



# THE APPLICATION OF JEREMY BENTHAM'S THEORY OF UTILITARIANISM IN EXPLAINING NIGERIAN DEMOCRACY

RUFAI SANI USMAN

*Department of international Relations & strategic Studies, School of  
Social & management sciences, Adamawa State Polytechnic, yola*

## ABSTRACT

Utilitarianism is an ethical and philosophical theory that states that the best action is the one that maximises utility, which is usually defined as that which produces the greatest well-being of the greatest number of people. The most potent way of determining the usefulness of any good theory is to apply it to reality in order to know the extent to which it can accommodate the existing realities in society. This paper examines Jeremy Bentham's utilitarian theory and its relevance in explaining Nigerian state with reference to democracy. The question is does Jeremy Bentham's theoretical

## Introduction

Utilitarianism is an ethical and philosophical theory that states that the best action is the one that maximises utility, which is usually defined as that which produces the greatest well-being of the greatest number of people. The most potent way of determining the usefulness of any good theory is to apply it to reality in order to know the extent to which it can accommodate the existing realities in society. Ogunkoya (2011) affirms that, It is a version of consequentialism which states that the consequences of any action are the only standard of right and wrong. Unlike other forms of consequentialism, such as egoism and altruism, utilitarianism considers the interests of all beings equally (Scheffler 1988). Thus, it was more a political theory than an ethical one in the true sense of the term. Utilitarianism was first put forward by Epicurus (a Greek philosopher), in form of hedonism and is capable of social application. So it attempt merged combine individual hedonism with social hedonism with a view to creating a civilized society where both individual as well as social good could be achieved. It received its classical form in the hands of Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), the founder of the British Utilitarian School of philosophy

However, the Nigerian state has failed to promote the utility of its citizens in the aspect of democracy, human rights and ensuring security of lives and property. Many years after Nigeria Political Sovereignty, the prevailing ideas in the democratic literature maintain that democracy has failed and its consolidation has remained elusive. The challenges of insecurity is not new in Nigeria since the return to democracy in 1999 Insecurity was the major slogan that the government sworn-in on the 29th May, 2015



*postulation apply to Nigeria's democratic governance? Why is leadership a critical issue affecting governance in Nigeria's democratic system? This paper critically discusses Jeremy Bentham's Utilitarianism as it relates to democracy in Nigeria. The paper is substantially qualitative and descriptive in nature. Data for the study is obtained mainly from secondary sources such as text books, journals, articles, online publications. However, it discovered that, the Nigerian state has failed to promote the utility of its citizens in the aspect of democracy, human rights and ensuring security of lives and property . Many years after Nigeria Political Sovereignty, the prevailing ideas in the democratic literature maintain that democracy has failed and its consolidation has remained elusive more so, the fundamental features of democratic governance has been undermined by the myriad of contemporary socio-economic and political issues faced by Nigerians which include insecurity, poverty, corruption and election malpractice.*

**Keywords.** *Democracy, utilitarianism, happiness, Theory, State.*

employed to win elections in 2015 to displace the government of the People's Democratic Party that had been in power since 1999. The masses particularly, the people from the North Eastern zone in Nigeria and Nigerian generally were optimistic that the long-awaited messiah with the magic wand to curb the challenges of insecurity had emerged. Boko Haram insurgency was the greatest threat to security before 2015 and it was the only terrorist act that accounted for the decimation of the greatest number of people that died between 2009 and 2015. Armed robbery which was the major crime in Nigeria before 2009 was not carried out with the intention to kill but for pecuniary reason. Hired assassination was also another form of threat to life in the period before 2015 and it was directed against perceived political opponents. However, from 2015 to date, insecurity has cast a shadow on the happiness of the greatest number of the people. The increase in the intensity of operation of Boko Haram insurgency has resulted in the aggravated loss of human lives, displacement of people and destruction of properties. Kidnapping for ransom which started in the Niger-Delta areas, the oil producing region in Nigeria, has spread to every part of Nigeria armed banditry operation in Zamfara, Kebbi, Kaduna and Katsina States in the North-West region have resulted in the destruction of villages and properties leading to displacement of hundreds of thousands of people from their ancestral villages and painful deaths. The displaced people from this theatre of conflicts are now accommodated in the Internally Displaced Peoples Camps where they depend on humanitarian assistance for survival

The question is does Jeremy Bentham's theoretical postulation apply to Nigeria's democratic governance? Why is leadership a critical issue affecting governance in Nigeria's democratic system? This paper critically discusses Jeremy Bentham's Utilitarianism as it relates to democracy in Nigeria. The paper is substantially qualitative and descriptive in nature. Data for the study was obtained mainly from secondary sources such as text books, journals, articles, online publications.

#### **Origin and Nature of Utilitarianism**

Utilitarianism is a version of consequentialism, which states that the consequences of any action are the only standard of right and wrong. Unlike other forms of consequentialism, such as egoism and altruism, utilitarianism considers the interests of all beings equally.



Proponents of utilitarianism have disagreed on a number of points, such as whether actions should be chosen based on their likely results (act utilitarianism) or whether agents should conform to rules that maximize utility (rule utilitarianism). There is also disagreement as to whether total (total utilitarianism), average (average utilitarianism) or minimum utility should be maximized. His importance of happiness as an end for humans has long been recognized. Forms of hedonism were put forward by Aristippus and Epicurus; Aristotle argued that eudaimonia is the highest human good and Augustine wrote that "all men agree in desiring the last end, which is happiness." Happiness was also explored in depth by Aquinas.

Different varieties of consequentialism also existed in the ancient and medieval world, like the state consequentialism of Mohism or the political philosophy of Niccolò Machiavelli. Mohist consequentialism advocated communitarian moral goods including political stability, population growth, and wealth, but did not support the utilitarian notion of maximizing individual happiness. Utilitarianism as a distinct ethical position only emerged in the eighteenth century

Jeremy Bentham was an English philosopher and political radical. He is primarily known today for his moral philosophy, especially his principle of utilitarianism, which evaluates actions based upon their consequences. The relevant consequences, in particular, are the overall happiness created for everyone affected by the action. Influenced by many enlightenment thinkers, especially empiricists such as John Locke and David Hume, Bentham developed an ethical theory grounded in a largely empiricist account of human nature. He famously held a hedonistic account of both motivation and value according to which what is fundamentally valuable and what ultimately motivates us is pleasure and pain. Happiness, according to Bentham, is thus a matter of experiencing pleasure and lack of pain. Although, he never practiced law, Bentham did write a great deal of philosophy of law, spending most of his life.

Critiquing the existing law, and strongly advocating legal reform. Throughout his work, he critiques various natural accounts of law which claim, for example, that liberty, rights, and so on exist independent of government. In this way, Bentham arguably developed an early form of what is now often called "legal positivism." Beyond such critiques, he ultimately maintained that putting his moral theory into consistent practice would yield results in legal theory by providing justification for social, political, and legal institutions. Bentham states the importance of Utilitarianism in describing the state. In his opinion, utilitarianism would be the foundation of all state policies. All decisions of the government will be based on the utility policy. Keep in mind the happiness of every person. The lawmakers will take care of utility policies. Each person's opinion will play a role in decision-making. The policy of the policy will be clear. Every person will participate in all activities. No representation will be considered as important here.

#### **Democracy as a Means for Good Government**

Bentham was equivocal about democracy in his early work, at one point calling himself 'a royalist in London, and a republican in Paris. However, his support for the French Revolution quickly faded in the face of the regicide and the French declaration of war on Britain in 1793, and he took a turn in his writing that can only be described as anti-democratic, writing, for example, that 'The people are all will—they have no reason, no understanding' and that democracy only worked in America because, as most men were farmers, their business keeps them separate and quiet. He went so far



as to suggest that political education for the poor should be limited to a sermon and that a short one, on the text: study to be quiet and mind your own business. It may be that it took some time for the shock of disappointment over the violent turn of the French Revolution to wear off, but eventually his own experience in his on-going pursuit of legal reform eventually led him to become a supporter of radical parliamentary reform, even in Britain. His return to those ideas came with the discovery in 1804 of what he referred to as 'sinister interest,' or the idea that rulers, in pursuing their own self-interest, might act in opposition to the interests of the citizens over whom they rule. But even as he whole-heartedly came to embrace democratic republicanism, the basic structure of the system never changed in his mind

There were rulers, and there were the ruled, and what was important was to ensure as best as possible that the interests of the former were aligned with (or subordinated to) the interests of the latter. The best means by which that could be accomplished, he came to believe, was by enabling the ruled to hold the rulers accountable through a system of representative democracy, reflecting an instrumental perspective that permeates his political theory. Furthermore, only through a representative democracy with universal suffrage could the individual interests of the electorate be aggregated and reflected in the political system.

#### **1. Sinister interest.**

Bentham's primary interest, throughout his career, was legal reform. He believed that the fundamental basis of all human activity was self-interest, because it was the source of all human productivity was also a danger because people unrestrained would end up undermining their own happiness even as they pursued it. Thus the principal role of government was to provide people with a sense of security, principally in the form of private property rights, so they would know that they could enjoy the fruits of their labor or that they would be rewarded for taking financial risks. Government need do little to encourage people to seek their own subsistence, but if it did its job well, the people might enjoy abundance. Further, government policy should promote equality to the greatest extent possible to ensure the widest distribution of happiness, although never in a way that might undermine or threaten security (which he thought it would most of the time).

In contrast to France at the time of its revolution, Bentham believed that, in Britain, equal representation has already been accomplished, more or less, as the constitution provided the elements necessary to ensure good government, including 'Liberty of the press, the absence of arbitrary executive power, and the impartial administration of justice. However, events led him to recognize the presence of what he called 'sinister interest,' the presence of an interest particular to a group that is opposed to the public interest, which undermined the functioning of the system. The first step came with Parliament's lack of attention to his arguments regarding legal reform in Scotland, which brought him to the conclusion that, the legislature, habitually deferred to the lawyers within it on any legal question, and would carry no measure relating to the law without the lawyers' sanction. It wasn't that the legislators had been tricked, but that they recognized that the interests of the lawyers were aligned with their own interests, which were generally opposed to those of the public. But, while a free press might be expected to expose such practices, he found that in cases of libel, public officials were able to name what amounted to private juries which could be reliably counted upon to return verdicts in their favor. If legal reform was to be successful, public criticism of the established system was necessary. But if the established powers could



effectively censor such criticism by charging their critics with libel, and silencing them by finding them guilty in a court with a packed jury, then the ability to root out and expose corruption, necessary to any kind of reform, would be impossible. If Bentham had earlier believed that fundamental reform of the British political system was unnecessary because of Liberty of the press, the absence of arbitrary executive power, and the impartial administration of justice, the realization of the existence of sinister interest provided a powerful impetus to reconsider his position.

## **2. Popular sovereignty and the chain of subordination**

From the very beginning, one of Bentham's most fundamental principles was that governors must govern in the interests of the people. Initially, he was content to argue that the sovereign power can never be other than fiduciary. There is nothing inherently democratic, of course, about the idea that sovereign power must be exercised for the benefit of those who are subject to it, as the idea of a trust may hold true as much for a monarch or a dictator as for an elected official. In fact, it can be seen as largely paternalistic and the subjects are to be taken care of by the rulers, an arrangement that always leaves the former subordinate to the latter, even when, in formal terms under conditions of popular sovereignty, the legislature is subordinate to the people. The paternalist model is clear enough where the sovereign is contained within a single individual or group, such as a monarch or an aristocracy. Where the people are sovereign, however, the fiduciary model gets complicated, to the extent that it designates one party as active and the other as passive, the notion of the sovereign as fiduciary separates the sovereign from those for whom the sovereign power is exercised. If the people are sovereign, they are, in effect, their own subjects. In this case, it becomes important to distinguish between the sovereign and the exercise of sovereign power, as it is the sovereign power that must act as fiduciary. Here, the sovereign does not directly exercise sovereign power, but the fiduciary model means that government, while it may be said to be for the people, and even by the people, is not of the people. Rather, government, the instrument of sovereign power stands outside of the people themselves. In his later writing, Bentham was very clear, the people are sovereign, and they are to exercise their sovereignty in a democratic fashion, however, their exercise of sovereign power is limited.

There is a distinction between the direct exercise of sovereign power in constituting the legislature, and its indirect exercise by the legislature itself. Effectively, the legislature exercises the sovereign power through the instruments of rule. This distinction becomes clear in Bentham's theory in his discussion of the 'originative' or 'investitive' and 'divestitive' power on one side, and 'operative' or 'executive' power on the other side. This makes it seem like the sovereign power is bifurcated, but it can be understood more simply as a case where the former confers sovereign power and the latter exercises it. In a representative system based on popular sovereignty, the electors invest their representatives with the operative power, whom then form an executive or administrative body through which that power is exercised. Bentham follows Locke in envisioning the structure of government not as a separation or balance of power but what Schofield calls a chain of subordination. Indeed, Bentham was critical of the balance of powers idea because it suggested equality among them. Rather, the chain of subordination meant that each branch of government stood in a specific relation to the sovereign: The sovereign's role as supreme power was limited to the exercise of the act of investiture in the establishment of a legislative body that



would act on the basis of the interests of the sovereign. The legislature then would have superiority over the administrative branch (which includes the judiciary), which carries out the commands of the legislators. This accomplishes one of Bentham's fundamental requirements for good government, that rulers be dependent upon, and accountable to the people. The people invest their representatives with power, and the people can take it away from them.

### **3. Strumentalism, elite rule and official aptitude.**

Bentham turned to fundamental, so-called Radical reform in late 1817 or early 1818, as he realized that the legislature as constituted either could not or would not implement the kind of comprehensive civil and penal code he envisioned, but in his mind, at least, would do so if a representative democracy were established in which the rulers are held accountable to, and therefore willing to advance the happiness of the community.

What is significant about Bentham's turn to a representative system is that he clearly did not consider it to be a good of and by itself. Rather, representative democracy was the only means by which government could be ensured to pursue the happiness of the people in general. But while Bentham's theory may be democratic, in many ways it is more of a theory of governance than a democratic theory. It is, as Rosen (2001) says, 'a theory of elites. a major thesis underlying his argument is that all rulers, however they are chosen, form a class apart by virtue of their wealth and political power and are potentially at odds with the people whose happiness they are supposed to secure. Democracy, in the form of periodic elections, is then a mechanism that links the ruled to the rulers and makes the rulers dependent upon, and accountable to, the ruled. The sovereign (the people) does not exercise sovereign power except in a very limited sense. It is not a system by which the people can be said to rule themselves. Elite rule, however styled, is quite different from rule by the people. This brings us to official aptitude, the ultimate corrective to sinister interest, which consists of three parts: moral, intellectual and active. Moral aptitude Bentham sees as a negative quality, as the absence of motivation to pursue one's own self-interest before that of others. Constitutional law, he argued, must presume the predominance of sinister interest. Moral aptitude, then must be forced by organizing the institutions of government so as to produce it, in other words, by making it so that those in power are not capable of using that power in a way that would further their own personal aggrandizement. Finally, 'active aptitude' simply refers to the conscientious performance of duty. Simply put Bentham's primary concern in his constitutional theory is the development of official aptitude, to ensure that legislators (the primary branch of government) act in the interests of their constituents. This reveals much about Bentham's perspective; his concern is the aptitude of public officials, not the aptitude of the voters or the public. In fact, he argued that lack of intelligence among the public was no real concern. When it came to voters, what was dangerous was intellectual aptitude combined with active aptitude but lacking in moral aptitude. The lack of moral or intellectual ability was no great concern as long as members of the public also lacked active aptitude.

The design of the system of representation, then, is not based on democratic principles but on Bentham's ideas about what had the greatest utility value. Bentham argues that there is no need to exclude criminals and the insane, because the former would not be released from confinement in order to vote, and the latter would be too small in number to affect the outcome. (David 1996). In the Theory of Legislation, he argued that women should be excluded because they could not be



presumed to have 'a sufficient degree of knowledge (Stephen 1989). Although he later argued that intellectual capacity should not be an issue with regard to granting suffrage. By 1809, when he began to advocate parliamentary reform in Britain, he argued for suffrage rights based on the 'payment of direct taxes.'

By 1817 in the Radical Reform Bill, Bentham began to argue for what he considers 'virtual universality,' which explicitly excluded women as well as children. But while he excoriated James Mill for his failure to provide an argument to support his claim that women could be excluded from the franchise, (Schumpeter 1950). Bentham himself later excluded women from the 'Constitutive Authority' in the Constitutional Code despite a spirited argument for their inclusion. Ultimately, he rejects the idea for fear that it would derail the possibility of other reforms being implemented. It could be argued that the exclusion of women arises not from any defect in his theory but from practical political considerations. But it is difficult to believe that an argument in favor of extending the franchise to incarcerated criminals and the insane would be less controversial than the inclusion of women. Essentially, Bentham justifies his position by saying that the greatest happiness requires constitutional reform that expands the franchise and makes legislators accountable to the electorate. If it is necessary to exclude half the adult population to accomplish it, so be it, since some expansion is better than none at all. What matters most is official aptitude, which is the consequence of a democratic system, not the principle of democratic participation. In effect, democracy in Bentham's political theory amounts to a third- or even fourth order concern. The first concern is the greatest happiness of the greatest number; this requires good laws. To get good laws requires establishing a system for good governance, which requires maximizing official aptitude and minimizing expense. Democracy, then, is instrumental to good governance, and the ultimate end, the greatest happiness insofar as it ensures official aptitude and minimizes expense. Schofield (1998) admits that, The system of representative democracy was not an end in itself, the end was the greatest happiness but it was an indispensable means to that end, in that it was only under such a system of government that effective measures could be implemented to secure the appropriate aptitude of officials and minimize the expense of government.

#### **4. The role of the public:**

The Public Opinion Tribunal, although clearly an elite theory, the public is not entirely absent from Bentham's theory of governance. In fact, he outlines an important role for them through what he refers to as the 'Public Opinion Tribunal. (Foucault 1978). By the time of the Constitutional Code it was much more formalized. The Tribunal includes not only those who wield constitutive power (i.e., voters), but all those classes, which stand excluded from all participation in such supreme power and even members of other political communities who might have some interest in the question under consideration. Despite the importance he appears to give it, it is difficult to believe that Bentham really laid all that much weight on the Public Opinion Tribunal. Given the care with which he worked out the details of political institutions, he has remarkably little to say about it, and he delineates no specific mechanism through which the Tribunal's power would be expressed.

#### **5. Reform: radical; democratic theory: mainstream.**

The specific features by which representative government should be constituted were crystal clear to Bentham, 'Secrecy [of the ballot], universality [of suffrage], equality [of the vote], and annularity of suffrage [one-year terms of office]. (Foucault 1978). These are generally accepted



now as essential elements of any representative democracy (although elections are usually not quite so frequent), by the same token they were certainly radical at the time. But the fact that Bentham was a “philosophical radical” should not confuse us, he was not what we would now call a radical democrat. Indeed, his theory has much in common with contemporary “mainstream” democratic theory. Bentham presents powerful arguments for representative democracy and is concerned with the design of the institutions of government so as to ensure that they are as representative as possible. But, like Schumpeter, (1950), Bentham sees democracy as a method, not an end to itself.

### **NIGERIAN EXPERIENCE**

Nigeria is a multi-ethnic nation, with not less than 250 ethnic groups. The major ethnic groups include the Hausas and Fulanis, usually found in the northern part of the country; they constitute about 29% of the population. The Yorubas, occupying mainly the western part of the country, account for about 21% of the population, and the Igbos and the Ijaws, mainly in the eastern and southern part, constitute about 18 and 10% respectively. Other ethnic groups account for the remaining population. The dominant religions are Islam (50%), Christianity (40%), and traditional religions (10%). The capital of Nigeria is Abuja, created in 1976 as a symbol of national unity, where every Nigerian would have a sense of belonging irrespective of ethnic origin (Atoday 2007). This is why Abuja is not a state. The Nigerian 1999 constitution does not recognize Abuja as a state. The territory is governed directly by the federal government through a Minister, as approved by the National Assembly. The Minister may be appointed from any part of the country. Nigeria was colonized by the United Kingdom and attained political independence in October 1, 1960. However, the development of democracy was cut short by a military takeover in January, 1966 and a civil war from 1967 to 1970. The military returned government to civilian rule in 1979, which lasted to 1984, after which the military took over again until 1999. Currently, Nigeria is under democratic governance, but the elections that have been conducted since 1999 have been described as corrupt and unfair. It is important to understand this turbulent past when analysing happiness in Nigeria today.

### **Democracy, Freedom, and Happiness in Nigeria**

The association between democracy and happiness is very intriguing. Initial evidence showed that democracy is positively and highly correlated with happiness (Inglehart & Klingemann 2000). Further analysis dispelled the notion that democracy may be a causal factor, but showed that democracy and level of economic development interact to predict happiness. Inglehart, Foa, Peterson, and Welzel (2008), in refuting the set point theory of happiness, showed that even when income is controlled, the extent to which society allows free choice has a major impact on happiness. Although Nigeria cannot be ranked among the countries where democracy and freedom flourish, some historical incidents may explain its ranking on happiness, especially in the period 1995–2000. A survey conducted between 1990 and 1998 in 65 countries placed Nigeria as 36th on the happiness ladder (Inglehart & Klingemann 2000). Nigeria was under military dictatorship from 1980 to 1999, and in 1999 it transitioned to democratic rule. It is therefore possible that the transition to democracy created positive hope among the populace that things



were going to be better. Inglehart and Klingemann (2000) argued that “aspiration adjustment” in terms of recent changes can influence happiness. This is in line with the idea that emotion can result from expectations of how things are likely to be, and not necessarily from how things are. Nigerians may have rated their happiness based on their hopes of how life will be in the future. This thinking is in line with Møller’s (1999) assessment of South African quality of life trends, which she referred to as “post-election euphoria”.

The fundamental features of democratic governance in the recent past in Nigeria has been undermined considering the myriad of contemporary socio-economic and political issues faced by Nigerians. This is at variance with Roberts and Edwards (1991) when they aptly elucidated the features of democratic governance in contemporary times as popular participation, independence of Judiciary, freedoms of press and association, regular elections, separation of powers, checks and balances and obedience to the relevant constitutional provision. The implementation process is a rule-making arena for executives. The executive may mold public opinion, to enhance national unity and prosperity.

In democratic setting, it is usual for the executive to propose legislation, while the legislature may choose to adopt it or not, with or without alteration or substitution. These powers and others shape the process of governance (Benjamin, 2004). The measure of the voice of accountability, transparency, government institutions effectiveness are fundamental to examining the influence of democratic governance on poverty alleviation as well as providing a signal for the adjustment or maladjustment to the —new realities in the Nigeria socio-political environment.

Democracy thrives where there are free, fair and credible periodic elections with the various actors playing according to the rules. This makes it possible for the governed to effect a change in any government with an unpopular policy and then put in place government that will be responsive and responsible to the plight of the people. This therefore ensures the formulation and implementation of programmes that positively affect the generality of the people including the poor in the society.

However, in the Nigerian context these conditions are not strictly adhered to. This is because the system of democratic governance in Nigeria is characterized by some limiting factors such as; over bloated and unsustainable cost of governance, existence of systemic corruption, weak institutions and political will, massive embezzlement of public funds, political patronage and favouritism. This places the poor and vulnerable majority in situation of no option rather than to dance to the tune of the few powerful political leaders for survival

in spite of the efforts made by the government, Nigeria as a nation state has not been able to attend to the socio-economic aspirations and improved welfare of its citizenry. Thus the elimination of the scourge of poverty has remained a mirage in Nigeria (Obadan, 1997). The hardening of political conditions shows that tension remains high at about 8.3% in 2012 as a result of the killings by the religious Sect ‘Boko Haram’ to the tune of about 568 persons in 2012 and about 299 persons in 2011 (Risk Advisory Group, 2013).

Also, in tune with these realities, the World Happiness Report of 2016 ranked Nigeria as 103 and 6th in the world and Africa respectively as against 78th and 2<sup>nd</sup> in 2015. This fall in Nigeria world rank in happiness could be attributed to the fact that a significant proportion of its citizens have continually been impoverished due to the weak policies and programmes of political office holders



In addition, CIA World Fact book (2015) showed a damning picture of poverty in Nigeria when it revealed that life expectancy was 52 years in 2011 and 2012 and 52.62 years in 2014, infant mortality stood at 100 out of 1,000; 24.4 per cent of children under five years of age were stunted due to malnutrition. In 2013 over 70 still live on \$1.25 per day and 35 per cent live in abject poverty, despite its abundant resources and oil wealth. In summary, Arowolo and Aluko, (2012) and Igwe (2010) explained that democracy had not been able to deliver the much anticipated development dividends in Nigeria.

### **Conclusion**

The Nigeria democratic experience has not resulted in the much expected good governance which is the foundation for economic growth and development and by extension poverty reduction. This is because democratic government in Nigeria is practiced at variance with the basic tenets and principles of good democratic government. Relevant studies revealed amongst others that democratic government in Nigeria is pervaded by various issues such as electoral violence, manipulation of election results, political apathy and the 'do or die' posture of the major political leaders. These challenges have made it difficult to achieve consolidated democracy that will, in turn, ensure good governance and by extension improvement of the general well-being of the poor majority in the country.

### **References**

- Aluko, S. (1975). *Poverty: Its remedies*. In: *Poverty in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Proceedings of the 1975 Annual Conference of the Nigerian Economic Society, Ibadan, August.
- Benjamin, S.A (2004). *The Executive in Democratic Nigeria: Problems and Prospects*. Ibadan
- David, H. (1996). *Models of democracy*. Stanford university press.
- Foucault, M. (1973) *The punitive society*. Picador, USA
- Igwe, L. E. (2010). *Democracy and Development in Nigeria: Issues and Challenges*. International Journal of Economic Development Research and Investment, 1 (2) & (3), 116 -122
- Inglehart, R., & Klingemann, H. D. (2000). *Genes, culture, democracy and happiness*. In E. Diener & E. Suh (Eds.), *Subjective well-being across cultures* (pp. 165–183). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Møller, V. (1999). *Quality of life trends in South Africa in the late 1990s: Major divides in perceptions*. *Society in Transition*, 30, 93–106.
- Obadan, M. (1997). *Analytical Framework of Poverty Reduction: Issue of Economic Growth Versus Other Strategies*; proceedings of Nigerian Economic Society Annual Conference.
- Ogunkoye, T (2011) *The role of freedom in relations; the causes of crises*. VDM Veag
- Risk Advisory Group (2013), [www.riskadvisory.net/terrorismtracker/](http://www.riskadvisory.net/terrorismtracker/) (accessed 25th August, 2016)
- Roberts, G. & Edwards, A (1991). *A New Dictionary of Political Analysis*, London and New York.
- Rosen, M. (2001). *From poetry to politics*. Walker books LTD.
- Schumpeter, J. (1950). *History of economic analysis*. Allen & Unwin
- Schofield, J. (1998). *On the institutional foundations of law: The insufficiency of custom and private ordering*. *Journal of economic issues* 43(1)143-166