



# DEFENCE TRANSFORMATION AND THE CONSOLIDATION OF DEMOCRACY IN NIGERIA

**EDITOR**  
**USMAN A TAR**



First Edition 2017

© Usman A. Tar, 2017

The rights of Usman Tar to be identified as editor of this work have been asserted by him in accordance with Copyrights Act, Cap 28 LFN 2004, and international copyright law.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without either the prior written permission of the Publisher.

All trademarks used herein are the property of their respective owners. The use of any trademark in this text does not vest in the Editors or Publisher any trademark ownership right in such trademarks, nor does the use of such trademarks imply any affiliation with or endorsement of this book by such owners.

The Editor, Publisher and Sponsor are not responsible for the content of third party internet sites.

ISBN: 978 - 978 - 54893 - 3 - 0



**Nigerian Defence Academy Press**  
A Division of Nigerian Defence Academy  
Publications Committee  
PMB 2109  
Kaduna, Nigeria  
<http://www.nda.edu.ng>



**Supported by:**  
Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFUND)

Designed, printed and bound in Nigeria by  
Pyla-Mak Press Ltd, NM 5 Lokoja Road, Kaduna, Nigeria  
Telephone: +234 706 816 5542 | +234 802 363 3763

# 15

## Militarism, Militarization and Demilitarization in Africa

Etim O. Frank

### Introduction

Militarism, Militarization and Demilitarization are phenomena, which characterized all nation-states, developed and developing, imperial and colonial perhaps for the States of Iceland and Costa Rica. Except for these two, all other states have these elements as their symbol of statehood. The questions to ask are why are these phenomenon the most dominant elements of ancient and modern nation states. As a point of departure, it is the postulation of this essay that all states at one point or the other especially in the earlier stages of its development were militarized. Thus, states and nations are often founded by military or warlike leaders, kings and Queens. Great empire builders were warriors and soldiers.

In the book 'The warrior tradition in modern Africa' (1977) Ali Mazrui derived from Eugene Walter and E. R. Service illustrated the nature of fundamental social organization to be a 'band' a political community involving face-to-face relationship in warfare. The band progressed into 'a tribe' which progress into 'chiefdom' and to a state. Two forms of survival have been at stake in the history of human collectivization-economic survival and military survival (1977; p: 7-8) he observed. Karl Deutsch and William J. Foltz in the book 'Nation Building' identified five stages of achieving the 'Systematic Process', first the group exists as a 'tribe' which at the second stage, are then incorporated forcefully into other groups with the use of naked force. The third stage involve the use of force or threat of it use to coalesce the different people into a nation. These indicated the dominance of militarism in the early stages of state formation hence militarism is a feature of all human settlement.

Militarism that state of affairs where war, and the use or threat of military force (no matter how rudimentary) are accorded the highest priority by the state in the pursuit of its political ends is a phase in nation and state building in every society. A situation where military values (patriotism, unity, hierarchy, discipline) come to permeate civil society is but militarism (McLean et al, 2003: p. 348). Thus, in all society developed and developing, militarism was a phase in societal development. In the warrior tradition in Africa, military role was fused

with the civil role. In other words, at one level the warrior tradition was a major link between the individual and society. It signified the readiness of the eligible individual to sacrifice his life for his society. At another level, the warrior tradition links each household with the wider community. In defending his own cattle or his own women from external raiders, the warrior is often fulfilling a military obligation as real as participating in a regular army (Mazrui, 1977 p. 2). The exposition here is that in all societies militarism persisted. This led to its theoretic as derived from the book 'Political Soldiering, a theoretical analysis of military in Politics (Frank, n.d).

### Theory of Militarism

Theory of militarism presupposes the cause and effect explanation of the dominance of the military in every state. A theory is a logical order of causal explanation of a phenomenon, which enhances the predictability of an occurrence. It embodies within it the laws, principle and hypotheses that clarify issues at corresponding levels of analysis. An important measure for a theory is that it must be verifiable and the method of arriving at it must be replicable, otherwise it is something else (Igwe, 2005 p. 443). What causal factors are responsible for the constancy of the military institution or militarism in all states? There are two major theories of militarism, which attempt to provide explications of the situation, the first being from the classical postulation of Plato 428 BC, while the second is the treatise of Niccolo Bernadi Machiaveli.

The classical theory: Plato postulated that as human society grew from the state of nature, the need assessment would increase, this increase would require a larger territory to generate the needs, and this want may involve it in war with its neighbours. However, wars imply soldiers. In addition, soldiers must be carefully trained in their profession. Thus, in Plato's Republic, it provided that the state must possess a standing army, or class of guardian...they must endeavour to remove any tendency to excessive wealth or excessive poverty in the other members of the state (Desmond, 2003).

The expansion of the society and the corresponding increase of human needs predisposed men to search outside of their immediate environment to fulfil their needs. This would require some form of force in case they encounter resistant. The probability of resistance made it imperative to have a militarized society even if it were of rudimentary nature.

Secondly, that every individual has natural talents which qualify him to serve his fellow man in capacity of ruler, soldier, or worker, members of the remaining classes, soldiers and workers would not interfere with the ruling class in carrying out its duties, for they lack the



qualifications to do so (Mioton & Shirkey, 1976: 414). There must be the group of the fighting men known as the soldiers. To protect and secure their resources against those who might want to appropriate it to themselves

This was derived from his presumption that the society consist of classes of people who are not equal in their gifted talents, there are 'the guardians, philosopher kings, auxiliaries and artisans. Plato averred that 'the guardian class was subdivided into (guardian proper or the rulers, and the auxiliaries). The rulers exercise supreme authority in the state. Auxiliaries discharge military, police and executive duties under the orders of the rulers. In Book three (3) of the 'Republic' Plato asserted ...and to call the young men, whom up to this time we entitled guardians, auxiliaries whose office it is to support the resolutions of the rulers? (:106). Here Plato was positing that the military (Auxiliaries) should be subordinated to the civil authority. This is the cradle of the civilian-military supremacy.

In Book eight (8) (543 - 544) he stated further that if a state is to be carried to perfection, it must recognise and have a community pursuits in war and in peace; and that its kings must be those who have shown the greatest ability in philosophy and the greatest aptitude for war...they are to take soldiers, and settle them in dwelling place of a certain description which is the common property of all. Put differently, any territorial state must have those who would go to war on its behalf. Wars are not fought by all but by specially trained men known as the military. Thus, every state must have fighting men who should be housed together in a barrack community.

In Book five (5) Plato set some of the known characteristics of the military when he stated that the auxiliaries (military) are to live a life of austere simplicity without private property. Furthermore, as soon as the rulers have established their position, they are to take soldiers, and settle them in dwelling places of a certain description (barracks). These conjectures laid the foundation of militarism, which were built upon by other philosophical postulations.

It is the position of this essay that one of the greatest philosophical and theoretical foundation of militarism is Plato Ariston (427- 347 BC), who made it crystal clear that militarism is natural arising from; expansion of the society and its needs; this created the need to scavenge for additional needs outside one's jurisdiction which bring him naturally in encounter with other men. This created the need for a forceful group to push through the enemy- military. The military acting for everyone have to be taken care of by the state in terms of housing (barrack accommodation). Every state requires a standing army to conduct its functions expertly well. The leaders of the state should be ex-military men. On the values of the soldiers; Plato submitted that the

soldier should be austere in their lifestyle, they should not have private property and the family because it lays the foundation for corruption.

### **Machiavelli on Militarism**

What Machiavelli said nearly 500 years ago is still largely true today; states -whether 'old', 'new', or 'mixed' or in the contemporary social science parlance, whether 'traditional', 'transitional', or 'modern'- are defined by their monopoly of the military function, the legitimate command of force. A political unit without this characteristic, Machiavelli declares bluntly, is not a state (Adekanye, 2008:15 cited in The Prince and the Discourses -Book 1).

In his advice to the 'Prince', he averred that the main foundations of every new state, as well as ancient or composite ones are good laws and good arms. Explaining further, he pointed out that the ruin of Italy was because of the lack of standing army, avoiding that experience would require any state to have a fighting force. In submission, armed forces must be under the control of either the Prince or a Republic; a prince should assume personal commands and captain his troops himself, the authority of the commander of the armed forces should be limited by statute...a republic which has its own citizens army is far less likely to be subjugated by one of its own citizens than a republic whose forces are not its own (Machiavelli, 1961:40-1). These two theories laid the foundations for militarism in the state system, and places the military under the command of a civilian Prince who might at one time or the other led in war.

Theoretical Summary: In the 428 BC came the following rationale:

i) That men are differently endowed by nature, hence are divided into classes of artisans, auxiliaries, guardians or philosopher kings. This classification is according to skills. While some have the potential to be philosopher kings (when trained), others have the potential to be auxiliaries with the right to defend the political community, while others would be plebeians (ordinary citizens) and workers.

ii) Secondly, as society grew, the need of the society also increased, and the in-country resources would not be sufficient for the citizens. The need to source and acquire additional resources from external sources would become necessary and this would generate potentiality of conflict.

iii) Thirdly, because of the inevitability of conflict in the societal interactions-there would certainly be conflict, which translates into war.

iv) Fourthly, since there are people who are naturally incline to war by the natural division of labour, they should be constituted into a standing

army, who would perform the role of fighting whenever the situation present itself.

v) Fifthly, Plato clearly stated the nature of civil-military authority. He posited *...young men, who, up to this time here entitled guardians, auxiliaries whose office it is to support the resolutions of the ruler* (The Republic, p. 106) specified that the military authority in the state should be subordinated to the civil authority and that their major function is to support the laws made by the civil rulers. Thus, the nature of civil military relationship should not be contentious. This is the imperativeness of a standing army in any state. These constitute the Platonic theory of militarism.

vi) Machiavelli on his part had defined a state by the possession of the monopoly of the instrument of violence. As he put it, the foundations of all states, whether new, old or mixed, are good laws and good arms... there cannot be good laws where there are no good arms. Where there are good laws, there must be good arms (Machiavelli, The Prince, p. 14). He further stated that the best ordinances in the world would be despised and trampled underfoot when they are not supported, as they ought to be, by a military power... Three social events become outstanding from the theories; one is the concept of civilian supremacy in the state, civil military relations and militarism as a universal character of all states. Militarism transits to military rule in states with low political culture, hence its examination.

### **Military Rule**

Is it possible that militarism account for the preponderance of military regime in the third world states? If militarism was a universal practice, why did we not have the dominance of military rule in advanced society? The situation here seems to be that wherever representative democracy advanced, the military powers were curbed and the principles of civilian supremacy over the military became a major component of the political culture. This according to S.E. Finer was due to the developed or matured political culture, whereas in not fully matured political cultures militarism emerged in the form of sporadic and usually covert intervention, the limits of which are set in part by countervailing social forces and institutions (1962). A fully militarized society confers a privileged position to soldiers, in which case they the nature of basic institutions, the rights and duties of citizens and the share of the national resources and what is allocated to the military establishment (1962). This was the situation in Nigeria until 1999 and in very many African and Latin American societies which Lasswell (1941) called 'the garrison state'.

A combination of factors in Africa brought about the 'Garrison state'; these included among others 'the manipulation or delay of elections, when society becomes disorganized to the point of anarchy, military force seems essential to the restoration of public order, where the elites are at odds over such issues as corruption, constitutional procedure, etc one or another faction could eventually turn to the military for help, during civil strife or in crises of succession, (1941). This study would rather assert that in a minimal political culture, the causal factors of the military rule could be categorised into; domestic factors such as spiral inflation, prolong shortage of essential goods, insecurity etc. The other include external factors where a super power is not convenient with a regime and seeks its overthrow usually through CIA manipulation or stoppage of support, intra-military cleavages which are personality clashes among officers in the military leading to coup d'état and reasons which cannot be grouped into any of the above classes of reasons, which we choose to call miscellaneous factors. These are group of factors, which predisposes the military in most third world, Africa and specifically Nigeria to coup. These factors accounted for the 1952 Egyptian coup d'état, the Sudanese November 17, 1958 coup in which Lt. General Ibrahim Abboud ousted Prime Minister Khalil and since then, coup had spread through Africa as wild fire, Nigeria 15 January 1966, 29 July 1966 (Mazrui, 1977 p. 91). Let us examine the concept of civilian supremacy over the military, as created by Plato and sustained by Machiavelli as a form of CMR.

### **Civilian Supremacy over the Military**

Every states formation was led by a military cum political leader. In Africa, as elsewhere, these roles were fused in one person, however in western polities these roles were incrementally separated through a supporting doctrine of civilian supremacy in governance and military supremacy in warfare. After the state had been formed by conquest, the military role gave way to civil governance. The civilian elements wanted to restrict the influence of the 'military officers' elements who were part of the processes of conquest and state formation. The bourgeois elements raised demands on the 'military-civilian rule in favour of the masses and assembled intellectual elements to refine the concept and principles of civilians –supremacy over the military in rulership as a critical component of CMR. This was favourable to the royalist or the cavalier'. From where the bourgeoisie and the wealthy ruling class consigned the military to specific warrior tradition, which gave birth to the doctrine and principles of civilian supremacy over the military on governance. The logic was and still is that governance is an everyday event, while warfare is occasional. Warfare require expert training which is unconnected to governance, which require different skill.

The above doctrine, which was developed and socialized, prevented the preponderance of military rule in matured political culture categorized by the ability of the majority of the people to read, write and engage in critical thinking on governance. This doctrine was absorbed as the legitimising idea for civil governance and above all, there were role specification for everyone. For instance in Europe when the political and religious power were fused in the clericalists, the doctrine of legitimization was 'papal infallibility', when the church lost its power to the Monarchy 'the divine rights of the Kings' was adopted. When the Monarchies began to lose their power to the rising industrial bourgeoisie, the doctrine of civilian supremacy became the tool for rationalising the exercise of power by the industrial elites (Ejembi, 1978 p. 110). Social roles were specified and upheld in society, described as matured political culture by S.E. Finer.

The doctrine soon became propagated and rationalized and the military stepped aside, housed in barracks and accepted their roles devoid of governance. The mature political culture developed along this lines in which everyone and group had their roles defined and the stocked to those roles. This prevented the military imploding into the political arena. It also allowed the development of the civil society organizations as a countervailing force to the civil government.

Ejembi (1978) drawing from the assertion of Samuel Huntington (1957) in 'Soldier and the State; The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations' inferred that the doctrine of civilian supremacy in its European setting was less a philosophy of government and more a weapon employed by civilians in the factional political struggle between themselves. This struggle may have been between the crown and parliament (both of which were 'civilian' institutions), or it may be between warring individual political aspirants, or a group of them. The important thing was that it was the civilians who were at war with themselves, not them against the military groups. In reality therefore, civilian supremacy was identified with the specific interests of one or more 'civilian' groups couched in the interest of all. In the final analysis, it conjured the idea that the soldiers should be professional in violence and warfare, and abjure meddling in other's jobs, especially governing until they are call to perform related functions. The development of role specification for every social group in the state was embraced by the military to keep to the warfare role, remain professional and apolitical. Military coup d'état became a taboo in such a political culture. These explicate the absence of military rule in western polities unlike in the third world states, which did not have the luxury of intellectual exposition on role specialization.

### **The Doctrine of Militarism in Africa: Nigeria**

Militarism was also the mode of nation formation in Africa-Nigeria, however, after the formation through 'military-civilian' alliance fused in one person, the military elements held onto power and the civil society had no luxury of intellectualization to delineate the roles and to create a political culture of role specification for every social organization in the polity. The gap meant that the military remained in governance and when there were agitations for increase democratization, they started transforming from military khaki (uniform) to civilian presidents. The cases of such transformation were numerous in the third world and specifically in Africa. These included Emperor Haile Selassie-Ethiopia, Robert Mugabe-Zimbabwe, Jean Bedel Bokassa, (CAR) Idi Amin-Uganda, Abdel Nasser-Egypt and more recently expelled Yaya Yammeh-Gambia. The failure of the doctrine and the development of low political culture paved way for pervasive military rule in Africa.

Beginning with the 1952 Egyptian coup d'état, the phenomena spread like 'bush fire' in the continent, thus, after the 1952 Egyptian episode, Sudan 1958, Togo 1963, Congo (Br.) 1963, Benin (Dahomey) 1963, Zanzibar 1964, Algeria 1965, Zaire, 1965, Benin (Dahomey), November and December, 1965, where Prime Minister Ahomadeghe forced out by armed forces Chief of Staff General Christopher Soglo, named Tahirou Congacou to head provisional government. Soglo ousted Congacou government in bloodless coup and named himself as president. Nigeria 15 January 1966, Ghana February 1966, Nigeria, July 1966 (Welch, Jr. 1977 p. 91). This background of militarism cascaded into the age of Militarization.

### **Militarization**

The culture of militarism preceded into militarization the process by which a society organizes itself into institutional military, preparatory to repel any external and internal enemies of the state. The creation of a standing military in a state, the management of the state in governance by military personnel and the attempt to establish a society with the reflexes of 'parade ground precision' in response to state order is herein referred to as militarization.

The early 1960s, 70s and the early 80s could be referred to the era in which militarization was a fad in governance, particularly in Africa. Immediately after political independence, the military establishment created in the colonial era particularly swept many civil governments in Africa away. The value of nationalism, patriotism and austerity, discipline acquired in training institutions sets the soldiers apart and predisposes them to sack civilian governments considered not patriotic enough in the management of the state affairs.



The reasons for their actions were alluded to in the preceding section of this chapter categorized as; External factors- under these rubrics, militarization of the polities were instigated from outside the state of Africa, Asia and Latin America. The external environment was ideologically divided into the Western and Eastern blocks of influence. Whenever governments in the third world indicated ideological associations with one block, the other plotted to use its military to remove it. The CIA played significant role here. As Claude Welch Jr, observed, external influences on coup d'état were in three forms, (i) direct involvement (2) indirect involvement through reference groups, and (3) contagion. The fine hand of the CIA is often purported to lie behind military intervention south of the Sahara yet as Ruth First has noted, coups d'état more likely result from the withdrawal of external support from a regime than from direct sponsorship of intervention. Officers trained abroad may absorb attitudes that, transplanted home, move them towards intervention (Price 1977 cited in Mazrui, 1978), Nigeria was not immuned to this. Internal factors included the corruption, the incompetence of the civil government in the management of the economy which have been deposed, interference with specifically military affairs and roles, insecurity in the state and poor economic conditions, others include Intra-military cleavages, are reasons which lie within the military themselves, these are personal and corporate causes. Individual animosities between Head of Departments and his commanding officers have on occasion led to early retirement of the latter example Ankrah in Ghana in 1965, Malloum in Chad in 1974, corporate causes, budget reduction political interference in matters solely of military competence, could instigate coups (Mazrui, 1978). An often matter in this class has nothing to do with larger society. Bypassing some persons in promotion, posting to lucrative duty posts etc. It included personality clashes among the military officers leading to coups, which has nothing to do with the welfare of the larger society. The disposition to coup, which does not learn itself more appropriately to any of these categories, would be classified as Miscellaneous. These are subjective motives not known to scholars of military politics, and may never be known, yet predisposes men to coup. The manifest outcome of the combination of these factors led to Military regimes and Government in a good number of African, Latin America and Asian States. This social order would be referred to Militarization of the polity in this chapter. Military government manifested certain characteristics.

#### **Characteristics of Military Government**

A Military regime refers to a Government type in which the political power rest with the armed forces. It should be known that often-military authority rule with a mixture of civilian bureaucrat who

was familiar with the routine of the government policies and procedures. Derived from the causal factors discussed earlier in the preceding section, military regimes often emerged as a product of political, economic, and societal crises, which overwhelmed the management capacity of the displaced civil government. It is often structured along the hierarchy of; the head of state, supreme military council, National Executive council, the National council of state and the state military governors. At the federal or national level, the laws made by the military government on exclusive matters are known as 'Decrees' while those made by military governors on concurrent and residual matters are known as 'Edicts.' In order for the military government to rule effectively, the emergent military governments often take the following actions;

i) Suspension of the constitution. A legal document, which set the structure and the management principles of a state. It is often an outcome of the people's constituent assembly where policies, procedures and the directive principles of state policies are outlined. The military is often not a democratic organization but based on command and compliance, hence to operate effectively, the military government often suspend existing constitution to provide operational latitude.

ii) Rule by Decree- The military is not a democratically elected organization, which operates through the parliament. Consequently, its laws are made by the select few and come in the form of 'instructed orders' which is often referred to as 'decree' or military law.

iii) Discipline- The military often expect a society under their command to respond swiftly to orders, be discipline, abhor lethargy in administration and wipe away corruption. The respond of the entire society is anticipated to be as swift as the 'parade ground precision'. The operations of these variables have certain impact on the society. Against these background, military regimes could be; a guardian regime which is intended to correct certain anomalies in the system and hand back governance to civilian. On the other hand, a military regime could be a radical one, which pursues fundamental changes in the system production and distribution to address certain ills in the society.

#### **Military Rule: Impact on the civil Society**

Frank and Ukpere (2012) succinctly captured the impact of Militarization of the society, when they averred that; the obvious outcome would be militarized political culture; manifested in the political behaviours of the dramatis personae in the democratic arena. The civic cultures of most militarized societies were eroded and militarized values imbibed. Thus the rule of engagement become combat rather than

dialogue, disregard of court orders and violation of human rights...democratic arena become an extension of the barracks ( p. 288). The authors further cited clear cases where the ex-military leader in Nigeria who became a civil President, violated policies and procedures of civil government with military mindset with impunity. These included the cases of (i) in July 2002, the President amended the capital budget provision of 2002 Appropriation Act by reducing it to 44 percent without forwarding it to the parliament for passage, thereby violating section 80(4) of the 1999 constitution. In the same year, the revenue allocation Act was purportedly amended through a presidential proclamation. This violated section 162(1 & 2) of section 315 of the constitution. In the year 2002, Mr. President ordered military detachment to 'Odi Town' in Bayelsa State to massacre the people under the pretext of searching for criminals who allegedly killed army personnel. The deployment of the military without recourse to the National Assembly violated section 217(2) c of the 1999 constitution. This was the same situation in 'Zaki Biam' Benue state in 2001 when citizens were again massacred on the instruction of the President (Frank & Ukpere cited in Djeba, 2002).

### **Militarized Political Culture**

The long years of military rule created militarized political culture, this is discernible from the fact that the colonial officer was a military man. He preferred ex-military officers to man key positions in his administration. He wrested power from military ruling class in the North and in some part of Southern Nigeria. It would be right to conclude that evidently, Nigeria has been ruled since 1900 either by a military government, a quasi-military government or by a command system that derives authority from the soldier's mind-set for authority, unity of command and obedience. It is empirically evident that the militarization of Nigeria and its manifestations were deeply implanted in the centralized command system. It is indisputable that the military, which has ruled Nigeria for 87 years of its 100 years, has created a psychological bastion against rational democratic ideals (Alli, 2001 p. 158-9).

The removal of any countervailing force in the civil society such as Trade Unions was a common feature of military regimes. This was because the military is structure for command and obedience rather than for dialogue. Intolerance of opposing views typical of the military regimes were learned and replicated in the democratic political arena. Opposition politics became in tolerated in politics of previously militarized states. The phase of militarization in Africa and most third world states, commenced shortly few years after independence until the 90s, after which the agitation for demilitarization gathered momentum.

### **Demilitarization**

Demilitarization or disengagement in politics refers to the processes of incremental return of the military officers back to the barracks, and keeping, strictly to the role of defending the state and assisting the civil government to control internal insurrection and repel external enemies, gathered steam in the world system from 1990s. This followed Mikhail Gorbachev, launch of reforms in the socialist system. This was known as 'Perestroika and Glasnot' (Political economy reformation of the Communist Party and openness to make it effective in service delivery). It must be stated that the Russian president was under considerable pressure from both late President Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher of Britain. However, the intention of Gorbachev was to make the socialist system more effective in service delivery, but the unintended consequence became the cessation of the cold war, and inadvertently the need to support and maintain reactionary military regimes all over the third world, to enhance political hegemony became politically unfashionable. It is instructive to note that if the East-West ideological rivalry had remained, military rule would have lasted in the global political community, and demilitarization for democracy would not have been a political fad. This give credence to one of the causal factors of military coups earlier discussed as being extra-societal or causes which are 'externally motivated'.

Put differently, the collapsed of the centrally planned economy of Eastern Europe led to the embraced of the most important element of the Western political, social and cultural value 'democracy.' It became the global social indicator for the measurement of development. This global value became a tool in the hands of Western International Financial Institutions, World Bank and, International Monetary Fund. Every state particularly in Africa, which needed assistance from these institutions, had to commence demilitarization towards democratization. This set the tone for demilitarization and African military could not find a hiding place. This made Military rule to be conceived as an anachronistic form of governance for preference of democracy.

### **Stages of Demilitarization in Africa**

Claude Welch Jr. had opined that there is no acceptable paradigm for the study of military disengagement herein referred to as demilitarization from politics and subsequent democratization (1992), however there are regionally based pattern which could be discerned and discussed. Thus, in Nigeria and in most West African states, demilitarization tends to follow a particular pattern, which usually consists of the following steps;

i) The announcement of the date for a return to civil rule and setting agenda for its actualization.

ii) Delineation of the country for the purpose of representation into political constituencies, namely; senatorial, federal and state constituencies respectively. This is usually to obtain proportional representation because of state and population. The transiting military government often have other nominees representing specific interests; sometimes they equal the representatives in numbers in the constituent assembly.

iii) The representatives so selected and elected, constitute the Constituent Assembly who are often charged with receiving memorandum from the public and organized groups on the form and nature of the proposed civil government. iv) The manifest outcome of the Constituent Assembly is usually a 'draft constitution.' In some cases, the supreme military council takes the draft constitution round the country for public hearing for additional inputs before the final and approved copy is sanctioned by a special decree.

v) The appointment of Electoral Management body is constituted. In the past, Nigeria had Federal Electoral Commission (FEDECO), National Electoral Commission (NEC) and at other time National Electoral Commission of Nigeria (NECON). The body is usually charged with the responsibility of registering political parties, conducting elections and regulating political communication otherwise known as 'campaigns' and finally deciding who wins any election.

v) Conduct of Elections; Elections is the process of aggregating individual differences for personages, programmes and a political party to assume governance of state to decide public policy for a specific period. The processes involve require objective management of the processes. However, no election has taken place in Nigeria without controversies. The essence is for the electoral managers to conduct election fairly and objectively.

vi) Inauguration of Civil Government- after successful conduct of election and clarification by the courts, where there are objections to the conduct of the election and possible violation of electoral law. The exiting military then inaugurate the elected civilian government and transit to the barracks with its men and hand over the constitution to the new civilian government. This is the gamut of demilitarization or disengagement, which closes the 'revolving barrack gates' against the military rule.

## Conclusion

Militarism generates militarization and eventually demilitarization or disengagement. In this chapter, we have embarked on intellectual journey tracing the natural need and the culture of militarism. Militarism lasted longer in the third world especially in Africa where the theory of the 'warrior tradition' had a fused role of the warrior and the ruler combined in one person. In contrast to Europe where the principles of 'civilian supremacy to the military was developed, socialized and practiced, thereby confining the military to the warrior tradition and the civilian concerned themselves with governance. This created a political culture referred to as 'matured political culture', while those of the third world and especially Africa remained 'low political culture.

Militarization regimes in Africa were examined and the predisposing factors to military rule outlined. The cradle of demilitarization or disengagement was traced to the end of cold war arising from the introduction of 'Perestroika and Glasnot' in the old Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR). The incident made financing and sustaining military regimes in Africa unattractive, and preference for democracy an urgent one. International Financial Institutions also assisted in pushing the frontiers of democracy as the standard of governance without alternative and a condition to access fiscal assistance from them. These quicken the speed of demilitarization. This led to different pathway to democracy in different polities, so much that democracy is today the standard for governance.



**References**

- Adekanye, J. B. (2008). *Military Organisation Multi-Ethnically Segmented Societies –A Comparative Study*. Ibadan: Ababa Press Ltd.
- Alli, C (2001). *The Federal Republic of Nigeria Army-the Siege of a Nation-Ikeja*: Malthouse Press Ltd.
- Deutsch, K. & Foltz, W. J. (2010) *Nation Building in Comparative Context*, New York: Atherton Press
- Desmond, L. (2003). *Plato's Republic-* (translator) N. Y: Penguin Books Classic
- Ejembi, H. I. (1978). *Civilian Supremacy: The Poverty of a Political Doctrine*. 'Democracy in Nigeria –Past, Present & Future in the proceedings of the 5<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of NPSA Ed. S. E. Oyovbaire, published by NPSA 1978. p.110-124
- Frank, E. O. and Ukpere, W. I. (2012). *Impact of Military Rule on Democracy in Nigeria*. *Journal Social Science, Kamla-Raj India* 33(3) p, 285 – 292 cited in Djeba, O. (2002), *Impeachment Charges: My Reply-* Obasanjo. Thisday 12, September 11, 2002
- Frank, E. O. (n.d). *Political Soldering- The theory of Military in Politics and Governance* (in the press).
- Finer, S. E. (1962). *The Man on Horseback: The Role of the Military in Politics*. London: Pall Mall Publishers
- Huntington, S. P. (1957). *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Igwe, O. (2005). *Politics and Globe Dictionary New Edition* Aba: Eagle Publishers
- Lasswell, H. (1941). *The Garrison State and Specialists in Violence,' s The Analysis of Political Behaviour: An Empirical Approach*. Hamden, CT: Archon Books
- Mazrui, A.A. (1977). *The Warrior Tradition in Modern Africa*. Netherlands: Leiden E.J. Brill

- Mazrui, A. A. (1977). *Armed Kinsmen and the Origins of the State – in Mazrui, A.A. Ed. (1977). The Warrior Tradition in Modern Africa*. Netherlands: Leiden E.J. Brill
- Mclean, I., & McMillan, A (2003).*Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics* London: Oxford Publishers
- Machiavelli, N. (1961) *The Prince –translated with notes by George Bull introduction by Anthony Grafton*. Penguin Books.
- Price, K 1977 cited in Claude Welch Jr. in Mazrui, A. A. (1977) Ed. *The Warrior Tradition in Modern Africa*. Netherlands: Leiden E.J. Brill
- Vaughn, K. I (1980). *John-Locke Economist and Social Scientist* London: The Athlone Press
- Welch, Jr. C. E. (1977). *Warrior, Rebel, Guerrilla and Putschist – Four Aspect of Political Violence – Ed. Ali A. Mazrui –The Warrior Tradition in Modern Africa*. Netherland: Leiden E. J. Brill