

The Challenges of Nation- Building and Peace-Building in Nigeria

Mevayerore Daniel Igbini¹

Abstract: Nation-building can be seen as a process of constructing or structuring a national identity using the state power which aim at the unification of the people within the state so that it remains politically stable and viable in the long run. United States and Israel have consistently and persistently pursued the new nation building designed to integrate their people, Nigeria continues to grope up around the orbit of nation-building without a genuine attempt to rotate it. Against this backdrop, this paper examined the role(s) political scientists in the overall project of nation building in Nigeria. This paper relies on secondary data collected from books and journal articles, and was content analyzed in relation to the scope of the paper. The paper concludes that without an effective leadership provision, no nation-building is achievable and this is where the role of the political scientists is seriously needed.

Keywords: Nation-building; Peace-building; Political scientist; Leadership role

Introduction

introduction nation-building defines the process of any country and this is why it is taking for granted by those who development close to their hearts imperative, once nation-building is compromise development is also compromise unfortunately why advanced countries like the United States and Israel have consistently and persistently pursue the new nation building designed to integrate their people, Nigeria continues to grope up around the orbit of nation-building without a genuine attempt to rotate it. America experience has shown that political scientists and lawyers plays significant roles in American nation building such leaders like Abraham Lincoln J. F. Kennedy Lyndon Johnson Woodrow Wilson and Barak Obama, to mention but a few, remain outstanding not only because of their leadership exploits but also their intellectual erudition sustained through scholarly contributions to most social problems confronting man in its ecosystem anthropocentrism.

¹ PhD Student, Department of Political Science, Delta State University Abraka, Delta State, Nigeria, Address: Abraka, Nigeria, Corresponding author: igbinidaniel@gmail.com.

Against this backdrop, the critical question to ask remains, what role(s) should political scientists play in the overall project of nation building in Nigeria? This question was necessitated by two interrelated reasons: firstly, it does appear that the panacea for genuine nation-building relies on the crucial role of the political scientists. Secondly, it also appears that pure scientists in government see societal conflicts as an evil and so expect human beings to behave like organisms in the laboratories. These pure scientists do not see conflict as something inherent in a society which is healthy for its development. Indeed, it was John Allen Paulos who queried, ‘why don't American elect scientist?’ (Allen, 2012). He concludes that one reason responsible for such disinterestedness among Americans in electing pure scientists to occupy government positions is that an abstract scientific approach to problems and issues often leads to conclusions that are odds with religious and cultural beliefs and scientists (pure) are sometimes ton-deaf to the social environment in which they state their conclusions (Allen, 2012).

Concept of Nature of Nation-Building

To understand the idea of nation-building, explain the meaning of a nation becomes important. Early definitions of nation conceived it as ‘a group or race of people who share history, traditions, and culture, sometimes religion, and usually language’ (Carolyn, 2005). In this regard, the people of a nation generally share a common national identity. Part of nation-building therefore becomes building of a common identity. Accordingly, distinction can be drawn between ethnic nations based in race or ethnicity and civic nation based in common identity and loyalty to sets of political ideas and institutions as well as the linkage of citizenship to nationality (Carolyn, 2005). However, the contemporary understanding and usage of the term nation is fast corroding the older order and is now synonyms with the state only that a state is more properly the governmental apparatus by which a nation governs itself.

In the content of this paper, a nation may be liken to an umbilical cord that joins the fetus with its mother thereby creating an everlasting bond that is sustained after delivery through breastfeeding. A state, on the other hand, is like an apparatus that makes or mar this bond. Nationhood would give the state the legitimacy to operate. Once a nation is build to an enviable standard, state failure becomes difficult and security guaranteed. With this in mind, a nation is here seen strictly in the Civic sense which de-emphasizes ethnic monolithic in a place of political commonality irrespective of the number of ethnic groups that make up the nation-states.

Having operationalized the concept of nation, it is therefore imperative to understand the meaning of nation-building. It was Carolyn, Stephenson who once noted that:

Nation-building is a normative concept that means different things to different people. The latest conceptualization is essentially that nation-building program and those in which dysfunctional or unstable or “failed state” or economies are given assistant development of governmental infrastructure, civil society, dispute resolution mechanisms, as well as economic assistance, in order to increase stability (Carolyn, 2005).

The implication of that, nation-building generally assumes that someone is doing the building intentionally and consciously. The building must be planned and properly defined if the structure were to reflect the choice of the builders. The concept of nation- building has been seen as ‘the use of armed forces in the aftermath of a conflict of underpins an ending transition to democracy’ (Robbins, 2003 cited in Carolyn, 2005). Accordingly, Alesina and Reich (2003) conceive nation-building as ‘a process which leads to the formation of countries in which citizens feels a sufficient amount of commonality of interest, goals and preferences so that they do not wish to separate from each other’ (Alesina & Reich, 2012). In line Karl and Williams (1966) conceptualization of nation-building (Karl & Williams, 1966), in the context of this paper, nation-building can be seen as a process of constructing or structuring a national identity using the state power which aim at the unification of the people within the state so that it remains politically stable and viable in the long run.

Understanding Nation-Building

The paper adopted the theory of state-planned nation-building strategies as developed by Harris (2007). State-planned nation-building entails a parallel process where the ruling political elites maintain and reinforced differences with “nations” in surrounding States and eliminate differences within their own boundaries (Harris, 2007). Although people have been conscious of national ethnic differences for many centuries, with the advent of modernity, this consciousness is becoming intertwined with the political programmes of self-determination. Citing Max Weber, Harris (2007) defined the state as ‘the organization that has the Monopoly of legitimate use of force and extraction within a clearly defined territory’. He therefore opined that the ultimate goal of the ruling political elite of every modern state is to master the loyalty of its population and remain sovereign. This political elite group

controls the coercive apparatus of the state and can use it to make or mar the progress and development of the State. A government is therefore considered legitimate when it enjoys the consent of the citizens. Accordingly, Harris noted that, ‘legitimate rule enhances the taxing abilities of a state, facilitates conscription to the army, fosters compliance to the law, and prevent separatist movements. Troubles ensue when a section and population do not consider the government legitimate’ (Harris, 2007).

Consequently, the following deductions can be made from the theory of state-planned nation-building:

- i. The existence of a culturally distinct group does not necessarily involve a competing claim to the political loyalty of this population in modern nation-state.
- ii. Cultural distinctiveness is politically irrelevant unless there is a group formation process of turn it into a social identity, only then can member shall be drawn.
- iii. The non-core groups (the minorities in a very narrower sense) are often territorially dispersed and are likely to quickly assimilate into a higher status group in order to maximize their self-esteem. This has led to the absorption of these non-core groups by their surrounding core groups(s). However, certain variation may occur there some non-core groups who are territorially concentrated become politically conscious and being to espouse distinctive political identity (this usually the case in countries whose nation-building is still in doubt).
- iv. On the basis of the following, the study assumes that:
 - v. States with ethnic and religious conscious political elite group will have more problems of nation-building than those with less ethnic and religious conscious political elites.
 - vi. Ethnic and religious consciousness creates divisiveness and corrodes national consciousness that breeds common political cal and national identity.
 - vii. Many fctors, such as prior democratic experience, level of economic development, and social homogeneity, can influence the ease or difficult of nation-building, but the single most important controllable determinant seems to be the level of effort, as measured in troops, money, and time.
- viii. Finally, there is no quick fix for nation-building. The hard way is the only way.

Nigeria and the Task of Nation-Building and Peace-Building

Nigeria since independence has made some efforts targeted at nation-building. Some of these efforts came after the civil war which understandably was an ample time to engineer nation-building to enhance proper integration of the warring elements. Among the efforts are: the institution of the policy of 'No Victor, No Vanquished' with its attendant 3Rs mechanism, the establishment of the National Youth Service Corps (NYSC) scheme, the convocation of political reform conferences including the ongoing one, among others.

The 'no victor', no vanquished' policy which gave rise to the 3Rs of Reconstruction, Reconciliation and Rehabilitation was initiated to demobilize the Biafrans and reintegrate them into the national life. While the objectives of this policy were laudable, actual implementation was deceitful. However, the policy remained a nation-building effort in Nigeria whether or not it yielded meaningful result(s).

Similar effort was made through the establishment of the NYSC scheme. The National Youth Service Corps scheme was created by decree No. 24 of 22nd May, 1973 in a bid to reconstruct, reconcile and rebuild Nigeria after the civil war. The core objectives of the scheme include: to foster encouragement and development of common ties among the youth of Nigeria and promotion of national unity. This scheme involves posting of young graduates of thirty years and below to different parts of the country distinct from their states of origin and probably regions. This was to enable them learn and appreciate the cultures of the people in their places of primary assignment. Whilst this scheme has recorded a lot of achievements, recent developments in the polity where corps members become easy preys in times of crisis and where the well-connected graduates are posted to their choice and juicy places irrespective of their geographical contiguities (always blamed on corruption) are some of the challenges confronting the scheme and undermining the national integration efforts.

More importantly, the convocation of national political reform conferences over the years in Nigeria has remained an attempt at nation- building., these conferences were often mandate to draw the way forward for Nigeria but each time, failures have continued to be recorded; either as a result of the character of the delegates or the convocation and selection processes of members. And where the delegates succeeded at reaching a genuine and feasible conclusion, their recommendations are often not binding and are therefore confined to the dustbin of history. This is why

people are increasingly becoming jittery with political reform conferences in Nigeria especially as they have turned into avenues for political settlements.

Unfortunately, the only huge success of nation-building recorded in Nigeria is adorning our public institutions with the national symbols like flag, coat-of-arm, and pictures of the Nigeria President, Governors (within their respective states) as well as the recitation of the National Anthem in Official gatherings which in effect, does not guarantee oneness but at least, it is a sign of togetherness. However, while this effort is not bad because it reminds us of our national identity, it is not sufficient to guarantee nation-building which issues from personal conviction and patriotic stand.

Challenges of Nation and Peace-Building in Nigeria

One of the reasons for the difficulties of what many consider “failed states” is that some people who had been integrated were taken apart by European colonialism; while others who were separate people were integrated in new states not based in common identities (Caroyln, 2005). The foregoing represents the critical challenge face by Nigeria in its nation-building efforts. Nigeria is a colonial creation foisted on the peoples without their consent. This faulty foundation laid by the Europeans was purely done to actualize their interests and for any genuine development of the country. In fact, colonialism is a good example of how a country’s nation-building can become a security threat to another. Nation-building in Africa stunted. In Europe, nation-building preceded state-building but in Africa and other colonized countries, state-building preceded nation-building. Indeed, the aftermath of colonialism led to the need for nation-building.

In line with the above, Prof Ibrahim Gambari in a lecture at the first year of anniversary of Mustapha Akanbi Foundation in 2008 outlined the challenges before Nigerian nation-building as follows:

1. The challenge of history
2. The challenge of socio-economic inequalities
3. The constitutional challenge
4. The challenge of building institutions for democracy and development and
5. The leadership challenge (Gambari, 2008).

In Gambari’ own words:

The historical legacies of colonial rule create some challenges for nation-building in Nigeria. Colonial rule divided Nigeria into North and South with different land tenure systems, local government administration, educational systems, and judicial systems. While large British colonies like India and the Sudan had a single administrative system, Nigeria had two, one for the North and one for the South. It was almost as if these were two separate countries, held together only by a shared currency and transportation system (Gambari, 2008).

Beyond the challenges created by colonialism and its attendant, Nigerian political leadership since independence has contributed immensely in exacerbating the problem of nation-building. Unlike the Americans the fourth and won their independence and subsequently set to draw and pursue vigorously the type of nation they wanted, Nigeria were simply engulfed by the Joy of flag independence they got and made no attempt at defining the type of nation they desired let alone working for it therefore, among the five challenges mentioned by Gambari, aside the historical challenge, the challenge of political leadership remains the fulcrum around which other challenges revolve and this is where the role the political scientist is serious needed.

Factors Responsible for Nation-Building and Peace-Building

Nation-building has been identified as a political engineering on a grand scale (Pie and Kasper, 2003). Pie and Kasper (2013) also conceived three critical variables responsible for nation-building. These include:

- a. The internal characteristics of states,
- b. Convergence of geopolitical interests and
- c. Commitment to economic development by the political elite group.

The Internal Characteristic of States

This is one of the most critical factors that virtually define the success of other variables, ethnically fragmented states will have more difficulty in nation-building than a more ethnically cohesive one. The defining factor among the ethnic groups may not necessarily be heterogeneity or homogeneity, though the fragmentation and cohesion may be implicated on the either respectively. Ethnically fragmented states suffer high degree of ethnic fissures, inequalities, and in most cases religious

animosities. These factors are inherently resistant to political and national cohesion which breed nation-building.

Equally important in the internal characteristic of states is the organizational effectiveness and discipline of the military bureaucracy and the judiciary (Pie and Kasper, 2003). Where these institutions are strong, nation-building becomes a less difficult task but where they are weaker than the individuals, nation-building becomes extremely difficult. However, evolution of states with strong institutions is often organically linked to the social structure, cultural norms and distribution of political power of a given society (Pie and Kasper, 2003). In ethnically fragmented and heterogeneous societies, distribution of political power often assumes a rational arrangement among the ethnic group and with the conviction of non-exclusion in the power equation by the ethnic groups tension would be lessened and nation-building gradually begins.

Convergence of Geopolitical Interest

It is not so difficult building a nation if there is convergence of geopolitical interest. Geopolitical interest here must not be international or intercontinental. It can be domestic among the different ethnic groups that make up the nation-state. Nation-building of one state must not be a security threat to other state(s) especially within the international arena. For instance, building of a national in Iraq, must not be a security threat to the united states, Kuwait, or the rest of the states in the international system. So it is with nation-building in Iran, Syria, Libya, Russia, Israel, United States and the United Kingdom, among others, domestically, nation-building must be all encompassing embodying a varying degree of convergence of interests among the ethnic groups. Once any group feels isolated in the process, separatist movement becomes inevitable.

Consequently, if nation-building of a state overlaps into a security threat of another, there appears divergence of interest and allied forces are likely to be deployed in defeating such nation-building. This was the case with Iraq under Saddam Hussein and Libya under Muammar Gaddafi. If freedom were to be the yardstick for measuring nation-building and democracy the motor can drive it, then non-democratic states are likely to face stiffer challenges in nation-building because there would always be collusion of interests in a monumental proportion compared with democratic states (Democratic as used here may not necessarily translate to western type of democracy. However, western type of democracy appears to be more

amenable to majority participation. Democracy within this context is taken to be a form of rule that gives credence to mass participation, freedom of expression and protection of the fundamental human rights. Whatever name given to such democracy is immaterial to us so long as the above variables are incorporated). It is easier to build a nation in states where the interests of the component elements are the in convergence with one another. In the case of Nigeria, it would be easier to build the nation if the interests of the six geopolitical ones were in agreement.

Commitment to Economic Development by the political Elite Group

Like we stated in the introduction, economy lays the foundation for successful nation-building. This is another crucial area where the political leadership plays significant role. The political elite group that controls the machineries of the state must be able to launch a self-sustaining economic development process that de-emphasizes greater reliance on external help for economic recovery. It is only when the political leadership is a country has evolved a self-sustaining economic development strategies that foreign aid would make meaning. While we agree that there is no uniform pattern of nation-building, what remains incontestable to us is the conviction that these three factors must be properly harnessed before nation-building becomes possible.

Relationship between Nation-Building and Peace-Building

The term nation-building is often used simultaneous with state-building, democratization, modernization, political development, post-conflict reconstruction and peace-building (Caroly, 2005). The concept of nation-building was used especially by American political scientists after World War II to describe the greater integration of state and society, as citizenship brought loyalty to the modern nation-state with it, on a similar note, Alesina and Reich (2013) stated that:

Recently, state-building and nation-building have sometimes been used interchangeable; however, state-building generally refers to the construction of infrastructure for a functioning state, while nation-building is the construction of national identity, also for a functioning state (Alesina and Reich, 2012).

As a corollary, state-building has been used to refer to interventionist strategies to restore and rebuild the institutions and apparatus of the state; for example, the

bureaucracy, and non-building refers to the creation of cultural identity that relates to the particular territory of the state (Scott, 2007). Consequently, Ottawa (1999) observed that, while current foreign policy and popular culture tend to conflate state and nation-building, it is also possible to argue that state-building and nation-building are opposing forces (Ottawa, 1999 cited in Scott, 2007). Against this backdrop, whilst state-building focuses on creating a homogenous nation-state nation-building approach emphasizes the importance of cultural identity which may ultimately lead to calls for self-determination. Understood in this perspective, nation-building becomes antithetical to state-building which otherwise it is not.

On a more concrete and empirical pontification, nation-building is a term that dominated political literature around 1950s and 60s during the Cold War and it carried, according to Scott (2007), ‘a strong conceptual link to modernization theories of development’. Both the United States (US) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR) used it as a tactic to limit the reach of their enemies. State-building on the other hand, became more pronounced during the 1970s to justify American invasion and involvement in wars of some foreign counties. Accordingly, Pie and Kasper (2003) noted that, ‘since the end of the Cold War, the United States seems to be more willing to assemble multilateral supporting humanitarian interventions and the rebuilding of failed states’. This however, limits the understanding of state-building as a foreign and exogenous project (which serves the purpose of this paper) rather than domestic and endogenous affair (which nation-building is known for) which has resulted to such thing as rebuilding the states of Iraq and Libya by the United States or protecting the state of Syria by Russia. Synthetically, if nation-building is seen as the antithesis of state-building, then peace-building becomes the result of their reconciliation. In fact, what people call state-building or nation-building the UN prefers to call “peace-building” (Goldberg, 2006).

Interesting, both nation-building aim to achieve a functioning state system, but while nation-building emphasizes the cohesion of internal mechanisms of the state from within, state-building does same from without. The resultant implication of the foregoing is that state-building without nation-building will achieve little or no result. For instance, notwithstanding the American efforts at building the states of Iraq and Afghanistan; because the internal characteristics and forces of the states are relatively irreconcilable (at least to the type of US would have wanted), the efforts have been very futile. It therefore means that state-building is more of an external complement of nation-building and the complementarities of the two give rise to

peace-building. This is why the UN recognizes more of peace-building rather than state or nation-buildings. Indeed, the sale of western democracy and strangulation of authoritarian regimes especially by the United States are pointers to state-building. Like pie and Kasper (2003) noted, 'the use of American military and civilian personnel in the political administration of the target countries (state-building) is the quintessential features of nation-building'. To this end, Reimer (2005) identified crises prevention (peace-building) as the overall framework for state-building, nation-building and society-building.

Some of the important US involvements in state-building which are missing in the above table are those of Iraq (2003-2011), Libya (2011) and Syria (2013 till date). It suffices to note here that, state-building, according to Boutros-Ghali (1992), does not automatically guarantee peace-building, a term denoting actions that identify and support structures that strengthened and solidify peace in order to prevent a relapse into conflict (Boutros-Ghali, 1992). Indeed, Boutros further observed that, 'due to the inherently political nature of state-building, intervention to build the state can hinder peace, increasing group tensions and sparking off further conflict'. This becomes worse especially if the state-building turns predatory and rapacious. According to Stephen Carolyn (2005), nation-building is more than state-building; and to be a sustainable force for peace-building, it must incorporate more than just the Western appendages of democracy. Voting systems and free markets development and increasing the GNP per capita are not likely to bring stable peace (Croly, 2005).

The Way Forward

To build is a very critical and time consuming project because measurement is involved, but to destroy is very easy because no established pattern is required. This is also applicable in nation-building. Building a nation requires that the actors otherwise the builders must perfectly have an idea of the type of a nation they desire and therefore work towards having it actualized. Just like the services of many actors are involved in building a house, the architect to draw the plan, the surveyor to take measurement, the brick layers to lay the blocks, the carpenters to fix the wooden works and do the roofing, and a host of others; so also it is in nation-building. Cartographers are required to draw the map and define the boundaries of the nation, economists are required to draw the economic plans that lay the foundation of the nation, lawyers are required to defined the sovereignty of the nation, and political scientist are needed to offer leadership that can lead to proper execution of the project of nation-building. This leadership role of the political scientist is one the most critical aspects of human management that gives credence to nation-building and

development; the reason being that it defines both the structure and architectural designs of the type of nation to be built. This by implication is a master role that harnesses all other roles required in having a just society. For this reasons therefore, political science becomes a master science discipline and the political scientists, the master scientists. By virtue of being the master scientists, they are required to possess master knowledge of human problems both those relating to pure science and humanities as well as social relationships, and therefore use their administrative ingenuities to reconcile the contradictions arising from the antagonisms inherent there from.

As earlier stated, the role of the political scientists in nation-building is to offer a genuine political leadership that gives credence to building strong democratic institutions that would subsume individual egotisms. This was what Obama meant in Ghana when he said that the problem with Africa is the existence of weak political institutions and strong individuals. However, the critical task remains, how can the political scientists achieve this, given the type of Nigerian society where crude stereotypic mentality has been built around them as braggarts that are not worthy of administrative mandate? This is a task must be achieved if leadership problems were to be solvent in Nigeria.

It was by no mistake that political scientists are called juggernauts. Lest we forget, a juggernaut is an element with an overwhelming force which is usually articulated and does not move directionless. A political scientist in leadership position does not succumb to pressure designed to push him or her around because himself/herself is an overwhelming force. For a political scientist to be entrusted with power, the following two steps must be taken: first, he must as an individual package himself for leadership and second, there must be social group formation, vanguard or movement to throw him up.

Leaders are groomed from family through the classroom and then to the larger society, and at the first step of packaging, the individual must exhibit qualities of a leader. Packaging is a very important aspect of leadership which must eschew all forms of braggadocio. He must exhibit more of the qualities of a fox than a lion. By implication therefore, he must be very cunning and to talk too much but when he does, it is very weighty.

At the level of social group formation, vanguard or movement, it suffices to state that no individual achieves power by his effort(s) alone. He needs others and a platform to excel. Lawyers through the Nigerian Bar Association (NBA) have

remained vocal and their services sought by all and sundry. In fact, one can say that of all the professions in Nigeria, only two have their services not sought outside the country. These include: the law and the political leadership and they remain the only two professions whose constitutional provisions are unambiguous. Nigeria has not sought the services of foreign lawyers because they are not permitted to practice in the country without being called to the Nigerian Bar, and to be so called, the person must have gone through the law process in Nigeria and be willing to practice accordingly. So, constitutionally, embargo has been placed on seeking the services of foreign lawyers and jurisdictionally, cases involving Nigeria and Nigerians that have no international character cannot be instituted outside the country (Cases that have international character are those involving the services of international Court of Justice (ICJ) which is an umbrella judicial body of the United Nations and it is binding only on those who are signatories to it). On the other hand, political leadership is another profession whose services cannot be imported from outside the country; the reason being that constitutionally, foreigners are disqualified from holding elective positions in Nigeria (Section 65, 66, 106, 107, 131, among others of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999). However, while only lawyers are permitted to defend cases in the law courts (otherwise practice law), political leadership has become “all comers affair” with medical doctors, engineers, microbiologists, zoologists, among others, becoming more politicians than the political scientist. This is what is responsible for leadership failures in Nigerian and not until square pegs are put in square holes, the problem is bound to persist. When a country produces more political scientists as their leaders, radical transformation is found to take place and what is nation-building without development? Have wondered the reason for the failure of health and educational sectors in Nigeria? It is because people are constitutionally free to seek medical and educational services outside the country.

Consequent upon the foregoing, for the political scientists to create a formidable force capable of exerting an overwhelming influence, they must form a sustain a social movement. This social movement can be in the form of genuinely resuscitating the comatose Nigerian Political Science Association (NPSA) or form another umbrella body that must champion the course of political scientists in Nigeria. No doubt and devoid of sentiments, lawyers are more involved in nation-building in Nigerian than the political scientist in Nigeria. No doubt and devoid of sentiments, lawyers are more involved in nation-building in Nigerian than the political scientist and the reason is not farfetched. It is because their profession is protected by the constitution and the umbrella body of lawyers – the NBA – sustains

the protection. Left to them individually, either we would have been seeking the services of foreign lawyers or the law profession would have become “all comers affair”. Given such situation, even a microbiologist would have gone to court to defend his case instead of contracting the services of an advocate whose oratorical proficiency any be doubt. However, it is noteworthy that lawyers have not fared much better than political scientists in nation-building beyond their primary constituency in the law profession. Also thing of what social movement has done for many people, the Nigeria Bar Association, the Academic Staff Union of the Universities (ASSU), Nigeria Guild of Editors, among others. While the Nigerian Governors forum waxed stronger that it is now, imagine the impact and the strength of its bargaining power, in fact, at a time, they were almost dictating to the Nigerian President and ‘a gentleman agreement’ was reached that the subsequent Nigerian Presidents must be selected from among them and even Obasanjo with his overwhelming leadership style could not do otherwise.

What political scientists must understand and put into practice is that power is not given, it is taken and they can only take it when they put their house in order no outsider will do it for them, once this is done, the chance of having a functional constitution becomes possible. The point being made is that, with a functional constitution where justice rules, national-building in Nigeria becomes less difficult.

Conclusion

The paper took us down memory lane; through the meaning of nation-building to the theoretical framework for understanding of it, among other captivating and inspiring sub-topics that formed the structure of the work, interestingly, nation-building is not something that is achieved without planning which must be vigorously pursued. Comparative case-studies of nation-building in the United States and Israel have shown that it’s not an easy task and it is achievable in both heterogeneous and homogenous societies, either in terms of ethnicity or religion. It therefore means that cultural and religious differences cannot be a barrier to nation-building in Nigeria.

Accordingly, the paper also discovered that without an effective leadership provision, no nation-building is achievable and this is where the role of the political scientists is seriously needed. This is what has been lacking in Nigeria and the dysfunctional Constitution that is in an operation is giving the system then enablement to truncate a genuine political process. Against this backdrop, any nation-building that takes this for granted is bound to fail and the ones that will likely

contribute to stable national and international peace will need to emphasize the democratic participation of the people within the nation. It will need to build the society, economy and polity which will meet the basic needs of the people, so that they are not driven by poverty, inequality, unemployment, on the one hand, or by a desire to compete for resources and power either locally or internationally on the other hand.

References

- Alesina, A. & Reich, B. (2012). *National Building*. A Paper Prepared on October, 2012 and revised on August.
- Allen, P. J. (2012). Why don't Americans Elect Scientist? *The New York Times*, 13 February.
- Carolyn, S. (2005). *Nation Building*. <http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/nation-building>, retrieved on 17 July, 2014.
- Gambari, A. I. (2008). The Challenge of Nations: The Case of Nigeria. A Lecture Delivered at the First Year Anniversary of Mustapha Akani Foundation at Sharaton Hotel, Abuja on 17 February Goldberg, M. L. (2006). *Nation Building Strategies*. <http://www.undispatch.com/nation-building-strategies>.
- Harris, M. (2007). *Contemporary Greece: Structure, Context and Challenges*, LSE. Paper prepared for presentation at the 3rd Hellenic Observatory PhD symposium on June 14-15 2007. The previous versions of this paper were presented at the conference on Civil Conflict and Political Violence, Harvard University (April 28th 2007) and at the 65th annual conference of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago.
- Karl, W. D. & William, J. F. (1966). *National Building in Comparative Context* (eds). New York: Atherton. Also available in <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nation-Building>, retrieved on 17 July.
- Pie, M. and Kasper, S. (2003). Lessons from the Past: The American Record in Nation-Building, <http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/nation-building>.
- Reamer, A. K. (2005). The concept of State-Building, Nation-Building and Society-Building. *AARMS* 4(3), pp. 367-379.
- Robert, K. (2011). *Nation-Building: Our National Pastime*. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/6/books/review/libertys0surest0guardian-by-jeremi-suri-book-review.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0.
- Scott, Z. (2007). *Literature Review on State Building*. A Report Prepared for the Department of International Development. University of Birmingham through the Governance and Social Development Resource Center Framework. 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.