations within the collectivities, cited in Coker & Obo, 2012: 63). Olowu and Akinola (2000) further observed two dimensions of the processes: the first has to do with the governors or leadership whose responsibilities are derived from the principle of effective governmental group; the second, with the governed, that is, with the masses of the people who have a responsibility to participate in the socioeconomic and political affairs of the society. To this extent, it is auspicious to investigate the behavioural
tendencies of both the leaders and the led as well as the structural and functional adequacies of the organizations they create to maintain law and order in the society.

Adesola (2012) posits the characteristics of good governance to include: popular participation, rule of law, transparency, responsiveness, and consensus oriented. Others are equity and inclusiveness, effectiveness and efficiency, and accountability. These characteristics provide the Grundnorm for a society to operate, on whose basis one may determine whether the society is experiencing good governance or bad governance.

Good governance is a key instrument that oils a sustained peaceful, secured and overall development of society as it is likely to breed peace and provide for security of lives and property, which will in turn create the enabling environment for sustainable development to thrive (George-Genyi, 2013). Odock (2006; cited in George-Genyi, 2103: 57) posits that good governance is “a system of government based on good leadership, respect for the rule of law and due process, accountability of the political leadership to the electorate as well as transparency in the operation of government.” According to Odock (2006), the full exposition of the theory and practice of good governance hinges on the role played by the leadership. For Odock,

... the need for leadership in all societies cannot be disputed; for it is only the aid of effective leadership that a society or group of individuals can succeed in attaining their political, economic and social objectives ... consisting the art of motivating people to work together, to attain some agreed objective... (2009; 4)

Odock while specifically alluding to ‘transparency’, asserted that:

Transparency in the operations of government on the other hand refers to carrying out government business in an open, easy to understand and explicit manner, such that the rules made by the government, the policies implemented by the government and the results of governments activities are easily to verify by the ordinary citizens, (2006: 4).

A cursory look at Odock's position above implies that good governance is just about the making and implementation of policies by the leadership which are simple to understand by the citizens. It is also not justified to reduce the role of the citizens to that of verifying the results of government activities. To be clear, good governance is an enterprise jointly undertaken by both the leadership and the followers. The type of governance a society enjoys depends on the substance of not only the leaders but also on that of the followers. Indeed, even in a situation where the citizens play 'spectatorial' roles in the society (see Hughes and Dowse,1972), their participation in watching what is ongoing in the complex society; and, their reaction to it would predominantly determine or modify the behavior of the leadership. It is very clear that the level of bad governance by the leadership in Nigeria has been to a great extent enhanced by the political orientations of the followers. For instance, in Nigeria, for ethnicity, prebendalism, and other forms of corrupt and related vices to thrive the formidable solidarity and cooperation of both the leadership and followers must take the central stage. Again, it is very common to observe leaders commit crimes with impunity and walk the Street free and even rewarded with higher offices and honours while the followership looks the other ways simply because those involved share the same primordial ties or belong to the same religious and/or cults group.
with them. This paper attempts to examine, to some extent, these unholy practices and collaborations and how they impact on governance in Nigeria.

Nevertheless, George-Genyi citing Onifade (2011),

… posed a critical question as to whether it is possible to have good governance without good leadership (and of course, good followership). Our understanding of reality points to the fact that the former is logically derived from the latter because where there is effective and efficient leadership, there is bound to be good governance, (2013, 58).

Chigbu (2007) partially echoes George-Genyi’s concern for the cause of the Nigerian problem by accepting Achebe’s argument in his book “The Trouble with Nigeria” that the trouble with Nigeria is simply and squarely a failure of leadership. Achebe noted that,

there is nothing basically wrong with the Nigerian character. There is nothing wrong with the Nigerian land, climate or water or air or anything else. The Nigerian problem is the unwillingness or inability of its leaders to their responsibility, to the challenges of personal examples which are the hallmark of true leadership, (Achebe, 1984; cited in Chigbu, 2007: 2 of 7 retrieved from http://nigerworld.com/articles.2007/doc/031.html).

Chigbu (2007) however, strongly disagreed with Achebe’s assertion that “there is nothing wrong with the Nigeria character”. This paper also subscribes to the above position. There are ample of things wrong with the Nigerian character: Most Nigerians do not cherish the ethics of good governance in their mad rush to acquire political power and wealth. Truthfulness, transparency, accountability, responsibility are values often relegated to the background on a daily basis. Chigbu posits that the problem with Nigeria is two-fold: Leadership and Followership. That is,

… the unwillingness or inability of its followers/citizens to rise to their responsibility; to live up to the challenges of coactive and proactive actions (or reactions) which are the hallmarks of true followership. Bad followership is the bad feature ... in the Nigeria character (p2 of 7)

Chigbu enthuses that bad followership is the bad feature in the Nigerian character. Chigbu acknowledges that “the whole idea of ... always blaming the leadership and ignoring the ever influential characteristic nature of the followership...” is one of the major problems militating against Nigeria’s progress (See Makinde, Punch, April 28 2012). Chigbu reiterates that the problem of Nigeria “can be said to be simply and squarely a failure of followership”. There is no denying the fact that the followership, as much as the leadership play equally important roles in the type of governance that live under. Even at the level of playingspectatorial role, the followership largely, are place in position of reducing or enhancing the political behaviour of the leadership by either explicitly or tacitly approving or disapproving them. Where the followership cannot live up their responsibilities of directly the affairs of the state, or are rendered politically, economically, psychologically efficacious, the outcome is state failure, with bad governance becoming imminent.
3.2. Bad governance

Bad Governance has been understood to reflect a general tendency of a public institution not being able ‘to manage public affairs and public resources’ ([Wikipedia]: wiki.Answers.com/Q/what_is_bad_governance). Wikipedia further notes that “Bad governance becomes more pronounced when a state or government fails (abysmally) to meet the needs of the society even though it makes use of the best of all the resources at their disposal”. Broadly speaking, Owoye and Bissessar (2009) see bad governance as a symptom of institutional and leadership failures, explicitly “manifested by its long list of dictatorial leaders, non free media and undemocratic elections.” Citing Jesperson (1992) Owoye and Bissessar note:

Africa performed well in the early years of its independence, but failed in its performance tests past 1973 as the region is now characterized by low growth rates, declining agricultural production, stagnating manufacturing, rising imports, and rapidly expanding external debts. ... has had many coups, civil unrest, ethnic violence; and widespread bureaucratic corruption alongside administrative inefficiency, and institutional ineptitude or outright failure (retrieved from http://www.ameppa.org/upload/Bad%20Governance.pdf. 1992: 1).

Highly manifest corruption and its related practices have been identified as major constraints on Africa’s economic, political, and social development (Owoye & Bissessar (1992), citing Klitgard (1998); Gray & Kaufman (1988); and Vogl (1988, 2004). The United Nations Economic & Social Commission for Asia and Pacific (UNESCAP) confirms that,

[B]ad governance includes governments that are ineffective and inefficient, not transparent, not responsive to the people, not held accountable for their actions, inequitable and exclusive to the elites, non-participatory; do not follow the rule of law and lacking policies that are consensus driven (http://www.unescap.org/pdd/prs/projectActivites/ongoing/gg/governance.pdf) [cited in Owoye &Bissessar, 2009:1].

Further corroborating this position, Owoye citing Calderisi (2006) averred persistent problems of inept leadership, institutional failure, and pandemic corruption as factors of bad governance in Africa. For Calderisi, “Africa’s problem is that it has never known good government ... and no continent has experienced such prolonged dictatorships” (cited in Owoye, 1992). Also, agreeing with Owoye, and Calderisi, Ayittey (2012) states that “corruption epidemic in African nations owes its existence to the long term tenure of their dictators, and he made this explicit by providing a graphic exposition of a long list of African dictators most of whom have held on to political power ranging from 30 to 42 years. Ayittey remonstrated that these dictators owe their successes to their effective control on the central bank, civil service, judiciary, the electoral commission, media as well as the security forces. Indeed, corruption remains unabated in the continent because “weak or failed institutions cannot control the excesses of their dictators”, due primarily to the fact that they were built on the unstable foundation of bad governance and pandemic corruption. The agency theoretical model of causes of corruption “considers the motives of legislators who must protect their own
interest of being re-elected or who must extort payments from interest groups wishing to influence legislative policies."

According to Owoye and Bissesaar "it helps explain the behavior of autocratic dictators and view legislators as predatory agents who are able to ignore the welfare of their principal or voters". The leadership believes that they can always buy the voters’ votes; hence the objective of the legislators (and others politicians) is "re-election and private income gain, “therefore, their ability to control grand corruption is dependent upon the strength of existing political parties, political institutions, and their methods of campaign financing” (Rose-Ackerman, 1978; cited in Ademu, 2013). Consequently, Corruption “… thrives from narrowly focused favors available for distribution, the ability of the wealthy to obtain funds legally, and the temporal stability of the political alliances” (Jain 2001). In fact, corruption pervades its way all through the political system from the tax collector to even the classroom teacher if left unchecked. It is imperative to observe that the theoretical model discussed has greatly illumined our comprehension of the dire governance scenario in Nigeria since 1999.

The resource allocation model of corruption is based on the rent-seeking behaviour of the governing elites who attempts to bypass the market, whose behaviour they view as a normal economic activity. It was adopted by Kaufman and Weis (1999) to compare the behaviour of a rent-seeking government official and a representative firm. The government officials adopt repressive methods such as harassment, bureaucratic delay in order to elicit unwarranted payment (bribes) from the people.

The internal markets' model posits that corruption is bound to occur in the system, as long as there is an internal market among government officials. Under this model, there are uncertainty and penalties associated with corrupt acts hence, it would become more beneficial if the gains of corruption are shared; with concomitant enhancement of income while corruption thrives (Owoye and Bissessar, 2009).

For effective leadership for good governance to be erected and sustained in African countries, Maathai (2009) suggested the existence of sound economic institutions; political Institutions; and, social Institutions. See Figure 1 below for illustration. There will be systemic incapacitations or even failures whenever any or all of these institution’s defaults in their assigned responsibilities. In Nigeria, a number of these institutions are developed, underdeveloped or overdeveloped. For instance, the bureaucratic institutions are more of less both underdeveloped and overdeveloped simultaneously. It is extremely common to find some ministries, departments and agencies, as well as public corporations being not only staffed by excessively large personnel who may not have any job to perform (whose appointments are based on prebendal politics or other pecuniary considerations), or are not in the first place qualified to occupy such positions in the public bureaucracies (both civil and military). In fact, whenever there is a disjunction between the political, social and economic institutions, systemic failure is bound to set in. In Nigeria, sundry experiences have buttressed that point, hence, the unending economic, social and political dislocations that even threaten the peace and unity of the country. Above all, in order to sort out these dislocations, the leadership adopts measures that further aggravate the terrible situation. Such condition is likely to generate and sustain bad governance in the county. It is necessary to say that since some of the leader came into office through electoral violence or corrupt practice, provision of good governance is far-flung.
The above models of corruption are adopted in this study to provide the theoretical underpinning of its utility in Nigerian politics and government. It also enables the comprehension of the reasons for founding the society on weak economic, political and social institutions. These further explain the kind of interface between leadership and followership in Nigeria over the years.

3.3. Understanding peace

The concept of peace is traceable to the Latin word pax meaning “freedom from civil disorder”. (Oxford Dictionary; retrieved from http://www.modernghana.com/print/380264/1/1towards-a-national-social-consciousness). Peace could also be taken as meaning justice, good health, safety, well being, prosperity, equity, good fortune and friendliness (Wikipedia-free encyclopedia). Oftentimes, peace is often seen as the absence of war, and by logical extension, war is the lack of peace. This view of peace is faulty because it really does not tell us anything about the meaning of peace as reflected above. However, Ibeanu (2005) has explicated peace in sociological terms as a condition of social peace (George, 2013), in which there are no social antagonisms. In other words, “peace is a situation in which there are no social conflicts and individuals and groups are able to meet their needs, aspirations and expectations. Peace in this sense can be explained from the perspective of structural functionalism” (George-Genyi, 2013).

George-Genyi expatiating, and broadening the definition of peace by Galtung (1990), identified two aspects of peace; namely: the negative peace, as “the lack of direct violence, war and fear of the person,
country, region and indeed at the international levels”; and,” the positive peace as the absence of unjust structures, unequal relationships, justice and inner peace of the person”. To George-Genyi peace in sum is, “the lack of fear, conflict, anxiety, exclusion, deprivation or suffering and violence. It is primarily concerned with creating and maintaining a just order in society” (2012: 58).

In fact, for Galtung

*Peace and indeed peace theory is intimately connected not only with conflict theory, but equally with development theory. Therefore a peace research must be one that looks into the conditions past, present and future for the realization of peace which is intricately connected with conflict research and indeed development research.* (1991:131).

An aspect of violence which is rarely mentioned in the political lexicon of Nigeria is the economic. Even when discussed, it is not treated with all seriousness and importance that it deserves. The reason for this levity in its treatment is due to the fact those that commit this type of violence are among the ruling class; precisely the leadership category. Again, perhaps another reason is that the victims (the governed) are mostly not conscious of this unwarranted violence on them. However, even when some of them become aware, what can they do? They are both helpless and hopeless before the coercive instruments of the state which the ruling class employs to cover up their ignoble activities in Nigeria is unleashed on them. Cases of economic violence abound in Nigeria. How have these activities impacted on good governance, peace, security and sustainable development of the various segments or geopolitical zones of Nigeria? In fact, George-Genyi has emphatically adumbrated that

“violent conflicts, whether social, political or environmental have seriously contributed to the crisis situation in terms of loss of human and material capital in Nigeria in the last decade especially has experienced the breach of peace from the six geopolitical zones”. (See George-Genyi, 2013: 59).

Commenting on the consequence of political violence on Nigeria, Jawondo (2011) maintained that it has,

... rendered a number of havoc on the national security, be it political, economic, social or religious. In response to oppression, suppression, intimidation, hunger, poverty, unemployment engendered by **bad governance** (emphasis mine) the citizens most especially the youth under their patrons have constituted themselves into militant groups who fend for themselves through nefarious means such as oil bunkering, hostage taking, assassination and a host of embarrassing acts, (p. 132).

True to the character of the Nigerian political leadership, rather than attempt to solve the seeming problems through dialogue and persuasion to nationalism; Jawondo (2011) argued that:

*The government at all levels (in the country) responded by cajoling, intimidating, injuring or even eliminating members of opposition. Consequently, the evils perpetuated by the governors*
and the governed have resulted in the violation of human rights, the rule of law and undermined the democratic project in Nigeria, (p. 132).

According to Jawondo:

_Thousand of able bodies, talented and selfless citizens, who would have contributed to the socio-economic and political development of Nigeria have been killed. They included persons like Mr. Dele Giwa, Rear Admiral Olu Omotetinwa, Dr Sola Omotosho, (the security manager of Federal Aviation Authority of Nigeria), Ahmed Pategi (Kwara State Chairman of Peoples Democratic Party, Mr. Dele Arojo, PDP gubernatorial candidate in Ogun State, and Harry Marshall, National Vice Chairman of All Nigeria Peoples Party, . . . (2011: 133).

Jawondo went on to mention other eminent Nigerians assassinated to include:

_Jesse Arukwu, a governorship aspirant of Alliance Congress of Democrats in Plateau State, Funsho Williams, governorship aspirant of Peoples democratic Party (PDP) in Lagos State, Ayo Daramola, a PDP governorship aspirant in Ekiti State, Chief Bola Ige, (former Minister for Justice and Attorney General of the nation) and Hajia Kudirat Abiola . . . (2011:133).

It is pertinent to observe that up to date; no person has been convicted for these high profile murders, even when there are possible clues. All those arrested have all been released, and are enjoying airs of freedom. Some of them have been rewarded by both electoral offices and executive appointments. Indeed, the case of Chief Bola Ige reverberated on the floor of the Senate during the screening of ministerial nominees submitted by President Jonathan when one of the ministerial nominees, responding to question posed by a member of the House, responded that he did not kill Bola Ige.

Another negative impact of political violence was the slowing down of oil exploration in the Niger Delta area of the country due to the activities of the militants (Jawondo, 2011). The government has through its Amnesty programme greatly improved on the dire situation. However, from time to time some aggrieved militant still threaten the peace of the area. Violent conflicts have contributed in no small measure to the continuing state of underdevelopment in Nigeria (Ohaegbuchi, 2014). There has been the loss of lives, livelihoods, destructions of infrastructure and natural resources, employment opportunities, which coincide directly with a weakened social safety net and a decline in the ability of the state to provide services such as health, education and indeed security for the people. Underscoring this point Nnoli (2013) notes “Each of the conflicts leads to wanton loss of human lives and property as well as human, displacement” (IPCR, 2013). It is pertinent to add that these human displacements have tended to galvanize and precipitate violent behaviours as the “settlers” attempts to integrate or find socioeconomic and political relevance in the communities they find themselves. The case of incessant violence and loss of lives and property in Jos city, Plateau State of Nigeria is very illustrative here. In a sentence, the peace and security and positively well-being of the people of Nigeria have been seriously compromised.
3.4. Security: Toward an understanding

Security is seen as “the condition of feeling safe from harm or danger, the defense, protection and preservation of values, and the lack of threats to acquire values” (George-Genyi, 2013). For Terriff (1991), Security is about survival and the conditions of human existence. In this study, the concept is adopted to extend beyond the military or the usual conventional dimensions. Therefore, security is broadly seen “as freedom from danger or threats to an individual” or a country (George-Genyi, 2013). It is the ability to protect and defend oneself, be it as an individual or a country, its cherished values and legitimate interests, and the enhancement of their well being (Imobighe, 1990; Mijah, 2007). To be specific, such security values include work, property, territory, franchise and not the least shelter and food.

McNamara (1968) and Mijah (2007) both viewed security as being equal to development. Development here suggests the substantive quantitative and qualitative improvements in peoples’ standard of living over time to such an extent that the levels of inequality, unemployment and poverty are tremendously reduced. Indeed, “Security is not just about the presence of a military force, although this is encompassed. There can be no development without security”. The non-conventional conception of security lays emphasis on social security. For Fayeye (2011), this suggests the maturation of the structures and processes that can engender and guarantee political space and sufficient conditions for the realization of among other things, personal, group or national aspirations (George, 2013).

It is not only useful to point out that “security means much more than the absence of war” (Mamam, 2012) but also, that lasting peace, an inherent ingredient of security that will encompass areas such as education, health, democracy, human rights the protection against environmental degradation and the proliferation of deadly weapons (See Definition of Human Security, retrieved from http://humansecurityinitiative.org/human-security). Indeed there can hardly be “security amidst starvation, peace building without poverty alleviation and no true freedom built on the foundation of injustice’ (Fayeye, 2012, retrieved from http://www.maxwellsci.com/print/crisis/v4190-195.pdf).

3.5. Understanding sustainable development

Sustainable development is “a socio-ecological process characterized by the fulfilment of human needs while maintaining the quality of the natural environment indefinitely (Green Sustainable Creations, http://www.gscaustralia.com.org; Jiboye, 201, cited in Coker et al, 2013). In its simple sense, adopting the 1987 report of the Brundtland Commission, formerly World Commission on Environment and Development, the concept implies “development that meets the needs of “present generations without compromising future generations to meet their own needs” (WCED, 1987, cited in Coker & Obo, 2013). The idea is that in meeting ones needs for survival today, one should always do it in such a manner that the achievements of the future needs are not jeopardized. It goes beyond mere ‘natural environment’. Sustainable development encompasses the economic, social, cultural and political environments. For the society to persist and endure it is imperative that these dimensions of the environment should be preserved. Both the Easton’s General System Model (1965); and Almond and Powell’s Structural Functionalism (1983), particularly illustrate the
expected synergies of the component parts for the overall survival of the political system. Dowse and Dowse (1983), posit that Almond and Powell see four types of challenges:

- that of building a legal structure: state-building,
- that of producing affective commitment; nation-building,
- that of meeting pressure from the population for a part in political decision-making: participation, and
- pressure to utilize the legal monopoly of force to redistribute scarce values (p. 77).

The extent to which the above expectations are realized largely depends on how each of these demands or any of the capability levels may use available resources to respond to inputs from the environment. It, therefore, means that for the society to survive optimally there should be balances in the use of these resources. For instance, economic resources are scarce; hence, must be judiciously expended in governance now, so that there would be a continuous flow for the future. This argument could be extended to the aspect of political leadership in the sense that efforts should be made at mentoring future leaders, as well as inculcating needful leadership values in them. A situation whereby there is mutual antagonism between the governing and non-governing class, the society is bound to experience serious governance issues both in the present and in the future. In the study, sustainable development covers all these dimensions of human survivalist instincts now and in the future.

4. The interface between peace, security and sustainable development in Nigeria

This section explores the links between the major variables of our study. We have stated elsewhere in this paper that the variables are intertwined and symbiotically related. Furthermore, we have asserted that the negative aspects of these phenomena tend to reproduce themselves if substantive counter measures are not taken to checkmate them. In fact, a cursory analysis of any of these variables certainly veers us into discussing the rest of them. However, for analytical purpose, we attempt to show how these phenomena are related through a presentation of a number of Commentaries and Studies by Students of policy, statesmen, and policy makers.

4.1. Corruption and bad governance in Nigeria

Commenting on issues bordering on bad governance, Hillary Clinton, (2009) a former U.S. secretary of State blamed “the failed government” of Nigeria on huge poverty gap arising from corruption and flawed electoral system, whose reputation or graft has undermined its International standing. For Clinton,

> Mismanagement and graft over decades have imperiled Nigeria’s development, deterred investment, undermined democracy and deepened conflicts such as the insurgency in the Southern Niger delta and bouts of religious violence in the north, (Reported by Sue Pleming and Felix Onuah, mobile.reuters.com/article/.../idUSTRESS7B346200908127?ca=ds, 2009).
Clinton (2009) reported a loss of over $300 billion to Nigeria since the past three decades due to corruption and other problems. Clinton not only argued that “... besides good governance, Nigeria’s future also depended on respect and understanding among religions, particularly among Islam and Christianity” but also that for Nigeria to move forward, she has to increase transparency and bolster democracy.

Dike in his “Governance and Nigeria’s Weak Institution: Is the 2020 Project achievable?” opines that corruption is a very serious vice bedevilling the country as it contributes to “poor governance, sociopolitical and economic problems.” In Nigeria, it takes numerous forms, but suffices to say that corruption should encompass any act undertaken by any person to gratify oneself unjustly as the expense of another person. With regards to the above, it is crucial to note that both the leaders and the led are guilty of this vice and its related forms; there is both the demand and the supply sides of the phenomena. Again, it could be bureaucratic, electoral, economic or legal. Cases of corruption and related vices/offenses are very common in Nigeria. Samples of these cases are mentioned in this paper.

An excerpt from Dike’s paper, for instance, reported.

The Press revealed how a former aide of Obasanjo... (now, a Senator of the Federal Republic of Nigeria) used the presidential jet to haul $170,000 in cash into the United States (Daily Trust, November 10, 2006) ... there was the shocking revelation by the Otunba Fasawe, during his testimony at the Senate investigations into the PTDF scandal that during the Obasanjo administration, the Presidency used billions of public money to fund the party’s 2003 election... (ThisDay, March 20, 2007;), and the national Assembly probe panel’s shocking revelation of alleged $16 billion the Obasanjo administration spent on the power sector without commensurate results (Daily Trust, March 21, 2008; Dike, www.gamji.com/article8000/NEWS8396.htm, p5 of 12).

Eboh (2013) reported that at the 2013 Annual National Management Conference, the President and Chairman of Council Mr. Michael Oluwale-Cole, observed that the attainment of the realization of the expectations of Vision 202020 is doubtful in view of the nature of the approach, strategy and style of governance of the political leaders in Nigeria. According to Oluwale-Cole, the attainment is uncertain mainly because “a majority of the leaders and individuals in authority are not showing commitment and loyalty to the development of the country” (Vanguard, 5 September, 2013). For Oluwale-Cole:

Nigeria can actually be very great. Vision 202020 can be doable, good governance will help us in achieving it. We have all it takes – both human resources, from (which) the country can tap. Bad governance is why we are still where we are in this country, despite the abundant resources at our disposal (Eboh, Vanguard, 5 September 2013).

Oluwale-Cole reiterated the need for Nigeria’s “need for urgent solution to much leadership and governance challenges besetting it which are threatening the nation’s existence.”

In a paper, ‘Celebration of Fraud in Nigeria’ Ephraim (2013) observed that:
The crime of embezzlement is a widespread crime in present day Nigeria. It impairs the property relationship protected by the law and the reputation of state organs and personnel... recent happenings in the country makes me sick. If you do not steal or embezzle public funds you are not recognized. ... the brazen disrespect for public funds in the country is outrageous and horrendous, (p1 of 2).

The insensitivities of most Nigerians to corruption practices with impunity are clearly noted by Ephraim thus:

I have watched with dismay how many Nigerian so called big men have arraigned in court in recent times for mismanagement of public funds. Ordinarily, this should be a thing of joy as it shows those who have tried to enrich themselves with public funds are being brought to book. However, it appears the whole thing now looks like a mockery and deceit of the Nigerian citizens, (p. 1 of 2).

Ephraim asked,

.. how else should one explain crowd gathering to sing the praises of those arraigned in court for fraud and dressed in uniforms in support of those individuals, clapping , singing and raining curses on the supposed enemies. There are people waiting to see their big men granted bail. The question is who pays for the uniform? Who organizes these big events when the individuals in question were supposed to be hounded in cells?

These are very serious questions; the answers to them are obvious: There are the orchestrations of the ruling class. They take advantage of the naivety, ignorance and poverty of legal, economic and political sophistication of the large number of the followership to rent their services. In such scenario enthroned of the tenet of accountability, responsibility and transparency is virtually non-existent.

Dr. Oby Ezekwesili, a former Nigerian Minister of education has attributed the rising poverty in the country “to poor governance and the monotonous economic structure....”

According to Ezekwesili,

Bad governance which had manifested through corruption was responsible for the poor economic performance of the country ... Nigeria had been unable to translate the huge natural resources at her disposal to the improvement of her citizens’ living standard (Chux Chan & Chukwudi Akasike, www.punchng.com>News Punch 7 2014).

Ezekwesili also confirmed that:

poor governance or its virulent manifestation, public corruption is ... the fundamental reason for Nigeria’s poor performance despite our globally acknowledged economic potentials to have
became not just one of the largest economies of the world, but in fact, one of the most prosperous in those countries (Chux Chan & Chukwudi Akasike, www.punchng.com>.News Punch 7 2014).

4.2. Violence and bad governance in Nigeria

Violence has been very disheartening episodic manifestations of the socioeconomic and political history of Nigeria. However, the present spates of violent activities are tended to become very significant and enduring to the extent that it has implications for the political system as a whole. The paper argues that the presence of violence in all its ramifications distorts the peaceful environment conducive for the security of lives and properties, with concomitant negative impacts on overall sustainable development of Nigeria. A number of reasons have been adumbrated for the condition: some blame the varied ethnic and religious configuration of Nigeria; others see the lack of ability or commitment on the part of leadership to provide the requisite leadership for prosperous society; however, others blame it on the underdeveloped nature of the economy which produces high-risk society powered by insecurity and poverty.

The violent activities in Nigeria became very militant in Nigeria since the Yar'adua/Jonathan administration. In order to checkmate these spate of violence the erstwhile administration granted general amnesty to the aggrieved militants. After the death of President Yar 'ardua his successor President Goodluck Jonathan continued the programme. The Amnesty Programme brought respite to the country, which was, however, short lived, and with the emergence of unprecedented violence in the north-eastern part of the country by a militant group called Boko Haram. The magnitude of harm done and still being done in Nigeria is very unprecedented whose implications have gone beyond the shores of the country.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on Information and Public Affairs, Senator Enyinnaya Abaribe has pointed out that “increasing level of violence in various parts of the country posed grave danger to the nation's security and economy,” Abaribe maintained that “The Senate is very worried about the spate of killings happening all over the country. We have seen a trend developing where every dispute is now settled with burning and all that.” To call what magnitude of violence in the North-East States of Bornu, Jigawa and Adamawa (News 24 Nigeria). Halima Abubakar Aliyu (2013) has this to say about the economic implications of violence and terrorism in Nigeria:

\textit{the economic implications of the growing rate of violence and terrorism in Nigeria can be measured from different perspectives. The cost of distraction (destruction) of property and national productivity are directly affected while there is longer-term indirect cost of confronting and curbing the menace. ...the human cost, the amount of lives wasted in the process. ... the federal government is spending a whale of amount on defense and security. A heavy sum compared to expenditure in other critical sectors of the society, (Daily Post, 6 July, 2013:1).}

Aliyu (2013) further observed that the “cost of tackling terrorism in Nigeria also plunges us deeper into the mire of poverty and political destabilization, cankerworms that are themselves, already eating up the nation's vast capital and material resources”. The travesty of the Nigerian democracy is further accentuated in the words of Aliyu as follows:
... the recent state of insecurity in the country is happening at a time when most of the key industries in the country have become moribund. What is even more saddening is that the struggle against terror is gradually affecting transport and tourism industry, which is key foreign exchange earners, tax revenue generators, business opportunities for growing entrepreneurs and source of employment, (Daily Post Nigeria, 2013).

Aliyu (2013) concludes that terrorism and violent activities since the return to civilian rule has given Nigeria a name worse than that Corruption had given, thereby acting as a disincentive for even foreign direct investment to the country.

Agreeing with Aliyu on the economic factor as the cause of political violence in northern Nigeria, Opposition Nigerian politician Hafsat Baba argued that “the only way to stop the increasing violent attack in northern Nigeria is to alleviate poverty and address economic problems…” (2012).

Lawanson (2012) Executive Director, Corporate Banking of First Bank Plc. in the US- Nigeria Infrastructure Conference in Washington DC in 2012 was reported by Abiodeun Oluwarotimi as maintaining that bad governance hindered the Investment growth in Nigeria. As further reported, Lawanson observes.

The only limitation that Nigeria has today is the limitation of its governance. If this can be addresses and the problem of corruption which to a great extent has limited competitiveness, we will get value for every investment, (Oluwarotimi, 2012).


The displacement resulting from continuing violence in Adamawa, Borno, and Yobe, north-eastern Nigeria is having significant humanitarian impacts in Nigeria and neighbouring countries. „ „ Thousands of people are being forced to flee from the fighting between Nigerian security forces and armed groups in the north-eastern Nigeria (2013, p.1).

Expatiating further, Audu et al (2013), conclude that political violence in Yobe State was caused much more by systemic leadership failure than by poverty and unemployment. The question is what generated poverty and unemployment in the first place? As argued in this study, these variables are symbiotically related: they generate and reproduce each other in the systematic manner. Methodical poverty and unemployment enervate the followership to the extent that could take bad governance for granted, because the leadership momentarily ditch out “handouts” from their ill-gotten wealth to them?

4.3. Leadership and bad governance in Nigeria

According to Alamu (www.unilorin.edu.ng/publications/alamu/leadershipquality.htm), Leadership in its simplest form portrays the ability to inspire, direct, motivate and encourage others positively to specific end. “It is about being able to meet the challenges of organizing, and adequately coordinating the resources of
time, relationship, skills, expertise and finances to achieve a goal for the common good of all” (Alamu, 2004: 318) addressing the leadership issue observes cited in Annang (2013). In a broader sense, leadership connotes the following: assignments, effectiveness, responsibility, accountability, vision, character, productivity, persuasion and realization of targeted goals. The extent to which these characteristics are inhered in our leadership largely determined the type of governance that we have in Nigeria over the years.

Alamu (www.unilorin.edu.ng/publications/alamu/leadershipquality.htm) contends that in Nigeria, there is “perhaps pollution of leadership qualities, a bastardizing of revered tradition, convention and culture”. Alamu argues that leadership is perceived as “a means of exploitation, personal enrichment, fulfilling parochial interest and selfish ambition”. Given the above position, Nigeria has over the years been in search of credible leadership to no avail. Those that succeed to take over the reins of power Alamu observes “proceed methodically to strip the public treasury for their own pocket and their cronies”. Consequently, Alamu suggests among others that public leadership in Nigeria should “imbibe and cultivate moral character, piety, human-heartedness, self discipline, purpose, accomplishment indispensable for quality leadership with deep conviction, responsibility, knowledge, leadership with example”

In fact, the challenge of leadership is very serious in Nigeria. Scholars such as Chinua Achebe (1984) and Ibrahim Gambari (2008) note the failure of leadership in the country.

For example, Gambari asserts that among other challenges:

*Leadership is a critical factor in nation-building, and it should be understood in two important but related ways. Firstly, there are the personal qualities, honesty, commitment, and competence of individual leaders at the top. Secondly, there are the collective qualities of common vision, focus, and desire for development of the elites as a whole.* (2008, p6 of 8).

Gambari succinctly encapsulates the dire condition in the country further:

*The standards for recruitment and the performance of our individual leaders over the years have left much to be desired. We do not need leaders who see themselves as champions of only some sections of our population. We do not need leaders who do not understand the economic and political problems of the country, not to talk of finding durable solutions for them. We do not need leaders who are more interested in silencing their opponents, than in pursuing justice. We do not need leaders, who preach one thing and do the exact opposite. We do not need leaders who place themselves above the constitution and the laws of the country, but leaders who lead by upholding and respecting the law. We do not need leaders who have no sense of tomorrow, other than that of their private bank accounts,* (2008, p7 of 8).

To address the leadership problem Gambari (2008) recommends thus:

*[W]e must have a leadership that is committed to the rule of law and has a demonstrable sense of fair play and democratic tolerance; a leadership with ability and integrity; and above all else ...
leaders who have a vision for Nigeria better than one they inherited; leaders who will lead by deeds and not by words; achievers, not deceivers, (Gambari, p7 of 8).

Achebe while addressing the problem with Nigeria vividly declared that the problem with Nigeria is principally that of Leadership. Achebe observed that there is absolutely nothing wrong with the Nigerian character. To Achebe, the problem with Nigeria is “the unwillingness or inability of its leaders to rise to the responsibility, to the challenge of personal examples, which are the hallmarks of true leadership” (1984).

Nwobu (2013) commenting on Achebe's judgment notes

Achebe’s testament of bad leadership by successive Nigerian leaders remains timeless in the scale and scope of its vindication from independence to date. Looking around Nigeria, nothing but colossal failure is evident. From local government councillors all the way to the presidency, the only business of government is the monumental and frenzied looting of the nation’s coffers, while the huddled masses reek in unbelievable poverty and destitution, (Nwobu, 2013:1; http://247ureports.com/2013/05/03/the-trouble-with-nigeria-achebes-testaments-of-bad...., Assessed on 12/02/14)

Nwobu cites Achebe further in these words:

Nigeria is “a nation for sale,” high jacked since independence by thieves, bigots, mass murderers, war criminals, unpatriotic opportunists, election riggers and other such vermin who have run the nation through an unnecessary civil war, corruption and total despoliation. Nigeria is consequently, a failed state, plagued by social injustice, unrest, debilitating poverty, disharmony and ethno-religious turbulence. A score card of the nation’s sadistic leaders since independence as listed below underscores the timeless veracity of Achebe’s apocalyptic testament of a nation poisoned since its founding by bad leadership, (cited by Nwobu, 2013; http://247ureports.com/2013/05/03/the-trouble-with-nigeria-achebes-testaments-of-bad...., Assessed on 12/02/14)

The depiction of the problems of leadership graphically presented by both Achebe and Gambari (2008) are appropriate demonstration of the existential condition in Nigeria. Most political “leaders” in the country strictly speaking are not leaders; they are what the Nigerian Afro Music King, Fela Anikulapo Kuti as well as music veteran Sony Okosun in their respective musical albums, appropriately refer to as “rulers” and not “leaders”. To all intents and purposes “Rulership” is largely antithetical to modern-day tenets of democracy. Some of the high points of the negative “leadership” practice in Nigeria are wanton looting of public treasuries, insensitivity to public opinion, non accountability, abuses of power with impunity. Others are the raising of sycophancy to the level of statecraft, sponsored blackmailing, or kidnapping; and outright and assassination of political opponents. These activities of the political leadership in the country do not exhibit commitments to the enthronement of just and fair society; a society where the ingredients necessary for the achievement of peace, security and sustainable development can be insured. Contrarily, their activities can
largely without any doubt enhance and perpetuate bad governance in Nigeria. Zainab’s Musings (2011) in his commentary on bad leadership had this to say:

*The basic philosophy of our Nigerian-ness after more than 5 decades has become lost amidst the rubble of crippling poverty, increasing inequality between the haves and the have-nots, the dearth and near collapse of infrastructure, alarming level of insecurity, intensification of ethnic, regional and religious cleavages and animosity amongst citizens, infamous bad leadership and scandalous corruption*, (p 2 of 160).

Zanaib concludes that:

*All these have culminated in a political leadership that is confused, mediocre and grossly inefficient populated by corrupt self-seeking, and fractured political elite devoid of patriotism, nationalistic pride and sovereignty....This leadership and elite have not only resulted in weak and dysfunctional state institutions but also a followership which in the absence of effective and inspiring leadership is distrustful of such leadership and mutually antagonistic of one another, a followership bedeviled by poverty, inequality, marginalization and a sense of injustice that is increasingly becoming desperate, disillusioned and militant*, (p.2 of 16).

Furthermore, leadership and followership problem in Nigeria is also captured by the Governor of Kogi State who identifies sycophancy, lack of unity and cooperation among political leaders as a major threat to sustenance of democracy in the country. Captain Wada argued that Nigeria had not been able to affect positive change in the lives of the people because the “leaders cannot come together and speak with one voice” (*This Day* Newspaper, February, 5 2014). Dike expatiating on the leadership challenges in Nigeria explains that:

*The leaders have the capacity to influence public policies to make a difference in the lives of the citizen, but have failed to do so because their primary goal of assuming leadership position is self-enrichment... Leading a country involves making policies and finding solutions to problems, ensuring stability of the polity, and guiding the society to prosperity.* (Governance and Nigeria’s Weak Institutions: Is the 2020 project Achievable? Dike: 1-2).

Dike is quick to observe that most leaders in the country "lack the vision, the passion, and thr character to effectively govern the state and deal with crumbling economy". According to Dike, our leaders do not demonstrate clear comprehension "of their responsibilities, as some of them are insensitive to the people’s sufferings." Dike summarized Nigerian’s loss of faith in their leaders in the following words: "Nigerians are tired of complaining to those who are leading without listening to them."

Another serious dent on the leadership demeanors is inability to keep not only electoral promises but also fulfilling legislative and executive pronouncements. In other words, there is obvious lack leadership credibility. In fact, one the foremost reason for the prolonging the last Academic Staff Union of Universities in Nigeria, was the fear of the Jonathan Administration reneging on the promise (based on previous experience.
This perception of present day leadership in Nigeria is a direct contrast to olden day's governance, where every public office holder and their agent were seen to be credible, and the public had faith in their political efficacy. Recent development has proven the Union right as the report in a newspaper inter-alia:

_Barely, two months after the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU), called off its nearly-six-months strike, the university system may soon be thrown into another round of crisis, which portends dire consequences, if not immediately nipped in the bud, (Sunday Newswatch, Sunday February, 2014)._  

The ASUU's National Treasurer Dr Ademola Aremu, “alerted the nation of an alleged non-compliance by the Federal Government with the agreement signed between both parties, last December (2013), prior to ASUU's decision to call off the industrial action.” In a nutshell, the Union alleged that the Federal Government is yet to honour the agreement; that, the promised N220 billion is not with the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN). This is preposterous, given the fact, that the Federal Government made a public show of her compliance with the Agreement by displaying the Cheques transferring the money to the Press. Dr Aremu, therefore, calls on the public to intervene by appealing to the government to keep its own side of the bargain. Indeed, this kind of antecedence contributed tremendously to decay in the educational system at all levels in Nigeria.

---

**Figure 2.** showing the interface between Bad Governance and Lack of Peace, Security and Sustainable Development. Source: Authors' conceptualization, 2014

The above figure conceptualizes the interface among the major variables of the study. The figure attempts to demonstrate that lack of peace, lack of security and lack of sustainable development is largely a factor of
lack of good governance (bad governance). Sustainable development is not feasible where there is lack of peace and security since its absence is likely to produce and even aggravate discontentment, frustrations among the masses of the people wallowing in relative or abject poverty; as they witness deliberate flaunting of the enormous wealth of the country by a few governing elites. From the above, it is useful to reiterate that each of the variables collectively acts on one another either positively or negatively to produce peaceful, violent free, good governance and sustainably developed society or vice versa produces unstable, violent prone, bad governance and un-developing society.

5. Conclusion

It is very clear from the foregoing that bad governance is an albatross on the sustainable development of Nigeria. It is also an incontrovertible fact that, bad governance is cyclically intertwined with the lacks of peace, security and sustainable development. In fact, sustainable development is not likely to thrive and persist where there is systemic poverty, deprivations, frustration of aspirations, and violent activities by a sizeable number of the citizens. This study reveals that Nigeria has not been fortunate enough to be governed by honest, transparent and accountable leadership. Equally, the masses of followership in Nigeria has over the years exhibited a high degree of political ineptitude, sycophantic and political lethargy and overall double-facedness.

Equally, the study affirms that bad governance, lack of security, internecine violent scenarios and, challenges to peaceful co-existence in Nigeria are closely related and intertwined. These variables, the study posits, are made possible by the absence of reliable and resourceful leadership and followership in the country. The Leadership, as well as the followership is both culpable in the persistent lack of sustainable development of Nigeria. In fact, the leadership creates and takes advantage of their stupendous primitive accumulation of wealth on one hand, and the enervating poverty conditions of vast majority of the populace.

Religious and ethnic precipitated conflicts in the country are largely promoted and inflamed and most, often are precipitated and sustained by the politicians through their unguarded and unpatriotic utterances on the one hand, on the other hand, the lack of capacity by those in position of political power to absorb, contain, assess, and evaluate criticisms from the “Oppositions” have tended to ignite unnecessary misunderstandings and tensions in the country.

We point out that sustainable development cannot thrive where peace and security is a luxury. No sensible investor will continue to invest in a volatile environment. Indeed, potential investors are scared to invest in such societies. In Nigeria most investors and potential ones have stayed off the country due the unending violent environment.

6. Recommendations of the way forward

- All forms of corrupt practices and related vices should be abhorred, and defaulters apprehended and comprehensive punished. Accordingly, the problem of corruption should be succinctly defined within the context of our cultural dispositions, and appropriate laws enacted to address them (Coker, 2006).
Foreign governments in collaboration with international institutions should assist the Nigerian government in locating and repatriating Nigeria's stolen monies stashed overseas by dubious politicians and public officials (Coker, 2006).

They should be transparency in the electoral system to the extent that both the electors and the elected radiate spirit of acceptance of outcome as free and fair. The people should be allowed to make the votes count in choosing the “best” hands for public governance.

Government at all levels should create more job opportunities for the ever-increasing armies of the unemployed. This will substantially provide gainful activities to them, rather than wasting away in unprofitable ventures.

Leadership should not only be very responsive to the yearnings and aspirations of the people, but should be accountable and transparent in all their activities.

Attempts should be made to strengthen the political, economic, social and other institutions of governance in order to sustain effective policy making and implementation.

An enlightened followership is an imperative force if good governance, peaceful, developed and non-violent society is desired in Nigeria. Sycophancy should be discouraged in the nation’s statecraft.

Divisive politics based on ethnicity, religion and regionalism should be underplayed in the country.

Governments at all levels in the country should ensure that they uphold a minimally acceptable standard of good living for the people by ensuring the availability of their basic needs.

All forms of insurrections and violent contrivance should be proactively checkmated before they become full-blown and more difficult to contained or resolved.

Attempts should be made to create sound economically-driven projects, programmes, and laws conducive for healthy economic activities to thrive and persist.

Interreligious platform for synergizing the efforts the major religious groups should be established and encouraged to redress the misunderstandings among them with a view to clarifying and defusing areas of needless differences among them. Once this is achieved, escalations of interreligious conflict will be brought to its barest minimum.
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