INTRA-PARTY POLITICS AND PRIMARY ELECTIONS IN PEOPLES DEMOCRATIC PARTY: A STUDY OF THE EMERGENCE OF GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATES IN KADUNA STATE, (1999-2015)

BY

Aminu Kwasau MUHAMMAD, B.SC. (UDUS) 2004, M.SC. (ABU) 2011,
PH.D/SOC-SCI./3299/2011-2012

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

PROFESSOR, EJEMBI ANEFU UNOBE (CHAIRMAN)
PROFESSOR YUSUF YAKUBU ABDULLAHI (MEMBER)
DR. MUHAMMAD URUDDEEN MUSA (MEMBER)

A PH.D. THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE POSTGRADUATE STUDIES, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF DOCTORATE DEGREE IN POLITICAL SCIENCE, DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA, NIGERIA

AUGUST, 2017

DECLARATION

I, Muhammad Aminu Kwasau, with registration number, Ph.D./SOC-SCI/3299/2011-2012, do hereby declare that, this thesis has been written by me and it is a product of my research. No part of this thesis was previously presented for another degree or diploma at this or any other institution. All quotations are indicated and the sources are specifically acknowledged by means of reference.

…….…… …….. ……..

Name of Student Signature Date

CERTIFICATION

This Thesis titled "INTRA-PARTY POLITICS AND PRIMARY ELECTIONS IN PEOPLES DEMOCRATIC PARTY (PDP): A STUDY OF THE EMERGENCE OF GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATES IN KADUNA STATE, (1999-2015)", by Aminu Kwasau MUHAMMAD meets the requirements governing the award of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D) in the Department of Political Science and International Studies, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

Prof. Ejembi Anefu. Unobe (Chairman, Supervisory Committee)	…… Sign	…….. Date
Prof. Yusuf Yakubu Abdullahi (Member, Supervisory Committee)	…… Sign	…… Date
Dr. Muhammad Nuruddeen Musa (Member, Supervisory Committee)	…… Sign	…… Date
Dr. Aliyu Yahaya (Head of Department)	…… Sign	…….. Date
Professor S. Z. Abubakar (Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies)	…… Sign	…….. Date

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my late father, Alhaji Aminu Abdullahi and my mother, Hajiya Halima Muhammad Inuwa and to the entire family of late emir of Zazzau, Malam Ibrahim the son of emir of Zazzau, Malam Muhammad Lawal Kwasau.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I must begin by expressing my sincere gratitude to Almighty Allah, the Omnipotent, the Omniscience, the Lord of the earths and heavens and the master of the Day of Judgment, for giving me chance to reach this time in my life and in my academic career. I must be grateful to Him for enabling me to undertake this research in a good condition of health. Again, praise is due to his Incumbent Messenger of the last revelation to wholesome Mankind.

I owe my enormous intellectual and moral gratitude to Prof. Ejembi Anefu Unobe (Chairman, Supervisory Committee), Prof. Yusuf Yakubu Abdullahi (Member, Supervisory Committee) Dr. Nuruddeen Muhammad Musa (Member, Supervisory Committee), Prof. Habu Muhammad (BUK) (External Examiner), Professor Anyebe (Internal Examiner), Dr. Siddique Abubakar Muhammad (Internal Examiner), Dr. Audu Jacob (Internal Examiner), for their mentorship, dedication, commitment, patience and tireless efforts which broadened my scope of knowledge. The team of supervisors and examiners proved this by correcting the manuscript, making constructive criticisms, suggestions and recommendations in every stage of writing this thesis. Infact, their intellectual guidance and constructive criticisms have not only reduced imperfections in the work, but also embellished it.

My sincere gratitude also goes to all my respected and well-deserved lecturers of the Department of Political Science and International Studies, for their academic mentorship throughout my post-graduate studies in ABU, especially Professor Paul Pindar Izah, Professor Rauf Ayo Dunmoye, Professor Ejembi Anefu Unobe, Professor Kayode Omojuwa, Professor Hudu Ayuba Abdullahi, Professor Yakubu Yusuf Abdullahi, Professor Umar Mohammed Kaoje, Dr. Mohammed Abubakar Siddique, Dr. Isah Mohammed Abbas, Late Dr. Sabo Bako, Dr. Isma'il Shehu, Dr. Mohammed Fahl, Late. Mal. Saidu Adamu, Mal. Garba Aminu, Dr. Musa Idris (Public Admin. Kongo), Late Dr. Odofin, Dr Edgar Agubamar, Dr. Aliyu Yahaya (Head of Department), Dr. Nuruddeen Muhammad Musa, Dr. Moveh David Omeiza, (PG. Coordinator), Dr. Audu Jacob,
Dr. Dayyabu Muhammad Hassan, Mal. Umaru Tanko Abdullahi, Dr. Bello Basiru Gwarzo, Dr. Lawal tafida, Dr. Bappa Habib Yahaya, Late Dr. Suleiman Sunday, Late Mr. Muftwang, Dr. Rahanatu Lawal, whose positive ideas, motivation and academic guidance during my course work, have not only broadened my scope of knowledge but also widened my political horizon.

I am also very grateful to other respected lecturers of this great department whose name did not appear above, especially, Malam Hamza Auwalu Abdulaziz, Malam Abdul, Malam Isma'il Aminu Danja, Malam Mohammed Shu'aibu (Babangida), Malam Danladi,

Malama Fatima Mahmud Tope, Malama Bukola, Mrs. Rahila Yakubu, Malama Halima, Malama Khadija Sanusi Gumbi, Mal. Abubakar Aliyu Rafindadi, Mal. Saminu Idris, Mal. Ridhwan Abdullahi Aliyu, Mal. Ridhwan Mas'ud Umar, and Mal. Hadiza Sarki Edwards for their interest towards seeing the success of this research.

I also wish to extend my special thanks and appreciation to the members of my family especially Late Alh. Ja'afaru Kwasau (Galadima), Late Alhaji Aminu Abdullahi Kwasau (my father), Hajiya Halima Muhammad Inuwa (my mother), Malam Muhammad Inuwa, Late Aishatu (Tauraruwa) Alhaji Mohammed Hayatuddeen (Galadima), Malam Buhari Mohammed, Malam Abubakar Aminu, Ja'afar Aminu (Bature), Suleiman Aminu, Ahmad Aminu (Magaji), Late Hadiza (Maman Ladi), Late Hadiza (Tambaya), Hauwa'u Adamu, (my step mother), Karimatu Abdullahi (my step mother), Safiya Sokoto (My beloved sister), Fatima (Binta), Hauwa'u (Asabe), Aisha (Ladidi), Aisha (Allarai), Malama Salamatu (Inna uwa), Malama Maimuna, Rahinatu Khaleel (my wife), Asma'u Salisu (my wife) Malam Lawal Umar, Late Aminu Usman Gayya, Mal. Abubakar Musa Kago, Mal. Ibrahim Jaafar, Mal. Yahaya Jaafar, Mal. Ibrahim Umar, Mal.Yahya Umar, Mal. Hamza Nuhu, Mal. Jamilu Abdulqadir and Late Mal. Adamu Muhammad Danbaba for their financial support, guidance and concern throughout my studies, and the entire families of both the Malam Abdullahi Ibrahim Kwasau and Malam Muhammad Inuwa.

My appreciation will not be completed without acknowledging my gratitude to all staff of CEDDART Zangon-Shanu Zaria especially the chairman, Dr. Abubakar Siddique Mohammed, Malam Garba Wada (Chief Librarian), Khadija Adamu (Librarian), Sakina Aliyu (Librarian), Bitrus (Cleaner), my class mates, friends, and research assistants especially Mal. Usman Mohammed (Kogi State University), Mal. Shehu Usman Sani, Prof. Ntim Gyakari Esew, Dr. Patrick Peter, Dr. Tukur Abdulkadir, Dr. Yusuf Musa, Dr. Usman Mohammed, Mal. Yakubu Haruna Ja'e, Mal. Sama'ila Suleiman Adamu, Mal. Alidu Muhammadu, Mal. Aliyu Yero, Mal. Barakatu Sani, Hajiya Halima, Alh. Hamisu, Mal. Safiya (Secretary), Mrs. Afiniki, Mrs. Justina, Mal. Habiba (KASU), Salim Ahmed, Muhammad Kabir Mahe, Muhammad Sani Shu'aibu, Muhammad Sani Abdullahi, Kaduna State University, PDP Secretariat Kaduna, Kaduna state Independent Electoral Commission (KSIECOM), Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) Kaduna, Transition Monitoring Group (TMG) Kaduna, Malam Sama'ila Sani, (Kaduna State PDP Admin. Officer 1999-Date), Abdullahi Muhammad Ibrahim (INEC), Dr. Yusuf Musa (Bauchi State University), Abubakar Musa Kalgo, Mal. Hussaini Dambo (Federal University Gusau), Abubakar Liman, Mr. Shapera Simon Aondohemba, Mr. zasha Tersoo Zasha (Federal University Dutsinma), Miss Mary Edet Etim, Mal. Aminu Musa (Federal University Kebbi), Muhammad Aminu Danjuma, Shehu Hussaini, Muhammad kabir

Umar, Malam Kabir Musa Tukur-Tukur, Malam Yunus Abbas, Haruna Munkaila, Malam Bello A. Bello, Abdurrahman Baba Marte, Mr. Festus Okeye, Mus'ab bn Umair Islamic School Fadama, Kaura Zaria, Mu'az bn Jabal School for Islamic Studies and Guidance Tukur Tukur Zaria, Malam Musa Hudu, Malam Umar Shehu (Baballiya), Malam Umar Aliyu Baballe, Mal. Sani Mohammed, Mal. Mohammed Abdulkadir Tabari (Baba Karami), Baitussalam Al-Islamiyya (Dutsinma), Mal. Abubakar Hamza, Mal. Abdussalam Umar, Mal. Bashir Jaafar, Dr. Isah Sa'idu Liman Mal. Munir Abubakar Muhammad, Mal. Abdullahi Gali, Mal. Gazali, Mal. Nuhu Ramalan, Mal. Ibrahim Magaji, Mal. Juwaratu, Mal. Hadiza, Mal. Binta Ahmed Dodo, Mal. Ibrahim Ahmed Ladi, Mal. Hajara Ado,Mr. Daniel Awuudu, Mr. Umar Garpiya, Mr. Gabriel Obute, Mal. Yahya Abdulkadir Jamfalam, Mal. Ramatu Yusuf, Mal. Ibrahim Kawule Mikailu, Mal. Ibrahim Baba Gombe and Mal. Hafiz, (FCE Zaria), Mal. Auwal Magaji (KAD-POLY) for their love, criticism, and contributions towards realization of this dream.

Finally, my heartfelt gratitude also goes to Miss. Promise Eyo (Typist), Mr. Ameh, Mr. Sunday (Sunny), Miss. Ruth, Miss Pauline, Adam Harauna, Nura B. Ahmed, Umar Aliyu Barewa, Misah Café Kongo, Teku Ventures (TV) Kofar Doka Zaria, for typing this research from manuscript to a flash drive and subsequently to its present shape. God bless you all.

ABSTRACT

As a result of irregularities in the conduct of PDP governorship primaries, which has to do with the imposition of candidates, substitution of candidates' names in INEC some weeks to the general elections, submission of names to INEC of candidates who were defeated at the primary election, neglecting rank-and-file members in most decisions affecting party primaries, the party has been bedeviled by crises in varying proportions, ranging from distrust among members, instability of the democracy, political thuggery, inter-party defections, anti-party politics, verbal warfare and physical violence to mention just few.

The study seeks to i. Examine the nature of Intra-Party Politics in PDP Kaduna State Chapter with regards to its Gubernatorial Primaries from 1999-2015. ii..To critically analyze the extent through which the conduct of PDP's Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State conform to the internal democracy requirements as contained in the electoral Act, indices of candidate's selection as well as the constitution of the party from 1999-2015. iii.. To find out some of the factors that influence party members to vote for a particular candidate during Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party in Kaduna State between 1999-2015. iv. To examine whether or not irregularities have been manifested in the conduct of Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party in Kaduna State from 1999-2015. v.. To discuss the implications of the absence of the observance of democratic principles in the conduct of PDP Gubernatorial Primaries to the development of democracy in a developing nation like Nigeria. The research adopted the Elite Theory in the analysis of intra-party politics in Nigeria. The researcher made use of the multi-stage sampling technique to get the population of the study. The State was clustered into three (3) senatorial districts from where two (2) Local Government Areas were selected from each. From these, the Adhoc delegates were systematically selected for the interview. Data was presented using simple percentage statistical method. The interpretation of the analyzed data as it related to the objectives of the study was presented in a tabular form. Finally, the research has been able to find out that, intra-party politics in Kaduna state chapter of the Peoples Democratic Party between 1999-2015 was only in theory but practically it has been bedeviled by some major challenges that are identified as follows; godfatherism, financial inducement, influence of powerful political elite, incumbency factor, the application of the federal character principles, problem of rural and cosmopolitan politics and ethno-religious factor. The research also recommends that, Party members must be allowed to freely elect those who will carry their party's flag during the general election.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page - - - - - - - - - i

Declaration - - - - - - - - - ii

Certification - - - - - - - - - iii

Dedication - - - - - - - - - iv

Acknowledgement - - - - - - - - v

Abstract - - - - - - - - - viii

Table of Contents - - - - - - - - ix

Appendices - - - - - - - - - xiii

List of Tables - - - - - - - - - xv

List of Abbreviations - - - - - - - - xviii

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study - - - - - - 1

1.2 Statement of the Research Problem - - - - - 3

1.3 Research Questions - - - - - - - 4

1.4 Aim and Objectives of the study - - - - - 5

1.5 Research Assumptions - - - - - - 6

1.6 Significance of the Study - - - - - - 7

1.7 Scope and Limitation of the Study - - - - 8

1.8 Organization of Chapters - - - - - - 9

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction - - - - - - - - - 11

22. Literature Review - - - - - - - 11

2.2.1 The origin of the Concept of Democracy - - - - 11

2.2.2 Basic Principles of Democracy - - - - - - 13

2.2. 3 Conditions for a successful Democracy- - - - - 16

2.2.4 Perspectives of Democratic Governance on Political Parties and

Inter-party Politics - - - - - - - - - - 17

2.2.5 Conceptual and operational definitions of intra-party politics - 22

2.2.6 The Critical Role of Political Parties in Democratic Dispensation- - - 24

2.2.7 Measuring Intra Party Politics - - - - - - - - 28

2.2.8 Political Parties and Intra-Party Politics in Nigeria - - - - 36

2.2.8.1 Intra-Party Politics in the First Republic - - - - - - 37

2.2.8.2 Intra-Party Politics in the Second Republic - - - - - - 48

2.2.8.3 Intra-Party Politics in the Third Republic - - - - - - 50

2.2.8.4 Intra-Party Politics in the Fourth Republic - - - - - - 52

2.3. Theoretical Framework - - - - - - - - - 57

2.4 Gaps in the Literature: - - - - - - - - - 64

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction- - - - - - - - - - - - 66

3.2 Research Design - - - - - - - - - - - - 66

3.3 Sources of Data Collection- - - - - - - - - 67

3.3.1 Primary Sources- - - - - - - - - 67

3.3.2 Secondary Sources- - - - - - - - -68

3.4 Sampling Procedure- - - - - - - - 69

3.5 Population and Sample Size of the Study- - - - - 69

3.6 Method of Data Presentation and Analysis - - - - 76

3.7 Methodological Challenges - - - - - - 76

CHAPTER FOUR

HISTORY AND FORMATION OF PEOPLES DEMOCRATIC PARTY (PDP) IN NIGERIA

4.1 Background to the formation of political parties in Nigeria - - -- - - - - - 78

4.2 Origin and Formation of Peoples Democratic Party - - - - - -79

4.3 The Manifesto of the Peoples Democratic Party- - - - - - 80

4.4 The Constitution of the Peoples Democratic Party- - - - - - 83

4.5 Intra-Party Politics in Peoples Democratic Party - - - - - - - 88

4.6 PDP and internal wrangling in Nigeria's fourth republic- - - - - - 93

4.7 Intra-Party Politics in PDP Kaduna State Chapter - - - - - -106

4.7.1 Politics and Governance in Kaduna State Before 1999 - - - - - 107

4.7.2 Peoples Democratic Party and Intra-Party Politics in Kaduna State - 108

CHAPTER FIVE

ANALYSIS OF GUBERNATORIAL PRIMARIES OF PEOPLES DEMOCRATIC PARTY (PDP) IN KADUNA STATE, 1999 -2015

5.1 Introduction- - - - - - - - - - - - - -113

5.2 Data Analysis and Interpretation - - - - - - - - -114

5.3 Discussion of Major Findings - - - - - - - -157

5.3.1 Nature and character of PDP Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015- - - - - - - - -157

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

6.1	Introduction - - - - - - - -	175
6.2	Summary - - - - - - - -	175
6.3	Conclusion - - - - - - - -	178
6.4	Recommendation - - - - - - - -	181
	References - - - - - - - -	185
	Appendices - - - - - - - -	194

APPENDICES **PAGES**

APENDIX 1: Interview Schedule - - - - - - 194
APENDIX 2: Interview Schedule for INEC Resident Commissioner - - 197
APPENDIX 3: Questionnaire Sample - - - - - - 200
APPENDIX 4: Questionnaire Sample (Hausa Version) - - - - - - - 206
APENDIX 5: List of People Interviewed - - - - - 212
APENDIX 6: Summary of Kaduna State Gubernatorial Primary Elections Results From 1999-2015 - - - - - - - 215
APENDIX 7: Kaduna State Update on Distribution of Permanent Voters Cards - - - - - - - - - 216
APENDIX 8: List of Adhoc Delegates for Kaduna State 2014 Gubernatorial Primary Elections - - - - - - - 217
APPENDIX 9: List of Zone 1 Ad-Hoc Delegates for Kaduna State 2014 Gubernatorial Primary Elections - - - - - - 217
APPENDIX 10: List of Ad-Hoc Delegates from Lere local Government for Kaduna State 2014 Gubernatorial Primary Elections - - - 217
APPENDIX 11: List of Ad-Hoc Delegates from Zaria Local Government for Kaduna State 2014 Gubernatorial Primary Elections - - 218
APPENDIX 12: List of Zone II Ad-Hoc Delegates for Kaduna State 2014 Gubernatorial Primary Elections- - - - - - 219
APPENDIX 13: List of Ad-Hoc Delegates from Birnin Gwari Local Government for Kaduna State 2014 Gubernatorial Primary Elections - - - - - - - - - - 219
APPENDIX 14: List of Ad-Hoc Delegates from Kajuru Local Government for Kaduna State 2014 Gubernatorial Primary Elections - - 220
APPENDIX 15: List of Zone III Ad-Hoc Delegates for Kaduna State 2014 Gubernatorial Primary Elections - - - - - 220
APPENDIX 16: List of Ad-Hoc Delegates from Zangon Kataf Local Government for Kaduna State 2014 Gubernatorial Primary Elections - - - - - - - - 220
APPENDIX 17: List of Ad-Hoc Delegates from Kauru Local Government for Kaduna State 2014 Gubernatorial Primary Elections - - 221
APPENDIX 18: Interview Notification Letter for respondents- - - - 223
APPENDIX 19: The Electoral Act on Political Parties Rules and Regulations- - 224

APPENDIX 20: PDP Constitution - - - - - - - - - 231
APPENDIX 21: The Manifesto of the Peoples Democratic Party - - 250

LIST OF TABLES **PAGES**

Table 3.1 23 Local Government Areas of Kaduna State - 71

Table 3.2 6 Selected Local Government Areas Under Study - 71

Table 3.3 PDP Registered Members and Sample Size in the Six Local Government Areas under Study -- - - - 72

Table 3.4 PDP Registered Members and Sample Size according to the Political Wards of Birnin-Gwari Local Government Area - - 72

Table 3.5 PDP Registered Members and Sample Size according to the Political Wards of Kajuru Local Government Area - - 73

Table 3.6: PDP Registered Members and sample size according to the Political Words of Kauru local Government Area - - - 74

Table 3.7 PDP Registered Members and Sample Size according to the Political Wards of Lere Local Government Area - - - 74

Table 3.8 PDP Registered Members and Sample Size according to the Political Wards of Zangon-Kataf Local Government Area - - 75

Table 3.9 PDP Registered Members and Sample Size according to the Political Wards of Zaria Local Government Area - - - 75

Table 5.2.1 Administration and Retrieval of Questionnaires - - 114

Table 5.2.2 Gender of Respondents - - - - - 114

Table 5.2.3 Age of Respondents - - - - - - 115

Table 5.2.4 Marital Status of Respondents - - - - 116

Table 5.2.5 Religion of Respondents - - - - - 117

Table 5.2.6 Occupations of Respondents - - - - - 118

Table 5.2.7 Qualifications of Respondents - - - - 119

Table 5.2.8 Employment Status of Respondents - - - - 120

Table 5.2.9 Emergence of PDP delegates in 1999 gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State - - - - - - - 121

Table 5.2.10 Emergence of PDP delegates in 2003 gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State - - - -- - - - 122

Table 5.2.11 Emergence of PDP delegates in 2007 gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State - - - 124

Table 5.2.12 Emergence of PDP delegates in 2011 gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State - - - 125

Table 5.2.13 Emergence of PDP delegates in 2015 gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State - - - 127

Table of 5.2.14 Emergence of PDP candidates in 1999 gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State - - - 128

Table 5.2.15 Emergence of PDP candidates in 2003 gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State - - - 129

Table 5.2.16 Emergence of PDP candidates in 2007 gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State - - - 132

Table 5.2.17 Emergence of PDP candidates in 2011 gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State - - - 133

Table 5.2.18 Emergence of PDP candidates in 2015 gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State - - - 135

Table 5.2.19 Existence of equal participation of all members in gubernatorial primaries of the Party in respondents' wards or Local Government Areas- -- -- - - - 136

Table 5.2.20 Analysis of whether rules governing PDP Gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State are commonly observed, widely understood, and confidently anticipated- - - - 138

Table 5.2.21 Analysis of whether political power has been decentralized all PDP Members in Kaduna State with regards to selecting candidate for governorship primaries from 1999 – 2005- - 139

Table 5.2.22 Analysis of whether PDP leaders in Kaduna State recognize the Legitimacy of electoral competition as the only route to political offices from 1999 -2015- - - - - - 140

Table 5.2.23 Analysis of whether PDP gubernatorial primary elections for the post of governorship hold as regulatory at the convention or state congress of the party in each of the twenty three local government areas of Kaduna State from 1999-2015- - - - 141

Table 5.2.24 Analysis whether INEC Supervises and monitor the governmental Primaries of PDP in Kaduna State from 1999-2015 - - - 142

Table 5.2.25 Analysis of whether Godfatherism has a negative effect n Governorship primaries of PDP in Kaduna State from 1999-2015- - - - - - - - 144

Table 5.2.26 Analysis of whether financial inducement has a negative effect in governorship primaries of PDP – Kaduna State from 1999-2015- 145

Table 5.2.27 Analysis of whether Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) exists independently of powerful elite within and outside the party in Kaduna State from 1999 – 2015- - - - - 148

Table 5.2.28 Analysis of whether incumbency factor has a negative effect in governorship primaries of PDP Kaduna State from 1999 - 2015- - 153

Table 5.2.29 Analysis of whether exclusiveness of rank and file members in party primaries has a negative effect on governorship primaries of PDP in Kaduna State from 1999 – 2015- - - - 154

Table 5.2.30: Respondents' view about the interests and intrigues that worked against PDP's gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015- - - - - - - - - - 156

Table 5.2.31: PDP Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015 - 162

ACRONYMS

(1)	AC	-	Action Congress
(2)	ANPP	-	All Nigeria Peoples Party
(3)	BATC	-	Business Apprenticeship Training Centre
(4)	CCEPAE	-	Code of Conduct on Ethical and Professional Administration of Elections
(5)	CEP	-	Civic Education Programmes
(6)	DG	-	Director General
(7)	DWDGCEP	-	Draft Working Document on Good Common Wealth Electoral Parties
(8)	EC	-	Electoral College
(9)	EO	-	Election Observers
(10)	EO	-	Electoral Officer
(11)	EUEOM	-	European Union Election Observation Mission
(12)	FFE	-	Free and Fair Elections
(13)	FRCN	-	Federal Radio Corporations of Nigeria
(14)	G.C.E	-	General Certificate Examination
(15)	IAUEI	-	Inter American Union for Electoral Institutions.
(16)	INEC	-	Independent National Electoral Commission.
(17)	KSMC	-	Kaduna State Media Corporation.
(18)	LGCE	-	Local Government Councils Elections
(19)	L.G.A	-	Local Government Authority
(20)	LGEA	-	Local Government Education Authority.
(21)	NCE	-	Nigeria Certificate In Education
(22)	NMCS	-	Nigeria Media and Civic Society.
(23)	NPC	-	National Population Commission.
(24)	APC	-	All Progressive Congress.
(25)	OSCE	-	Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.
(26)	PDP	-	Peoples Democratic Party
(27)	PRP	-	Peoples Redemption Party
(28)	SDP	-	Social Democratic Party.
(29)	SIEC	-	State Independent Electoral Commission
(30)	SIECOM	-	State Independent Electoral Commission
(31)	SSCE	-	Senior Secondary Certificate Examination.
(32)	TMG	-	Transition Monitoring Group
(33)	UNO	-	United Nations Organization
(34)	U.S.A	-	United States of America
(35)	ZLGA	-	Zaria Local Government Area
(36)	INT: IDEA	-	International Institute of Democracy and Electoral Assistance.
(37)	ANG	-	All Nigeria Congress.
(38)	NCP	-	National Conscience Party
(39)	NRC	-	National Republican Convention
(40)	NNDP	-	Nigerian National Democratic Party

(41) NYM - Nigerian Youth Movement
(42) NPC - Northern People's Congress
(43) NCNC - National Council of Nigerian Citizens
(44) NPP - Nigerian Peoples Party
(45) NPN - National Party of Nigeria
(46) GNPP - Great Nigerian People's Party
(47) UPN - Unity Party of Nigeria
(48) PDM - Peoples Democratic Movement
(49) WEC - Ward Executive Committee
(50)WC - Ward Congress
(51)LGEC - Local Government Executive Committee
(52) LGAC - Local Government Area Congress
(53) SDWC - Senatorial District Working Committee
(54) SWC - State Working Committee
(55) SC - State Caucus
(56) SEC - State Executive Committee
(57) SC - State Congress
(58) ZWC - Zonal Working Committee
(59) ZEC - Zonal Executive Committee
(60) ZC - Zonal Congress
(61) NWC - National Working Committee
(62) NC - National Caucus
(63) NBT - National Board of Trustees
(64) NEC - National Executive Committee
(65) NC - National Convention

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the Study

Political parties in a democratic government are expected to recruit members in order to aggregate diverse opinions from society to produce a common policy and to also perform the role of educating electorates to make informed choices during elections so as to vote individual candidates of their choice. This, according to Reilly (2008), is because parties organize voters, aggregate and articulate interests, craft policy alternatives, recruit and socialize new candidates for offices, set policy-making agenda, integrate disparate groups and individuals into the democratic process and provide the basis for coordinated electoral and legislative activity. Well-functioning political parties are therefore central to the process of democratic development.

Election is a necessary condition for democracy. Indeed, it is central to democracy. This is for simple reasons that it gives opportunity for citizens of any country to freely choose their leaders at periodic intervals. Freedom of choice, it has been argued, is at the very heart of democracy (Siddique, 2007). The lack of internal democracy is likely not only to cripple the parties internally, but also to adversely affect electoral successes.

Intra-party politics refers to the extent to which the conduct of internal party affairs embodies the principles of selectivity, accountability, transparency, inclusivity, participation and representation. It suggests a bottom-up approach in the building of the party structures and organizations in a manner that ensures internal distribution of power and dispersion of authorities at different levels rather than concentration of such powers in one organ (Sam, 2014).

Intra-Party Politics is indispensable if polititical parties are to fulfill their role as legitimate and credible agents of democratization. In other words, there can be no meaningful

democracy without intra-party politics and that, democracy and intra-party politics are not just connected but inseparable. The functioning of every democratic system depends to a large extent on the nature, character, composition, organization, ideals and institutionalization of political parties and party politics (Ogundiya, 2011). The emergence of representative democracy and republican government brought the need for political parties as well as the way and manner individuals are to be elected to assume political positions. It is obvious that political parties constitute the heart of democracy and the more vigorous and coherent they are, the better assured is the health of the democratic process. It is therefore difficult to imagine any modern democracy without political parties as they are to link the diverse groups of people and governments.

Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) has been the ruling party in Kaduna State from 1999-2015 because, it won the gubernatorial elections of 1999, 2003, 2007 and 2011. It also won 2 out of 3 senatorial seats of the state in 1999, 2 in 2003, 3 in 2007 and 2 in 2011. The party also won 13 seats out of 16 members representing the state in the House of Representatives in 1999, 11 in 2003, 9 in 2011 and 5 seats in 2015. In the elections of members of House of Assembly, the party won 27 out of 34 seats in 1999, 28 in 2003, 24 in 2007, 21 in 2011 and 7 seats in 2015 respectively (PDP Document, 2015).

The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999 specifies that the rules and procedure of any political party should make provision for open and periodic elections on democratic bases of the principal officers, members of the executive committee and other governing bodies of the political party. In terms of nomination of members to the position of Governorship, an electoral act 2010 with 2011 ammendments provided that, the party shall hold special congress in each of the Local Government Areas of the state with delegates voting for each of the aspirants and the congress to be held in designated centres on specified dates. The

aspirant with the highest number of votes at the end of exercise shall be declared the winner of the primaries of the party and aspirant's name shall be forwarded to the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC). As a party in power then, PDP had conducted series of primary elections ahead of its gubernatorial elections in Kaduna State since 1999. The conduct of these primary elections is a test on the working of internal democracy in the party. The process always ended up with crisis and protest against the undemocratic conduct of the primaries.

This work examines the intra-party politics with regard to Governorship Primary Elections conducted by People's Democratic Party (PDP), in Kaduna State from 1999-2015.

1.2 Statement of the Research Problem

In a liberal democracy, the right to freely associate is given, but the abuse of that fundamental right comes to the fore when those associations are to properly serve the people that voted them into office. Political parties have sadly become hired vehicles for chieftains to move from pillars to post in a desperate move to be in office for power and money rather than for service thereby affecting the essence of governance.

The conduct of gubernatorial Primaries by the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Kaduna State between 1999 and 2015 has been marred by irregularities and flaws. The improper conduct of this important segment of internal democracy became a great challenge facing the party which has its root from the zero sum nature of politics in the state, godfatherism, money politics, powerful influence of elite, incumbency factor, exclusiveness of rank-and-file members in party primaries and infact; this has left in its wake wanton destruction of party ideology, democratic practices and values, lives and properties. Not only that, intra-party politics has become an issue of serious concern in Kaduna State as a result of authoritarian nature and character of political parties. For instance, Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) could not adopt an

open system that will not only allow its members to select their candidates but also give them unrestricted opportunity to contest in elections under the party's platform. This kind of political restriction has increasingly resulted in wrangling, recrimination and acrimony. The bankruptcy in ideology and principles within the party has made party politics a-do-or-die affair, a source of political liability and decay. Carpet-crossing and non-issue based statements have become the order of the day.

As a result of irregularities in the conduct of PDP governorship primaries, which has to do with the imposition of candidates, substitution of candidates' names in INEC some weeks to the general elections, submission of names to INEC of candidates who were defeated at the primary election, neglecting rank-and-file members in most decisions affecting party primaries, the party has been bedeviled by crises in varying proportions, ranging from distrust among members, instability of the democracy, political thuggery, inter-party defections, anti-party politics, verbal warfare and physical violence to mention just few.

This study therefore, examines the nature and dynamics of intra-party politics in Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) Kaduna State, with particular focus on the Gubernatorial Primaries from 1999-2015.

1.3 Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions;

i. What is the nature of intra-party politics in PDP Kaduna State Chapter with regard to its Gubernatorial Primaries from 1999-2015?

ii. To what extent has the conduct of PDP's Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State conformed to the internal democracy requirements as contained in the Electoral Act,

indices of candidate's selection as well as the constitution of the party from 1999-2015?

iii. What are the factors that influenced party members to vote for a particular candidate during Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party in Kaduna State between 1999 and 2015?

iv. Are there manifestations of irregularities as claimed by some party members in the conduct of Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?

v. What are the implications of the absence of the observance of democratic principles in the conduct of PDP Kaduna state chapter to the development of Nigerian democracy?

1.4 Aim and Objectives of the Study

The main aim of this research is to critically examine the nature, character, manifestations and dynamics of intra-party politics in Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) kaduna state chapter so as to provide a framework for the systematic evaluation of gubernatorial primaries not only in kaduna state but the country at large.

In order to answer the research questions above, the study seeks to achieve the following objectives:

i.. To examine the nature of intra-party politics in PDP Kaduna State Chapter with regards to its Gubernatorial Primaries from 1999-2015

ii..To critically analyse the extent to which the conduct of PDP's Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State conform to the internal democracy requirements as contained in the Electoral Act

(2010 as ammended), indices of candidate's selection as well as the constitution of the party from 1999-2015.

iii.. To find out some of the factors that influence party members to vote for a particular candidate during Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party in Kaduna State between 1999-2015.

iv.. To examine whether or not irregularities have been manifested in the conduct of Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party in Kaduna State from 1999-2015

v.. To discuss the implications of the absence of the observance of democratic principles in the conduct of PDP Gubernatorial Primaries to the development of democracy in a developing nation like Nigeria

1.5 Research Assumptions

In line with the aforementioned research questions and objectives, the study is based on the following assumptions:

i.. Godfatherism has negatively impacted on the Intra-Party Politics of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Kaduna State with regards to its Gubernatorial Primaries from 1999-2015.

ii.. Financial inducement has immensely contributed to the irregularities in the conduct of Gubernatorial Primaries of PDP in Kaduna State from 1999-2015.

iii.. Political elite decide and dominate decisions regarding PDP Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015.

iv. Incumbency factor has greatly influenced the Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Kaduna State from 1999-2015.

v...Application of the principles of federal character (Zoning) in gubernatorial primaries affects democratic practices of the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Kaduna State from 1999-2015.

1.6 Significance of the Study

The research is of significance due to the fact that, it is aimed at examining intra-party politics in Kaduna state and suggesting possible ways in order to come up with the means of conducting proper gubernatorial primaries not only in the State but also the country at large.

Infact, intra-party politics within the PDP in Nigeria's fourth republic is a topic of interest among students of political science today because; it is an on-going phenomenon and so there are a lot to discuss about the nature and character of the party. This is also associated to the fact that PDP has dominated the national politics since from 1999-2015 at both federal and state level and yet, it has not been sufficiently studied by academic research. Even where studies on the party have been made such were mostly on pages of newspapers and workshops. Hence, this study will contribute significantly to the body of knowledge

Aside that, the significance of this research has manifested in the sense that, the literature reviewed were mostly on inter and intra-party politics in Nigeria. The available ones that examined PDP have concentrated mainly on the causes of its internal wrangling as well as divisions within the party but have not been able to critically examine the realities about intra-party politics within PDP particularly its gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State between 1999 and 2015. Therefore, the study is expected to fill gap created in the literature on party politics in Nigeria..

Therefore, if this work is successfully completed, it would serve as a reference material to the forth coming researchers in the field of academics to build upon so as to make political parties in Kaduna State in particular and Nigeria as a whole, more institutionalized and democratic in nature and character.

Other political parties not only Kaduna state but the country at large will benefit from this work because it is hoped to be in a very wider circulation. It is also hoped to be of benefit to those aspiring for any position within the democratic ladder as the study will throw more light to the policy makers in formulating decisions so as to have a hitch free and non destructive intra party democracy not only in the existing political parties of Kaduna state but the country at large.

1.7 Scope and Limitations of the Study

The study focuses on the intra-party politics within the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Nigeria, with particular reference to Kaduna State between 1999 and 2015. Therefore, the research work took time before completion because it requires much time as the researcher needs to synthesize the relevant data obtained due to the fact that; not all the data are correct and relevant. Aside that, the researcher underwent a lot of difficulties in going round to either conduct interviews or collection of the distributed questionnaires due to some protocols before reaching some respondents.

As the study involves oral interview, some of the relevant individuals contacted for an interview were usually unwilling to provide specific details on questions asked in an attempt not to expose what they saw as sensitive information. Other respondents did not accept the request that was why they were replaced with other important personalities within the party. This is done purposely in order not to affect the authenticity of the study.

Similarly, the study also observed that most of the relevant documents relating to PDP gubernatorial primaries (especially list of delegates) were not found in planning and statistics department of the party's secretariat in Kaduna but only few were later obtained at the administrative unit of the party due to repeated visits.

Closely related to the above, in some areas, the researcher realized that not all respondents understand English language to effectively respond to questionnaires, so he had to translate them into Hausa Language. He also employed and trained other research assistants from PDP card carrying members to help in the administration and retrieval of questionnaires.

With this therefore, a lot of time was spent for the said task as a result of repeated visits to meet the respondents for designated interviews which formed an important segment of the primary data, this also led to the delay in the research work.

1.8 Organization of Chapters

This research is structured into six chapters as follows;

Chapter one examines the general introduction, this contains the background to the study; statement of the problem, aims and objectives of the study, significance of the research, research assumption and methodology.

Chapter two is the literature review and theoretical framework. The literature reviewed by the study include the concept of democracy, principles of liberal democracy, Political Parties, Intra-Party Politics, indices of intra-party politics, Intra-Party Politics in Nigeria from first republic to the present democratic dispensation.

e.t.c.

Chapter three focuses on the Research Methodology; the sources of data collection and processing were examined in this chapter.

Chapter four dwells on the History and Formation of Peoples' Democratic Party (PDP) in Nigeria, PDP intra-party politics in Nigeria in general and Kaduna State in Particular. Chapter five is about the analysis, interpretation and presentation of data.

Chapter Six, being the concluding part, is the summary and conclusion of the major findings on intra-party politics in Nigeria, with particular reference to Kaduna state with a set of recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK:

2.1. Introduction

Elections in democratic or civilian transitional regimes like Nigeria are not only tools for mobilization but serve as functional elements of a representative or participatory political system. The conduct of regular, freely contested and fair internal elections among political parties is one of the indicators that can be used to measure the democratic health of a country, development and progress of any political system. To this end the thematic approach to literature review was adopted.

This chapter examines various works that are related to the field of study. In line with the objectives of the study, the literature reviewed by the research embraced the origin of the concept of democracy, basic principles of democracy, the concept and principles of liberal democracy, conditions for a successful democracy, perspectives of democratic governance on political parties and intra-party politics, conceptual and operational definitions of intra-party politics, the critical role of political parties in democratic dispensation as well as measurements of intra party Politics.

2.2. Literature Review

2.2.1 The Origin of the Concept of Democracy

The beginning of the idea of democracy is associated with the city states of Ancient Greece. The Word itself is derived from the Greek word “Democratic”, from Demos, i.e. “the people”, and Kratos, “rule”. Greek democracy was direct democracy in which the whole citizen body formed the legislature and in which the representative system was unknown. This was possible due to the limited size of the ancient state which was generally confined to a city and its

rural surroundings. Furthermore, women were disfranchised and there were numerous classes of slaves who enjoyed no rights at all. Ancient's democracy recognized the equality of citizens.

Political and social scientists have offered a number of definitions and explanations on the concept of democracy. In a nutshell, democracy is a popular rule. It embodies fundamental human rights such as freedom of expression, right to life to dignity of human person, right to personal liberty, right to fair hearing, right to freedom of thought, consciences, religion, press, peaceful assembly and association, movement, political participation, etc. in another sense, democracy refers to the control of an organization by its members, who take part in the making of the decisions. In other words, democracy implies majority rule and respect for fundamental rights of the people (Oddih, 2007).

Democracy is defined as a continuous process of promoting equal access to fundamental rights. According to Oddih (2007), democracy cannot be negotiated as a new bargain to developing nations, rather, it has to be richer than the liberal model, and should be capable of leading to a development strategy that is homegrown, people centered and oriented towards eradicating poverty. In the same vein, Ake (2001), argued that, the real democratic culture that can bring about real development in Africa is the one sustained by economic and political development based on centralization of power, and reliance on indigenous communities to provide some refuge from the centralized state.

Several exponents of democracy have treated democracy chiefly as a form of government. John Austin (1790-1859), James Bryce (1938-1922), AV Dicey (1935-1922), A.L. Lowell (1856-1943) and John Seely are some prominent supporters of this view. Lowell, for instance, says that, democracy is only an experiment in government. Seely describes it as government in which everyone has a share (Gauba, 1981). Appadorai, as cited in Okafor (2003),

describes democracy as a system of government under which the people exercise the governing power either directly or through representatives periodically elected by them.

For Agarwal (2000) democracy means “power of the people”. It is a form of government in which the governing body is a comparatively large fraction of the entire nation. Mahajan (2000), also conceptualizes democracy to mean, a form of government, a form of state, and also a way of life. As a form of government, it means that, the legal power in the community is vested in the people as a whole and the rule belongs to the majority in the electorate, in the communities which act by voting.

Therefore, considering the definitions of democracy given above, we can say that, democracy is the form of government in which the sovereign power of the state is in the hands of the people and the people are the source of state power, they take part in government directly or through representatives.

2.2.2 Basic Principles of Democracy

Certain basic principles must guide the operation of democracy anywhere because, democracy allows every individual to speak, criticize and disagree with others. Democracy is based on the principle of tolerance. Individuals can have their separate ideas and democracy does not believe in crushing them. Democracy believes in the method of persuasion and peace both internal and international spheres. The following are some of the principles or requisites of democracy;

a. **Liberty:** The main basis of democracy is liberty and equality. The people enjoy maximum liberty and equality because, criticism of the people is not tolerated in this system, but it is also encouraged. In Great Britain, the leader of the opposition is paid by the government and he is consulted by the Prime Minister in National emergency. For

example, when South Rhodesia threatened to declare its freedom unilaterally, the British Prime Minister consulted the leaders of the conservative party and liberal party. When Pakistan invaded India during August –September, 1965. The Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri consulted the leaders of opposition parties. In monarchies, Dictatorships, Aristocracies and Oligarchies, the people and the opposition parties have no say in matters of national importance. (Agarwal, 2000:266). He explains further that, other principles of democracy are; equality, fraternity, sovereignty, fundamental human right, independence of Judiciary and welfare state.

b. **Equality:** Special emphasis is laid on equality in democracy and there is no disparity on the basis of caste, creed, religion and position or status. Efforts have been made to establish social and political equality in democracies like England, Japan, France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, West Germany, the United States of America and Italy. Political and social equality is useless without economic equality.

c. **Fraternity**: Democracy can become successful only in a peaceful atmosphere; otherwise it has to face many difficulties. This is the reason why United Nations Organization (UNO) is making tireless efforts to promote peace round the globe.

d. **Sovereignty**: In a democracy, people are the ultimate source of sovereignty and the government derives its power from them. For this purpose, elections take place in democratic nations at certain intervals. In Nigeria and U.S.A, elections take place after every four years, while in England and India; general elections take place after every five years.

e. **Fundamental Human Rights**: In democracy, people are given fundamental rights because; in the absence of these rights the development of an individual is not possible.

Fundamental rights have been granted to the people in their constitution here in Nigeria, U.S.A, Japan, India, France and Italy. In England, the rights of the people are protected through the Rule of Law, Acts of Parliament, and Judicial Decision given from time to time.

f. **Independence of Judiciary**: In a democracy, it is the responsibility of judiciary to protect the fundamental rights of the people. In Nigeria, the Supreme Court and High courts protect the constitution and the fundamental rights of the people. Wherever judiciary is not free, the protection of fundamental rights is not possible.

The six principles or requisites of democracy explained above by Agarwal are very important factors that can aid the successful working of democracy. For instance, liberty and equality will empower individuals to make free choice among different political parties and candidates for elections. This will also allow them to vote and contest for elections without any hindrance. Fraternity, sovereignty of the people and fundamental human rights must all be observed and protected. This is necessary because, free and fair elections cannot be conducted in any atmosphere surrounded by intimidation, harassment and violence. Fundamental rights of people in any matter must be observed and leaders must be responsible and accountable to the electorate.

On the other hand, the existence of an independent judiciary is very essential and vital factor that aids the conduct of free and fair primary elections. This is so because, it is the body that takes charge of elections disputes therefore, without being independent, this will never be possible in any democratic nation.

2.2.3. Conditions for a Successful Democracy

Democratic institutions work successfully only in a particular atmosphere; both the leaders and the followers must be honest and conscious of the development of the community as a whole. People must take interest in the public affairs, and to be given opportunity to participate actively in politics. An atmosphere of peace is also significant for the successful working of democracy. Free and independent press is required which is ready to criticize government when it is going wrong and freedom of expression of opinion must also be given to people. Democracy must be successful if a country provided a poverty-free society. This is so because; poverty keeps the people of any country backward, uneducated and disorder.

Gauba (1981; 438) said that, in the contemporary world, democracy has been adopted as a form of government in a large number of countries. It is not equally successful everywhere. The successful working of democracy depends upon many conditions. Some of these important conditions according to him may be described as follows:

a. National Sentiment:

Some thinkers have pointed out that national homogeneity is an essential condition for the success of democracy. What is therefore needed for the success of democracy is not the uniformity of the people as a nationality, but the sense of belonging to a single nation, inspired by the feeling of having a common history, common life in the present, common future and also a common centre of loyalty.

b. Spirit of Tolerance:

True National sentiment cannot be created without the spirit of tolerance. In fact the spirit of toleration is the keynote of democracy. Different groups are expected to co-exist in spite of

their differences. We are free to win others by persuasion and discussion not by force or black-mail. The majority is expected to accommodate minority with full dignity.

c. High Moral Character

High moral character of the people as well as leaders is another condition for the success of democracy. If people are led by their narrow selfish interests or leaders lead by mere opportunism, democracy is bound to give way to demagogy that is the practice of leaders playing with the emotions of the people instead of appealing to reason. On the contrary, a sense of morality and discipline will make the people active in solving social problems more effectively.

d. Widespread Education

An educated electorate is an asset to democracy. Generally, the people should be literate if not highly educated so that they are able to exercise their judgment in the matters of common concern. Free access to the media of communication is provided within the democratic structure itself. Only a literate, preferably an educated electorate can make best use of its facility. For the fulfillment of this condition, the state itself should provide for universal education, economic security and equality. Lack of economic security of the masses is bound to undermine the people's faith in democracy. Similarly, vast economic disparities are bound to destroy the sense of equal dignity of individuals.

2.2.4 Perspectives of Democratic Governance on Political Parties and Intra-Party Politics.

Democracy has been described as government by persons freely chosen by the governed who also hold them accountable and responsible for their actions while in government: A democratic system is one where rulers are held accountable to the ruled by means of a variety of political arrangements. Such arrangements include but are necessarily conterminous with, competitive multi-party elections held at regular intervals (Onabule, 2009:1). However, the main

attribute of democracy is that, those holding political office do not have automatic security of tenure but can be challenged and even displaced in accordance with the will of the people through a wide range of institutional mechanism. Thus, the core ideas and ingredients defining democracy are participation and accountability; that the people determine who govern them, and that those who govern give account of their stewardship through periodic election is one of the most important mechanisms for the realization of the objectives of democratization. It is also important to note that, elections are not only meant to ensure, confirm or re-affirm the legitimacy of the governors through a regular consent, but also to provide a fertile ground for democracy to thrive (Ogundiya, 2008).

For democracy to be achieved and sustained, intra-party democracy is inevitable. The political system may vary from one country to another. This variation does not dilute the significant aspect of its expectation as a system or an institution that will guarantee free and fair intra or inter party elections. Intra-Party Politics can only be described as free and fair if the conduct does not deliberately disenfranchise a population of an individual. An environment should be created for the exercise of choices by the members in electing those that should represent them at any tier or arm of the government. When the party members are unmolested and unrestricted, to exercise their choices of representations in any intra or inter-party politics, the end product of such duty should reflect the choice of the people (Mahajan, 2000).

Furthermore, rather than being a political asset and a legitimate force, since independence, intra-party politics in Nigeria, have become a political liability, a source of instability and decay. The various experiences with party politics in Nigeria have brought the worst in political thuggery and brigandage, unmediated and unrestrained violence. It was

characterized by Wanton destruction of lives and property (Yaqub, 2003). Infact, the so-called party politics in Nigeria has been linked by several Nigerian scholars to warfare (Ake, 2001).

Political parties are undoubtedly the most important of all political organizations in any democratic polity. They represent the most important medium by which aggregates and groups within a political system compete in their quest to control the institutions of governance in the state and ultimately determine the formulation and implementation of public policies. It is hardly inconceivable to think of democracy without functioning political parties and party system. Indeed political parties and party system are the heart of a stable and viable democracy in view of the numerous functions they perform in the democratic process. While political parties exhibit a high level of variation in their ideological and organizational structure, it is agreed that modern political parties perform important functions in the running of democratic states. These functions however depend largely on the type of parties in the system, their history, the party system and the electoral system (Nnoli, 2003). Indeed, the goal of political parties is to gain control of the levels of government and thus realize their policies and programmes (Odofin and Omojuwa, 2007).

Moveh (2015) provides a comprehensive study of how political parties should behave. He critically examined the criteria to be met before a political party is described as democratic or undemocratic. In his view, a party should strive to influence the formation of public opinion and to have general impact within the society. A political party should demonstrate the will to consistently take part in the political representation of the people during elections. It should be independent and permanent organization and be willing to appear in public. It sould also be an association of citizens holding individual memberships and shall have a minimum number of members so that the seriousness of its targets and the prospects success remain clear.

Though contesting and winning elections are the central role of political parties, yet they perform other functions which are also essential to the smooth functioning of a democratic system. Among other things, political parties organize and aggregate public opinion, transmit public demands to the government and vice versa, recruit political leaders, engage in oversights in the implementation of public policies, political mobilization and socialization as well as in the provision of welfare services, particularly in third world democracies (Lapalombara and Anderson, 2001; Agbaje, 1999).

Political parties also work as intermediaries between the multitude of political individuals and the policy makers in government, build influence into aggregates so that they will have greater effect on the policy makers and the policies they make. They also codify and simplify information about government, politics and policies as it moves back to the individual. It is by acting as the link between governments and the governed in today's modern democracies that political parties articulate, aggregate, protect and advance the interest of the public (Beck and Sorauf, 1992).

Political parties are the most obvious feature in a democratic system. The role of parties in modern competitive democracy is as dominant as the role of corporations in modem capitalist economies. It is indeed difficult to conceive modern democratic system without organized political parties and functioning party system. The activities of political parties permeate much of peoples' lives in democratic system (Engelmann and Mudred, 1967). Parties are not just central to elections and policy making, but under their banner, mass publics are mobilized for good or evil, revolutions are fomented, political dissidents are arrested, tortured and killed, and ideologies are turned into moral imperatives. Not only in democracies, but all conceivable

political systems appear unable to function properly without the presence of one or more parties (Lapalombara and Andersons 2001).

Political parties play significant roles in all political systems; they are however more important in plural democracies, whose health often depends on the success of parties in linking the people to the political process (Magill, 1996). The nature and functions of parties vary with the nature of governance and the characters of the people, both of which it links. Parties take different forms under different regimes. While their functions and degree of importance vary from nation to nation, party to party and from time to time (Nnoli, 2003).

Lapalombara and Anderson (2001) define political party as any political group in possession of an official label and/or a formal organization that links centre and locality present at elections and capable of placing via elections "free or non-free', candidates for elected public offices. Following this line of exposition, Ayeni-Akeke (2008), defines political parties as a relatively durable social formation which seeks offices or power in government, exhibits a well defined structure or organization, links leaders at the centres of government to a significant popular following in the political arena and its local enclaves as well as generates in-group perspectives or at least symbols of identification and/or loyalty. In tandem with Ayeni-Akeke's position, Epstein (1980) contends that party is any group, however loosely organized, that seeks to elect governmental office holders under a given label or banner.

In modern day where the dominant form of democracy is indirect or representative, political parties are the principal mechanisms for ensuring citizens' participation and representation in public policy decision-making (Agbaje, 1999); and in fact through which individuals share the democratic values. Thus, a political party is an organized group of individuals who share similar political beliefs, opinions, principles, aspirations and interests with

the sole aim of capturing political power and exercising it through the formation of government. In democracies, a political party is "a more or less permanent institution with the goal of aggregating interests, presenting candidates for elections with the purpose of controlling governments and representing such interests in government. It is thus; a major vehicle for enhancing participation in governance" (Epstein, 1980).

Political parties are saddled with the responsibility of recruiting competent individuals for political leadership through periodic elections, educating the electorate through political rallies and dissemination of information about government policies as well as serving as a vehicle for the articulation and aggregation of the interests of people. Thus, they served as the pivot upon which the entire political process revolves".

2.2.5. Conceptual and Operational Definitions of Intra-Party Politics

Political party is one of the key political institutions that enhance democratic principles in any organized society. Thus, there are a number of certain conditions that political parties have to fulfill if they are to effectively promote the health of any democratic government. One of such requirements is intra-party democracy.

Despite the increased attention to issues of intra-party democracy, the very concept of what intra-party politics consists of has remained ambiguous. The main line of contradiction stems from the differential perspectives on the long standing question of whether internal party democracy refers to the participation and voice of parties' rank-and-file or to the responsiveness of parties to voters in the large electorate. Rahat and Hazan (2001) traced this distinction back to the classic writings of Duverger and Michels. For instance according to Duverger (1954) internally democratic parties would have members and leaders who adequately represent the party voters. Robert Michels (1965) however, conceptualized internal party democracy in terms

of the processes exclusively within the parties. For him, internally democratic parties would give substantial decision making power to their members and thus grant them the capacity to control through organizational mechanisms the party leaders and parliamentarians.

Intra-Party Politics can be seen as struggle for power and relevance among members within a political party in order to effectively enhance party institutionalization, candidates' selection methods, leadership nomination procedure, decision-making and other activities of party affairs and enforce the transparency and accountability of office bearers to its rules of governance. Tyoden (1994) argues that, it is hardly to have a democratic political system without the central placement of political parties in its political process. In similar vein, Salih (2006) asserts that various democracies in recent times have faced the problem of non-democratic political parties, a situation where most parties only focus on external activities, neglecting internal planning and organisation. He argues that in determining whether a political party is non-democratic, attention should be given to party's goals and practices. This is so because some parties often ignore essential elements such as their internal structures. The idea is that parties must be democratic not only externally in their operations, but also internally in the organisational functions. The interplay between parties and democracies should reflect the parties' adherence not only to democratic goals and actions but also to internal democratic structures. It enhances a necessary viable democratic culture within the party as well as society at large. Again, internal democratic procedures may have positive effects on the representation of ideas of the electorate and may strengthen the organisation by attracting new members and creating space for fresh ideas. It can as well provide necessary vertical linkages between different deliberating spheres, and also a horizontal linkage between competing issues (Tyoden, 2002).

Therefore, our operationalisation of intra-party politics in this research is simply the struggle for power and relevance among PDP members in kaduna state especially with regards to the conduct of gubernatorial primaries which comprises the procedure for the emergence of party delegates, rules governing candidates as well as the processes used by Peoples Democratic Party (PDP), Kaduna state chapter to nominate governorship candidates for party's reprersentation at the general elections. This is simply because, the standards of intra party democracy are defined by their democratic statutes based on the spirit of national constitution, electoral Act and a coherent political program owned by its members, organizational networks in society for social and system integration and regular elections to select and circulate party leadership with moral perspectives and public vision.

2.2.6. The Critical Role of Political Parties in Democratic Dispensation:

It is unanimously agreed among scholars, politicians as well as the general public that parties are the major lubricants of democracy and democratic process due to the fact that, they provide alternative world view and a means of expressing preferences by the citizens. In fact, it is a major institution of democratic sustenance as it provides a viable means of harnessing and aggregating multitudes of opinion requisite for democratic health.

Butler (2010) buttressed this point by arguing that, the existence of vibrant political parties is a sine qua non for democratic consolidation in any polity. Political parties are essential condition that contributes to the attainment of a democratically stable polity. In the course of preparing to capture state power and exercise authority, political parties devote their attention to recruiting and training people to occupy political positions in the state. Political parties therefore, articulate alternative policies while serving as legal opposition to the party in power. Political parties are principal instruments for contesting elections; they serve as instruments of political

education, interest aggregation, political socialization and political recruitment. Parties are institutions that help organize, move or affect agenda of government, etc. In the words of Epstein (1981), a political party is an organization that sponsors candidates for political office under its name. This view is central to the functions of political parties because they must have the capacity to select or nominate among crowds that the party parades as members.

Since the start of the third wave of democratization in 1974, various multi-party systems have been introduced in new, restored and emerging democracies around the world. Today, more countries decide on their leaders through multiparty elections than ever before. The numbers of competitive democracies have increased and the number of political parties now contesting elections world-wide has also increased. Multi-party politics, however, is no guarantee of democratic consolidation and development. Multi-party politics may empower vulnerable groups, increase transparency, mediate conflict and achieve redistribution of income to the poor but may also subvert the broader process of democratization by empowering already dominant elites, marginalizing minorities and, perhaps, most seriously, mobilizing ethnic, regional and religious groups against each other. As a result, there is a growing trend for developing democracies to attempt to shape their party systems by regulating the way parties can form, organize and behave (Reilly, 2008).

Yaqub (2002), argues that the functions of parties that are in opposition (or tinclude educating, articulating and aggregating issues that the parties feel the public is not well informed about or which they want to make their position clear. "Therefore, it is on the basis of competently performing these roles that a political party can stand a good chance of displacing and, thereby taking power from a political party currently in the saddle". Mahajan (2000) observes that a political party can best be described as an association of people who hold similar

views about what should be a community's social and economic priorities and come together to establish these priorities by gaining control of the machinery of government.

Thus, the common theme about the above definitions is their very nature; political parties are representative institutions that endow regimes with legitimacy by providing ideologies that represent social, economic and political interest. They produce leaders who through democratic elections form the machinery of government.

Odofin and Omojuwa (2007: 16) emphasize therefore that it is the desire to occupy the seat of government or control state power that distinguishes a political party from an interest group. In their view, a political party is an organized group of individuals seeking to seize the power of government in order to appropriate the benefits being derived from such control. Nevertheless, in as much as political parties are necessary in democracy, they are in some instances obstructions and could endanger democracy because of their vulnerability to conflicts and manipulations (Odofin and Omojuwa, 2007:16).

The above argument simply tells us that the desire of political parties to occupy and control state power could successfully be achieved if the parties have a standard means of socializing and recruiting candidates to occupy such offices and that, democratic principles can hardly be achieved without functioning political parties playing a significant role by practicing the principles and policies they advocate. In democratic societies, political parties are indispensable voluntary and informal associations of society, where people share commonly understood values, customs and attitudes to their role in politics. The roles performed by Political Parties include:

Furthermore, political recruitment is another critical role performed by any political party. This refers to the induction of individuals into different roles in the political system, and

also selecting them for membership into the political system. Modern political system cannot function without the mobilization and deployment of highly qualified and dedicated individuals of various kinds- engineers, doctors, teachers, scientist administrators and soldiers to operate the institutions of the state. Political Parties seek to control the governing apparatus by proposing candidates for political offices. This is elemental to all the classic definitions of a political party. Thus many of the parties' internal structures, like the youth groups and internal party offices, are created to identify and nurture future candidates. Political recruitment refers, properly speaking, to the processes by which political leaders and other generalist politicians, who undertake the task of identifying and coordinating societal goals.

As a matter of fact, some provisions of the electoral Act need to be amended and that, Nigerian political parties have contravened most of these provisions especially with regard to the observance of their internal democratic procedure that was why many people described their activities as anti-democratic. This is simply because, rather than being a ladder for practicing democracy, most political parties became stumbling blocks to democratic principles and values. For instance, the nomination fee and other various levies that were paid by the various candidates as provide by this Act are quite high that many who had genuine interest to run for elective offices were themed out of the exercise. It is unimaginable to expect an unemployed and or retiree to find the sum of about one million naira to obtain the nomination form to House of assembly. This amount is expected atleast to be kept aside for the running cost of campaign advert and other sundry matters. There was a particular instance where a very promising aspirant in Zaria Local Government Area of Kaduna state who had to defect to an opposition party on account of inability to raise the nomination fees. In some cases they had to borrow or pay few days before the screening exercise. When this situation is considered against the background of

the poverty level in Nigeria that is put at 70% of the population nomination fee is outrageous. In fact the issue of poverty reared its ugly head all through the entire exercise. Most of the delegates were more interested in who could be ready to offer them more money for their votes. In this kind of situation it is not difficult to conclude that the quality of the candidates emerging from the exercise had been sacrificed (See appendix 19 for more details).

Not only that, the Electoral Act is also clear on the security of lives during elections, but the way and manner the security issues were handled during the entire exercise deny the emergence of credible candidates from the primaries across the country. The use of thugs and various weapons were overwhelming. The number of deaths recorded as well as injuries of unimaginable proportion. The violence witnessed during primaries has continued unabated and made citizens within the country to live under perpetual fear in every round of election. This practice did not only lead to voters' apathy, the low level of prospective aspirants, but also drove away women folks from active party politics. These were made possible because either the Commission was sterile or the Law enforcement agencies reneged in their responsibilities because the Electoral Act is clear on this issue.

2.2.7. Measuring Intra Party Politics

Intra party politics is a very broad term describing a wide range of methods including the participation of members in party deliberations and decision making. It is democracy within the party and the extent to which a party subscribes to and abides by the basic and universal democratic tenets (Scarrow, 2005). Some indices are very essential in determining the health of any intra party politics. According to Salih (2006), there are three indicators for judging a democratic political party, these include; equal participation, inclusiveness in decision making and party institutionalization.

Closely related to the above is the view of Manning (2005), who opines that, Intra-party politics has two indicators, namely; the conduct of free, fair and regular internal elections on democratic bases and equal participation of all members in decision making affecting their party. These indices are very essential for creating an open and deliberative Intra-Party Politics in any modern democracy.

Mainwaring and Scully (1995) in their studies of Latin American countries examine the ingredients of internal democracy or party system institutionalization. These are:

a. When the rules governing party competition are commonly observed, widely understood and confidently anticipated;
b. When there is stability in the number of candidates as well as parties competing for office.
c. When Parties have strongly rooted in society, affecting political preferences, attracting stable electoral support and demonstrating continuity in ideological terms;
d. When Political elites recognize the legitimacy of electoral competition as the route to office;
e. When Party organization exists independently of powerful leaders, with well resourced nationwide organizations and well established internal procedures for recruitment to party offices.

Furthermore, Rahat and Hazan (2001) also observed that, good and democratic candidate selection methods should provide answer to the following questions; what has been happening to the selectorate, candidacy, decentralization, voting versus appointment?

These are four indices according to them to be used in measuring the democratic health of any candidate selection procedure. In their view, the purest party primary is where party members' votes alone decide the composition and rank of the candidates. Less pure types allow the party members to select the party candidates from short-listed, unopposed or

consensus candidates determined either by party agencies or by a nominating committee and/or allow party headquarters to veto certain candidates. Secondly, Candidacy addresses the question of who can him/her self as a candidate of a particular party. Every card carrying member is eligible to contest and stand as a party's candidate.

Thirdly, Decentralisation based on territorial mechanisms is also very essential in order to ensure regional and local representation. In many European cases, the selectorate at the district level plays crucial role in candidate selection. Therefore, National Party agencies (National Working Committee in case of Nigeria) cannot veto a candidacy that is determined at the district level and territorial representation is taken into account in each district. Fourthly, A candidate must be determined exclusively by votes and not for example, by an agreed-upon list or an allocation that is ratify by a unanimous or majority vote; and second, the voting results must be presented officially to justify and legitimize the candidacy. When candidate is determined without fulfilling these conditions, we refer to this as an appointment system. In a purest appointment system, candidates are appointed with no need for approval by any party agency except the nominating organ itself (i.e National Assembly in case of Nigeria). In a pure voting system, all candidates are selected through a voting procedure and no other selectorate can change the composition of the list.

A cursory look at these criteria will reveal that party systems in most African countries are both a negation and violation of these fundamental precepts. In Africa rules governing competitions are skewed in favour of incumbents; parties are banned or selectively unbanned; they lack clear cut or differentiated ideological positions and rely on patronage from members in government to survive. For these reasons, parties out of power in African states increasingly find it difficult to survive. And it is common wisdom that the demise of party systems, especially the

competitive type, as was witnessed in many African states in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, is a recipe for political instability. In Africa rather than deepen party systems, or consolidate democracy, what has been enriched is the idea that the only way to protect one's own interest is to acquire and hold on to a monopoly of power, to the exclusion of other groups.

Therefore, the questionnaires and interviews administered for this research work were mainly targeted at capturing the above indicators in order to examine intra-party politics in Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) with particular reference to gubernatorial primaries of the party from 1999-2015.

Reilly (2008) posits that, "Political parties in Africa are poorly institutionalized with limited membership, weak policy capacity and shifting bases of support. They often rely on narrow personal, regional or ethnic ties, rather than reflecting society as a whole". He further maintains that, "they are typically and organizationally thin and insufficiently funded, coming to life only at election time. They seldom have coherent ideologies or policy agenda; they are frequently unable to ensure discipline and collective action in parliament".

Corroborating the above therefore, Odofin and Omojuwa (2007), maintained that, Nigerian Political Parties are yet to be transformed for two reasons: Firstly; They are not organized according to any distinct ideology, principles or programmes. Indeed, all the three dominant political parties which contested the 1999 elections could hardly be defined theoretically as political parties. They were more or less pressure groups. Secondly, they are neither coherent nor focused. They lack internal democracy and party discipline. They have not been able to offer the electorate real choice.

Omotola (2010) is of the view that, "political competitions in unstable societies often gravitate around sectarian, exclusive identities or geographic bases". This point was further

buttressed by Yaqub (2003) when he posits that, "parties and elections can exacerbate differences and perceived identities, either as a result of a sense of communal insecurity or manipulation by elites who gain from the mobilization of sectarianism and polarization. In these circumstances, political elites often try to outbid each other on exclusive sectarian grounds, thus dragging political agenda to the extreme, leading to conflicts". Democratic practices do not automatically resolve deep-seated problems, particularly in societies traumatized by conflict. In fact, there is a danger that liberal peace building could exacerbate or prolong divisions; among political groupings.

In Nigeria, the 2002 Electoral Act, section 75 provides that every registered political party shall give the commission at least 21 days notice of any convention, conference or meeting convened for the purpose of electing members of its executive committees or other governing bodies or nominating candidates for elective office. INEC also reserves the right, with or without prior notice to the political party, to monitor or attend any convention, congress, and conference or meeting convened for the purpose of electing members of the executive or other governing bodies, nominating candidates or approving a merger with other political parties. Section 78(2) of the Electoral Act also authorizes INEC to examine the accounts and financial records of all the political parties and make such reports public for scrutiny. This is the more effective as the state gives financial subvention to political parties based on certain criteria, and expects to be able to monitor how those funds are spent.

However, in spite of all these provisions, political parties mostly do not conform to legal codes of internal democracy, whether at the level of electoral regulations or at that of their own internal party rules. That was why Ayoade (2008) laments that; in most of the West African countries, the level of trust people have in political parties is mostly very low because intra-party

relations are very poor. As the Nigeria Country Report clearly observes, 'The existence of party caucuses, the monetization of the party nomination process and ill defined screening process for candidates by INEC ensures that party members do not ultimately, in some cases, nominate their candidates'.

Indeed, in Nigeria, the parties have claimed exclusive rights over their internal processes through court action. During the 2006/2007 party primaries for the election of party candidates, the party leadership virtually appreciated the space and conducted selection, not election. Most of the political parties grossly manipulated the primaries, and in many cases the results of the primaries were not respected. Several candidates who did not win the primaries were eventually selected by the leaders of the party, claiming a spurious logic of party supremacy in the selection of party candidates to compete for general elections. One such reported incident took place in Imo State, where the candidate who polled the highest number of votes at the party primaries of the PDP for the governorship candidacy of the party in the state, Senator Ararume, was dropped for the candidate who came 14th at the primaries, Charles Ugwu. There is a general trend for the party congresses and primaries in Nigeria to be characterized by a lack of internal democratic conduct.

In a report released in June 2005, INEC indicate all the political parties for financial recklessness by not keeping proper accounting records. The PDP and the All Nigeria People's party (ANPP)-two leading political parties in Nigeria-were indicted for having 'no proper accounting records' in spite of the huge inflow of resources to them.

The issue of internal party democracy and the effective functioning of political parties, as noted above, is a major challenge to political parties in all countries in West Africa. There is a

democracy deficit in the internal running of the parties as powerful interest and forces often control their internal mechanisms and processes.

To remedy the afore-mentioned problem and also to address the discrepancies witnessed in the 2007 elections, the late President Yar'adua constituted a panel under the leadership of retired Chief Justice of the federation, Justice Lawal Uwais to review the Nigerian electoral system and proffer a solution to the problem. On August 2007 The Electoral Reform Committee released its report. In the report, additional provisions were made to compliment the 1999 Constitution and the Electoral Act of 2006. The report maintains that, any political association wishing to be registered as a political party must meet some criteria and regulations that will be made from time to time by the INEC or the political parties registration and regulation commission (Omoruyi, 2007).

The report further stated that, political parties must have identifiable ideologies and ideals, and should be encouraged to establish think tanks at all level to generate ideas. To avoid Godfartherism, parochial tendencies, the report encourages policy-based politics as against personality-based politics. Furthermore, to avoid confusion and replication, the report encourages parties to distinguish themselves from each other based on substantive issues of concern to voters rather than the personality of their leadeprs. In an effort to avoid intra-party conflicts, the report suggest that, there should be no dual leadership of political parties and primary elections should be open, monitored and their rules enforced by the electoral bodies.

With regard to funding, the report argued that, for the purpose of transparency and accountability, political parties shall publicly disclose to INEC all sources of funding including donations (ERC, 2008). In order to avoid crisis of legitimacy, the report encourages parties to establish internal machinery for determining nominations of candidates in party elections and

also for resolving disparity and that, going to court should be the last resort when all machineries are exhausted. On enhancing internal democracy, the report encourages intra-party reforms through democratic means. Party conventions, congresses and meetings should be held regularly and free from undue influence. Party organs should play active roles in determining who is to be nominated to contest for positions in the party appropriate to their levels. On the contentious issue of cross-carpeting, the electoral reform maintains that under no circumstances could there be cross-carpeting. Despite the above mentioned criteria, still political parties in Nigeria are engulfed in intra-party conflicts.

Thus; this research work established the facts that, intra-party politics can never promote a healthy democratic order if failed to conform strictly to the rules governing their internal democracy. In fact, many countries, especially in Africa, have no legal stipulations or codified guidelines on how the parties should manage their affairs internally. In a few countries like Burkina Faso, Liberia, Ghana and Nigeria, etc., there are regulations on how the parties should organize themselves, especially in terms of ensuring internal democracy in the selection of party officials to run the parties and candidates for elections, for example, the Nigerian Electoral Act (2002), states that, "there shall be held, at least, every six years, national convention by every registered political party in an orderly manner to elect its national governing body to serve for a period not exceeding six years. Internal democracy or intra-party politics and effective functioning of political parties in all West African Countries are compounding issues. What is manifesting is a frequent democratic deficit in the internal running of the parties as powerful interests and forces often control their internal mechanisms and processes. These, lead to intra-party conflicts that potentially limit the prospects of democratic processes in any country.

Party primaries among most Nigeria's political parties are not operating within norms of democratic principles. Various political parties have failed to open up their parties to all party members who are eligible and want to run for office in their party primaries. Some candidates were imposed on the party without election and due process. Some of the candidates allegedly won via so-called consensus option. Some of the governors have unprecedented sway over their state party machinery to the point of mandating the delegates to vote for a particular candidate. The governors' high-handed approach over their state party has made it difficult for democracy to take root at the state and local level. Some House of Assembly members who disagree with their state governors faces impeachment, or suspension from the House, for instance, the impeachment of Kaduna State House of Assembly Speaker in 2013 is a good example. Some Governors dissolves Local Government Areas where the chairman appears to be too independent and some refuse to conduct local government elections just for their personal ends.

2.2.8 Political Parties and Intra-Party Politics in Nigeria

The history of political parties in Nigeria dates back to 1923 when, with the introduction of the Nigerian legislative council, and when the franchise for participation was given to the inhabitants of the two towns, Lagos and Calabar. The granting of the franchise led to the formation of the Nigerian National Democratic Party in 1923, and subsequently in 1938, to the formation of the Nigerian Youth Movement. Their influence barely extended beyond the immediate environment of Ibadan and Lagos. Parties properly so called are formally associations which compete through the electoral process to control the personnel and policies of government (Dudley, 1982).

Generally, political parties are formed by groups of like minded individuals who are interested in shaping society in a particular direction. Political Parties are expected to recruit and

mobilize members which subscribe to their world views and motivations; recruit leaderships and train them for governance. In a liberal democratic system, political parties undertake the education and untiring orientation of their members about the appropriate skills and attitudes which will sustain the rules and regulations of good governance and of democratic game.

The parties that emerged in Nigeria between 1998 and 1999 were characterized by undemocratic practices and lack transparency. At best, political parties should nurture and organize the expression of political interests and opinions. Under the current Nigerian conditions however, most political parties are merely zero issue alliances of influential individuals and small groups who are able to control and often enough, manipulate party structures, candidatures and even the electoral process itself. Most parties are instruments in the hands of political entrepreneurs who invest huge amounts of money and expect concurrent rewards on such investment. Besides fueling corruption, this state of affairs is decidedly non-transparent and undemocratic. It impedes the emergence of a party system that focuses around issues and policies, rather than personality only (Olurode, 2004).

2.2.8.1 Intra-Party Politics in the First Republic

Among political parties of the pre independence period up to the first republic, considerable harmony was generated in intra-party politics especially at the early stage of their existence. It is evidently clear that, when Sir Hugh Clifford Constitution of 1922 introduced the "Elective Principle" in Nigeria and Herbert Macaulay followed up with the Nigerian National Democratic Party (NNDP) which contested and won all three seats allocated to Lagos in the 1922 Legislative Council Elections, you could say that the experiment was off to a good and promising start**.** The Nigerian Youth Movement (NYM) was also founded in 1938 initially as

Lagos Youth Movement, was a pan-Nigerian political organization and drew its membership across the country. However, struggle for leadership and ethnicity eventually led to its break-up.

The successor, National Council of Nigeria and Cameroon later renamed National Council of Nigerian Citizens (NCNC), was formed in 1944, but only came into prominence between 1946 and 1947 led by Herbert Macaulay, a veteran nationalist leader, and on his death in 1947 he was succeeded by Nnamdi Azikiwe, a journalist and newspaper proprietor. The NCNC caught the imagination of the people when its leadership travelled round the country rallying opposition to the Richards constitution and certain legislative proposals then before the Legislative Council. In furtherance of its opposition, the party led a delegation to London to meet the Secretary of State for the Colonies but its efforts met with little success. Thereafter the Party went into relative abeyance until it was given a new lease of life as a result of the coming into being of the Macpherson constitution (Dudley, 1982).

The NCNC has been described as a “mass party” in that unlike 'elite parties', its membership was open to everyone and it derived its finances from the contributions of its members. In actual fact, however, most of the parties then have tended to rely either directly or indirectly on the government of the region which they control to provide the bulk of their finances. In the case of the NCNC, the main source of its funds was 'loans' from the African Continental Bank (ACB) a bank whose principal shareholder was Nnamdi Azikiwe (and Zik Enterprises Ltd, a company again largely owned by Nnamdi Azikiwe) but whose assets were later to be taken over by the East regional government when the ACB was almost on the point of liquidation. From 1951 until the military coup of January 1966, the NCNC controlled the

government of the Eastern region and for much of the same period formed the main opposition in the Western House of Assembly. Between 1954 and 1957 and from 1959 to 1966, in coalition with the NPC (Northern Peoples' Congress) it formed the Federal government (Dudley, 1982).

Unlike the NPC and the Action Group (AG), the other two main parties of the First Republic, the NCNC drew much of its electoral support from its association with various interest groups. In the east, it relied largely on the Ibo State Union, a federation of diverse clan unions of Ibo-speaking peoples, for mobilizing the electorate. In the North, its support derived from the alliance it formed with the Northern Elements Progressive Union (NEPU) and with the Bornu Youth Movement before the latter switched its support in 1958 to the AG. In the West, the NCNC derived its strength from its association with such cultural unions as the Edo Youth Union (Association of Edo, i.e. Bini-speaking peoples, youths) and the Urhobo Progressive Union. And on the labour front, the party sought support from organizations such as the Railway Workers Union and the African Tin Mine Union. This eclectic approach to electoral support meant that the NCNC had to be different things to different groups, and hence its ideological orientation had perforce to be essentially pragmatic. Nevertheless, were one to characterize its position within a left'/'right' ideological spectrum, the NCNC would be placed to the left of the AG and the NPC.

The second major party was the AG, which was formed in 1948 and was, itself an offshoot of the Yoruba cultural association, Egbe Omo Oduduwa (Association of the Children of Oduduwa, the mythical ancestor of the Yoruba speaking peoples) started in London around 1945 by Obafemi Awolowo who was then a law student. Awolowo provided the rationale for the Egbe in his book, Path to Nigerian Freedom which was published with a

Foreword written by Dame Margery Perhain. The argument was straightforward enough, it was that in a heterogeneous society such as Nigeria's, political stability could be achieved only if ethnic conglomerates were grouped together to form a single self-administering political unit. Put differently, this is to say for example that all Yoruba-speaking peoples should form one single political entity and only by such means can the cultural heritage of the different ethnic groups be protected and safeguarded and political advance assured. When therefore the AG emerged from the Egbe, it was with the purpose of espousing the notion of cultural nationalism. But while such a move could assure the AG the prospect of control of the Yoruba-speaking areas, it was not likely to command support in other areas. Hence the ideological image of the AG had to be modified and the AG did this by promoting a welfarist programme encapsulated in the party's slogan of 'life more abundant' and 'freedom for all' (Dudley, 1982).

Be that as it may, the AG was essentially a 'caucus party', which derived its active support from the business class of merchants, transporters and contractors and the educated elite. This was clearly brought out, for example, in the way the party obtained its finances. The 'Coker Commission Report' for example, showed that to secure the resources the party needed to contest the 1959 federal elections, the party had had to found the National Investment and Properties Company (NIPG), a company controlled wholly by top AG functionaries, through which government funds from the National Bank (owned and controlled by the Western government)., the Western Regional Development Corporation and the West Regional Marketing Board, were channeled to the coffers of the party. Between 1958 and 1960, some six and a half million pounds of public funds found its way through the NIPC to the AG treasury. In actual fact, the funds provided by business interests had enabled the

AG to buy its way into forming the government of the Western region in 1951 and devices such as the NIPC were little more than ways of repaying the business interests which had invested in the AG in its early days (Dudley, 1982). .

For all the AG's cultural traditionalism, its hold on the electorate of the Western region was not as strong as the NCNC's in the East or the NPC's in the North. Ibadan, the Western region's capital city, remained lost to the AG, at least until 1958, as were such centres as Ilesha, Akure and Owo. And other than in the 1959 federal elections, at no time did the AG poll up to 50 per cent of the votes in the West. One explanation for this tenuous hold lies in the historical animosities between the various Yoruba kingdoms, but to go into that would be beyond the scope of this chapter. However, the AG did secure some support in other areas besides the West, particularly in the Benue province of the Northern region and in the Calabar, Ogoja and Rivers provinces of the East, areas with marked separatist tendencies which the AG effectively exploited. Throughout the years of the first republic, 1960-66, the AG formed the opposition in the federal Legislature and before that was a member of the coalition federal government in the period 1951-53 (by constitutional provision) and from 1957 to 1959 when at the invitation of the NPC/NCNC ruling coalition, the AG joined the federal executive in the attempt of the ruling coalition to create the consensus needed to secure Nigeria's independence. Relative to the NCNC and the NPC, the AG could ideologically be described as a 'centre' party, though the party leadership did attempt to move to the left during the period 1959-66 when the party proclaimed it was subscribing to the ideology of 'democratic socialism', a proclamation which in 1962 was to cause a split within the party, a split which initiated the series of events which was to culminate in the military coup of 1966 (Nnoli, 2003).

The third, and the most influential, party of the first republic was the NPC, which could be said to have been formed in 1951 and somewhat like the AG, was an offshoot of a 'cultural' association, the Jam'iyyar Mutanen Arewa (JMA) (the association of peoples of the North). The JMA was formed in 1948 by members of the North's intelligentsia who wanted a forum within which the political change then taking place in the country. An earlier attempt, also by members of the intelligentsia, to found a political party with a base in the North-the Northern Elements Progressive Association (NEPA) had led to most of the founding members losing their jobs in the bureaucracy and in the native authorities or being imprisoned. (Dudley, 1982). To escape the fate of the founders of NEPA, leaders of the JMA had to call their organization a 'cultural association'. After the indirect elections of 1951, the newly elected members of the Northern House of Assembly, most of them native authority functionaries and a number of whom were also members of the JMA decided to proclaim themselves members of the 'Northern People's Congress' and in a sense the JMA was thus converted into the NPC. The NPC, unlike the NCNC or the AG, could thus be properly called a 'parliamentary party'. But more importantly, because most members of the NPC were also native authority functionaries, the NPC became closely wedded to the structure of the native authority system of the North and since the NA system was the only effective administrative system in the North at that period, the party and the administration became one and the same thing and the NPC could thus proudly take as its motto: 'One North; One People, Irrespective of Religion, Rank or Tribe'. The party was the only party with a restricted membership, this being open only to 'people of Northern Nigerian descent' as the party's constitution was later to specify (Dudley, 1982)..

The NPC's leader, Alhaji Sir Ahmadu Bello, the Sardauna of Sokoto, was the Premier of the North until his death in the military coup of 1966; in this the NPC was unlike the AG whose leader, Chief Obafemi Awolowo, left the Premiership of the West regional government to become Leader of the Opposition in the federal legislature after the 1959 elections and the NCNC, whose leader, Dr Nnamdi Azikiwe, left the Premiership of the East regional government to become first, Leader of the Senate, the federal second chamber, in 1960, then Governor-General in 1962 and a year later, first president of the Republic of Nigeria. The fact that Alhaji Sir Ahmadu Bello remained the Premier of the North, gave his deputy, Alhaji Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, the opportunity to become the first and only Prime Minister of the Federation of Nigeria", a position the latter held until his death in the military coup of 1966. From 1954 to 1966 the NPC remained the dominant coalition partner in the federal government but the preference of the leader of the party to remain Premier of the North showed where the NPC's priorities lay with respect to the Nigerian political process and also where ultimate power in the federation resided, i.e., power resided in the North (Dudley, 1982). .

There were, besides the three main parties, numerous other smaller parties such as the Northern Elements Progressive Union (NEPU), the United Middle Belt Congress (UMBC), the United Nigeria Independence Party (UNIP), the Bornu Youth Movement (BYM), the Kano Peoples Party (KPP) and the Midwest Democratic Front (MDF). But these were highly localized parties, based essentially on specific interests and whose main significance was that they provided avenues for one or the other of the three dominant parties, through alliances by means of which they could extend their electoral reach into regions outside their principal sphere of influence. Thus, for instance, the AG by entering into an alliance with the UMBC

was able to reach into the North while the NPC succeeded in extending its electoral appeal into the Midwest through its alliance with the MDF. For the smaller parties, entering into an alliance with a major party had two advantages: first, an alliance assured the smaller party some access to funds which such parties lacked; and secondly, it enabled party stalwarts to enjoy some form of party patronage such as being appointed to the management boards of government-controlled parastatals (Dudley, 1982, Oyediran and Nwosu, 2005). Electorally, however, they were of not much significance since, taken together, at no election did these parties poll as much as 15 per cent of the votes.

Nnoli contends that:

> Under the condition of congruence between the interest of the political parties and the ethnic association, increased political activity led to the politicization of ethnicity. The struggle for political power became interpreted in ethnic terms. It becomes a struggle for the hegemony of the various regional factions of the petty bourgeoisie and comprador bourgeoisie (Nnoli, 2003; 23).

He added that political parties of the first republic were found on ethnic basis in order to achieve ethnic interest. Hence these parties could not contribute effectively to the achievement of national integration during that republic. For example, he states that, Action Group was inspired by ethnic chauvinism and regional parochialism (Nnoli, 2003: 115). He also argued that, the ethnic and regional orientation of the AG forced the NCNC to increasingly assume ethnic and regional character while NPC started as the political vanguard of the North. The formation and operation of the political parties which existed during that period was characterized and engineered along ethnic line. The collapse of the first republic was largely attributed to this factor.

Perhaps what was accountable for the notable silence of intra-party conflict at this period could partly be explained by the context to which they emerged and the goals they sought to achieve. Essentially, parties at this period emerged within the context of nationalist struggles for independence therefore, all attempts were made to achieve maximum mobilization of the citizenry to end colonialism and achieve self-rule. Achieving this involves downplaying, where need be, all forms of segmental interests and a focus on issues of common interest. Thus, as Yaqub (2002) remarks, despite their limitations, the parties did not fail completely to canvass for votes, to recruit members from diverse religious, ethnic and communal backgrounds, to become successful at the polls and thus institute government structures at various levels.

However, with the approach of independence, there was a total change in the operating environment of the political parties defined by the certainty of independence and the need for new set of leaders to emerge among the nationalists. The change no doubt brought about serious changes in the nature and form of intra and interparty relations. On the one hand, it was the struggle for who controls the center and on the other hand, it was the struggle for relevance, regional hegemony and overbearing control over party machineries by party leaders. Thus, intra-party relations began to assume a conflict dimension, leading, at times, to carpet crossings as was the case with a member of the NCNC in the Western House of Assembly who cross carpeted to the AG in the late 1950 (Okoosi-Simbine, 2004).

On the impact of the operating environment on intra party relations in Nigeria's first republic, Tyoden (2002) argues that, the criss-crossing of relationships and personalities between the NPC and the traditional socio-political order in the old Northern Nigeria gave the party some level of cohesion and a unity of purpose lacking in other two parties. Intra-party differences in the NPC therefore never got beyond acceptable limits because of the continuous influence of the

traditional authorities in the life of the party. But even with these, the party could not detach itself from some minor internal squabbles. Hence, a member, Ibrahim Imam broke away from the NPC and formed Borno Youth Movement (BYM).

The situation was different with the other major parties. In the NCNC, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, the leader of the NCNC was battling to assert his authority in the face of challenges from lieutenants such as Professor Eyo Ita and Kingsley Mbadiwe. In 1953, a fall-out of the sit-tight ministers' crisis in the NCNC is often cited against Zik for allegedly unseating Eyo Ita as a non-Igbo leader of governments' business in Eastern region (Onabule, 2009). While the sit-tight ministers' crisis rocked the NCNC and the dissidents (admittedly for political purposes) were supported by Awolowo against Zik, a supposed leader of (NCNC) government business (as regional premiers were then known) Professor Eyo Ita openly supported the sit-tight ministers against their party. At that stage, a show-down was inevitable to test Eyo Ita's popularity if he was supported by NCNC members in Eastern House of Assembly. A vote of no confidence in his continued leadership (of government business in the East) was moved on the floor of the house and almost unanimously carried. Zik had to assume leadership to restore party discipline and political stability. Again, in 1958, another revolt led by Kingsley Ozumba Mbadiwe broke out against Nnamdi Azikiwe's leadership in the NCNC. Mbadiwe was egged on by Obafemi Awolowo's Action Group. Collapse of Mbadiwe's challenge led to his expulsion from NCNC. He then formed Democratic Party of Nigeria and the Cameroon. (DPNC) (Ogundiya, 2008).

In the Action Group (AG), Chief Obafemi Awolowo, the leader of the party, was to struggle it out with the likes of Chief Samuel Akintola, who was the deputy leader of the AG.

Various historical accounts abound on the circumstances that led to the rift between the two political leaders. While some historians claimed that the genesis of the political crisis in Western Nigeria began with the sacking of Chief J.F Odunjo as the Chairman, Western Region Marketing Board by Chief Akintola over interfamily squabbles, others attributed the offshoot of the crisis to hard line stance of the AG leaders over differences that could amicably be resolved within the party (Faromoti, 2011). According to a publication of The Human Rights Law Service (HURILAWS), the AG crisis of 1962 arose primarily from disagreement over matters of ideology between Chief Awolowo, the party's leader and Chief S.L Akintola, his deputy. Akintola was expelled for anti-party activities, among other reasons, and he went on to form the United Peoples Party (UPP). The UPP and some members of NCNC and the Nigerian National Democratic Party (NNDP) formed an alliance, which controlled the government of the Western Region until the Western Regional elections of 1965.

Another account, states that "Awolowo favoured the adoption of democratic socialism as party policy, following the lead of Kwame Nkrumah's regime in Ghana. This radical ideology that Awolowo expressed was seen as a bid to make the AG an interregional party that drew support across the country from educated younger voters." Akintola, in reaction, attempted to retain the support of conservative party elements. He called for better relations with the Northern Peoples' Congress (NPC) and an all party federal coalition that would remove the AG from opposition and give its leaders greater access to power (Library of Congress Country Studies, cited in The National Mirror). Awolowo's majority expelled Akintola from the party. The then Governor of the Western Region, the Ooni of Ife, Sir Adesoji Aderemi demanded Akintola's resignation as Premier and named Alhaji Dauda Adegbenro as his successor. Crisis erupted in the Western Nigeria and this earned the region the appellation "Wild Wild West." This action

resulted in some legal battles as Akintola challenged his removal as the Premier of the region. Specifically, Sir Aderemi, had removed Chief Akintola from the office of Premier, and appointed Alhaji Dauda Adegbenro as the Premier. Akintola's supporters went wild and unleashed violence in the region while supporters of Awolowo reportedly retaliated. Akintola sued Adegbenro and the AG leadership, and the Federal Supreme Court decided that he had been wrongly removed (Faramoti, cited in The National Mirror, 2011).In fact, the AG crises between Awolowo and Akintola not only led to alignment of the latter with the NPC but equally degenerated into a serious political conflict that engulfed the whole of the Western Region leading to declaration of a state of emergency there (Akinwunmu, 2005).

2.2.8.2 Intra-Party Politics in the Second Republic

In Nigeria's second republic (1979-1983), five political associations were registered formally as political parties to contest for various political offices. These were the National Party of Nigeria (NPN), Unity Party of Nigeria, People Redemption Party (PRP), Great Nigeria People's party (GNPP), National People's Party (NPP). A sixth one, Nigeria Advanced Party (NAP), was registered in 1982.

However, as noted by Yaqub (2002), from a variety of analytical standpoints, contrary to the expectations of the drafters of the constitution and the military rulers, most of these parties resembled the ethno-regional ones of the pre-1966 period although legally parties were required to transcend ethno-regional bases. The only exceptions were the NAP, which proclaimed itself a "new breed" party, and the NPN, which despite its regional antecedents, was probably the only national party in Nigeria. The UPN was a resurrection of the AG with its Yoruba core; the NPP was a rejuvenation of the NCNC with its Igbo core and strands of middle-belt support; the PRP

recalled Kano's NEPU; and the GNPP, which appeared initially to be a new minority's formation, had its strength mainly within the North-eastern part of the country. Apart from the PRP, which flickered as a radical party, and the populist NAP, the other parties appeared to be parties of the wealthy class or those who aspired to join it, for which politics was a means of enriching themselves and consolidating their material base. In terms of intra party relations, this varied considerably from one party to another.

Among the second republic parties, the ruling National Party of Nigeria (NPN), Unity Party of Nigeria (UPN), Nigerian Peoples Party (NPP), Peoples Redemption Party (PRP) and the Great Nigerian Peoples Party (GNPP), succession crisis was as endemic as it was at inter-party contest for power. Politicians desperately jostled for both party and public positions at an alarming rate. Their desperation was manifested in the increasing factions that grew within the parties. Even within the National Assembly, Senators decamped from one party to another; yet insisted on carrying on with the mandate they won through another party from which they defected.

The second republic ruling party, the NPN also faced succession crisis. That was in its bid to hold its national convention (Osaghae, 2009). The party was factionalised between various groups. One group canvassed for a change of baton from the incumbent Party Chairman, Chief Augustus Meredith Adisa Akinloye to any other person from another part of the country, particularly the North in order to pave the way for the emergence of a southern candidate to bear the party's flag in the 1983 election. Another group fought to maintain the status quo by sustaining Akinloye as NPN Chairman to ensure that Shagari was fielded for his second term in 1983.

Similar skirmish was to be found in the UPN in which a Joint Action Committee had emerged ostensibly to challenge the existing order within the party. Such a crisis reared its head too in the PRP which was sharply divided between those who remained loyal to the late Mallam Aminu Kano and others who 'rebelled' against his leadership thus, we have the 'Yan Santsi' and the 'Yan Tabo' factions. Neither the GNPP led by the late Alhaji Waziri Ibrahin nor the NPP led by the late Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, was spared of similar stratifying forces (Onabule, 2009).

For the NPP, the greatest challenge came from its members who had benefited from its romance with the NPN in a working accord the two parties had reached in 1979. By the time the accord collapsed, the attraction of ministerial and similar appointments was so strong that the erstwhile NPP stalwarts opted to abandon NPP for NPN.

Obviously, to a large extent the intra-party crisis remained localised. Yet they did not go without making far-reaching effects on national politics and stability. The character of these intra-party crises later became manifest in the crisis that marred the process for selecting party candidates at the elections. Those who were dissatisfied with the process defected to the leading rival party in their states, mostly the NPN.

2.2.8.3 Intra-Party Politics in the Third Republic

There is no doubt, that experiences with political parties of the second republic greatly influenced the emergence and course of partisan politics in the third republic. Much of the maneuvers surrounding the emergence of the parties have been documented in detail by scholars (Yaqub 2002). Owoeye (2010) reiterated that what transpired during the General Babangida transition programme was a good case of study for political scientists. The programme was controlled by the military high command which decreed two parties National Republican Convention (NRC) and Social Democratic Party (SDP) founded on the superficial ideology of

‘‘a little to the right’’ and ‘’a little to the left’’. Of course, as stated by Owoeye (2010) the palace intellectuals the General assign to midwife the transition had in mind the promulgation by fiat of centrist ideology devoid of excesses. The internal democratic practices were regulated by the military high command which dictated who it wanted to participate in the programme; it retained the power to disqualify on security ground whoever it did not want. This led to banning and unbanning of certain categories of politicians on the pretext that it was trying to institute ‘new breed’ political culture founded on untainted politicians. This to a larger extent greatly affected intra-party relations in the second republic and how party officials behaved. What is perhaps of concern to us here is the fact that circumstances of their birth (being state imposed) and government insistence on separation of party office from government positions greatly impacted on intra-party relations. This is because the idea that the parties are state imposed, greatly eliminated the overbearing influence of leaders and/or founders (personality influence) as witnessed in the previous republic.

Nigeria’s Third Republic, even though it produced outbursts similar to those of earlier ones, happenings following the demise of the republic, General Abacha’s rise to power and his political maneuverings, his sudden transfiguration, his eventual death and the coming of General Abdulsalam in 1998, greatly changed the course of events and have been well documented by scholars (Akinwumi, 2005; Yaqub 2002). It must however be stated that the various events cumulatively ushered in the current fourth republic which began in May, 1999.

2.2.8.4 Intra-Party Politics in the Fourth Republic

A major landmark event that signaled a fourth Nigerian republic was the registration of political parties in 1998. The transition programme that ushered in the republic spanning a period of eleven months and supervised by the then military regime of General Abdulsalam has been adjudged as the shortest in the history of the country (Yaqub, 2003). Implicit in the above statement therefore is that political parties of the current dispensation were created in a matter of days (Tyoden, 2002). In other words, the parties did not evolve organically to produce a prior long term political association between the various groups that come together. Obviously, this trend combined with some others to impact on party relations in the fourth republic.

Interestingly, parties of the fourth republic emerged through a phased process. This was because, shortly after the ban on party politics was lifted by the military, about 30 political associations filed papers for registration with the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC). Of these 30, only nine of them were successful in meeting the minimum conditions for provisional registration and participated in the Local Government Elections. These are Alliance for Democracy (AD); All Peoples Party (APP); Democratic Advance Movement (DAM); Movement for Democracy and Justice (MDJ); National Solidarity Movement (NSM); Peoples Democratic Party (PDP); Peoples Redemption Party (PRP); United Democratic Party (UDP); and Unity Peoples Party (UPP). In other words, the formal and final registration of any association among the nine was based on their electoral performance. For an association to be finally registered, it was expected to score at least 10% of total votes cast in not less than 24 states of the federation.

Consequently, after the election of December 5, 1998, only the Alliance for Democracy (AD), All Peoples' Party (APP) and the People Democratic Party (PDP) were able to secure

INEC registration. It was only the three parties that equally filed candidates in the 1999 general elections. However, some months into the fourth republic, with Obasanjo as President, politicians began to clamour for the registration of more parties. The government refused to register more political parties; hence, unregistered associations went to court and won. Court judgment in favor of political associations thus, opened the floodgate for up to 30parties by the time 2003 elections took place (Ukeh, 2014). The number had since increased. It must be stated that although there were about 30 political parties in existence, the trio of PDP, ANPP and the AD came to remain most prominent in partisan politics in the country. The AD was later fractionalized into Alliance for Demodracy (AD) and Action Congress (AC) due to leadership crisis between Mojisola Akinfewa and Adebisi Akande, the AC later metamorphosed into ACN when it adopts some members from the ANPP.

If anything, intra-party feud has remained a predominant feature of partisan politics in Nigeria since 1999. But as Mohammed (2008) notes, the magnitude of intra-party feud tend to reflect the size and strength of the parties. Thus, the PDP which is the largest and ruling party is known to have greater number of intra party conflicts than the AD and ANPP. As will be revealed later, some factors serve to explain this. In capturing the nature and intensity of party competition, and inter/intra party relations, Agbaje (1999) notes that since inception of the present civil rule, the political scene has witnessed frequent discords, unresolved political issues, recriminations, threats of impeachments of executives, treacheries, flagrant breach of party rules, carpet-crossings and resurgence of factional cleavages within the parties which have continued to threaten the functioning of democracy in Nigeria.

As noted above, the PDP has been more engrossed in intra-party feuds which in .many instances have resulted in violent conflicts, suspension of party stalwarts among others. A typical

instance was the crises that erupted within the Anambra State PDP as a result of disagreement between the incumbent Governor, Chris Ngige and his acclaimed political godfather, Chris Uba. The crises which started in July 2003 shortly after inauguration of the Ngige-led government witnessed a wanton display of anti democratic tendencies such as adoption of the state governor, destruction of lives and property by conflicting factions among others (Muhammed, 2008). Ironically, the crisis which began in the rank and file of state party machineries was soon turned to one that engulfed the party at the national level.

In fact, the crises took a new trend when it degenerated into a public exchange of letters and words between the President and the party's national chairman, Audu Ogbe (The Guardian, December 13, 2004). The episode eventually culminated in the resignation of the national chairman from office. Yet, before the dust generated by this crisis could settle, another which threatened foundations of the party sprang up between the President and the Vice President and their different supporters. This was partly as a result of misgivings generated by the registration exercise embarked upon by the party. That is to say, after the resignation of Chief Audu Ogbeh, Col Ahmadu Ali was imposed by Obasanjo as the new national chairman of the PDP without an election in 2005, and to consolidate and strengthen their hold on the PDP, the party announces that members of the party would be re-registered as members. The party introduced what it called 'Linkmen' who determined those to be re-registered as members of the party (Guardian, 2004). This created bad blood not just in PDP but heightens tension in the polity. The Linkmen systematically refused to register Atiku and his associates.

Meanwhile, on the other hand, Obasanjo introduces a new phenomenon of tenure elongation dubbed "third term". This further creates a new crisis in the PDP and forces takes sides- with Obasanjo on one hand and Atiku on the other- By April 2006, the tenure elongation

issue was quashed in the national assemblies. In retaliation, Atiku and his associates were then forced out of PDP even while a case was in court on the matter. Consequently, these raise a realignment of forces among party faithfuls resulting in the emergence of 2 political movements, the Movement for the Defence of Democracy (MDD); and the Movement for the Restoration of Democracy (MRD). (The Punch, December, 2014).

With these and many others, we may perhaps be justified to say conflicting rather than harmonious issues within political parties in Nigeria are capable of limiting democratic practices in the country. Of course, this is not exclusive to the PDP alone. Almost all political parties in Nigeria have and are still characterized by factional and leadership crises both at federal and state levels such as between Dan Etiebet and Jerry Useni factions in the ANPP and between Bisi Akande and Mojiisola Akinfenwa factions in the AD. Physical combat among members of a political party and in some instances, disagreements, still exist within many political parties in Nigeria (Michael, 2013).

From our discussion so far, certain inferences could be drawn about intra party relations in Nigeria. The first obvious factor is that the mode of emergence of the parties as well as the context in which they operate usually impact on the nature and trend of intra-party relations. Political parties in Nigeria, as elsewhere, do not operate in a vacuum. Neither are their activities immune from the prevailing socio-political and economic interests. These forces, both within and outside the parties, therefore combine to shape intra party relations.

Another factor that serves to explain the nature of intra-party relations in Nigeria is the fact that virtually all these parties operate in ideological vacuum. None was able to come up with a clearly distinct ideology or world view that gives direction to the citizens on what the societal ideals should be and how this is going to be achieved. Such ideology, if expounded, provides a

rallying point for citizens' mobilization. In the face of profound ideological emptiness therefore, political parties were held hostage by individual differences.

Therefore, it could be deduced that the coming together of different individuals or groups under the label of a political party presupposes inevitability of a pattern of interaction among them. Such interactions usually produce impulses either in the direction of conflict or harmony. In Nigeria, intra-party relations are seen to oscillate between these two ends but more in the direction of the former than the later. Among the underlying factors of this state of affairs are the nature of the Nigerian society and operating environment of the parties, dominant interest or personality influence, ideological emptiness of the parties, goal incompartibility misunderstanding of the meaning and purpose of politics among others (Olaniyan; 2009).

No wonder, in their analysis of Nigerian politics, Odofin and Omojuwa (2007) have given us clear pictures of Nigerian political parties in democratization process which are considered by this study as stumbling blocks to the proper intra-party politics in Nigeria. According to them, Nigerian political parties are yet to be transformed. They are not organized according to any distinct ideology, principles or programmes. Indeed, all the three dominant political parties which contested the 1999 elections could hardly be defined theoretically as political parties. They were more or less pressure groups. Secondly, they are neither coherent nor focused. They lack internal democracy and party discipline. They have not been able to offer the electorate real choice. The third important challenge to the democratization process in Nigeria revolves around the political actors. One of the problems inherent in most transition from authoritarian rule is that the emergent democracy is usually a regime in which most of the political actors lack impeccable democratic credentials and where democratic rules of procedure are yet to be internalized. For example the People's Democratic Party (PDP) has as members

many retired military Generals. The president, Party Chairman and many of the governors and other top politicians between 1999 and 2007 were ex-military officers. Probably, their military background was responsible for the 'garrison politics' entrenched in the Nigerian body polity within the aforementioned period.

Finally, analyses of intra and inter-party politics have been made here by reviewing the works of many scholars and most of them argued that intra-party politics in Nigeria, right from 1999 to the present period, has been dogged by squabbling due to powerful influence of elite, money politics, godfatherism, incumbency factor, etc. and that this has debilitating effects in the polity. Specifically, the effect can be summarized as anti-party politics, loss of lives and property and instability of democracy. But the most important point to note here is that intra-party wrangling is an inevitable phenomenon in any society that operates party system. In other words, intra and inter-party differences is not peculiar to Nigeria. What makes it so bad in Nigeria is the extreme extent it always takes such as killing, enmity, sacking and packing. One major way of reducing destructive intra and inter-party squabbles is the need for ideological conviction among the Nigerian politicians.

2.3. Theoretical Framework

There are a lot of theories that can explain intra-party politics among Nigerian political parties with a view to examining the nature, character, dynamics and manifestations of party politics and how can the challenges facing political parties be managed for the effective realization of country's political objectives. One of those theories is the liberal theory which is said to be common among capitalist and peripheral capitalist nations. This notion of democracy emerged when capitalism became the dominant mode of production in Europe and North America supported by philosophical writings of John Locke, J Rousseau, Adam Smith, J Stuart

Mill, Montesquieu and other Liberal writers whose theories advocate private liberty, natural rights, social justice, majority rule and private property (Oddih, 2007) Based on this premise, the basic features of liberal theory are:

a. acceptance of capitalism
b. Free, fair and periodic elections based on universal franchise.
c. emphasis on civil liberties or individual rights such as freedom of speech, assembly, press and religion
d. Competitive party system as opposed to one party system
e. Pressure groups.
f. Rule of law
g. Separation of powers and checks and balances
h. Abhorrence of revolutionary approach to change the government.

The central idea of liberal theory is how to design a political system which encourages individual participation and enhances moral development of citizens. Liberal democracies usually have universal suffrage, granting all adult citizens the right to vote regardless of race, gender or property ownership. Liberal democracy may take various constitutional forms: it may be a federal republic, as the United States, Brazil, India and Germany, or a constitutional monarchy such as the United Kingdom, Japan, or Spain. It may also be a presidential or a parliamentary system.

As a result of the zero-sum nature of Nigerian Politics, liberal theory will not be used by this research and it has been criticized for putting more emphasis on the democratic values than on democratic mechanisms. It has also been criticized for not seeing any contradiction between the democratic political systems and the capitalist economic systems. The critics are of the view

that, liberal democracies are very expensive governments and conclude by saying that, the money which should have been spent for productive purposes is spent on electioneering campaigns, rallies and nursing of the constituencies (Mahajan, 2000).

Therefore, the study adopts the "elite theory" particularly the view of Robert Mitchels in examining Intra-Party Politics in Nigeria with particular reference to PDP gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State. This is simply because intra-party politics in Kaduna State is dominated and decided by the elites and according to Suleiman (2012), elite theory can be the appropriate theory in explaining the nature and dynamics of intra-party politics not only in Nigeria in particular but Africa at large. That was why he asserted that, consequent upon the elitist and urban origins of political parties; grassroot mobilization was not really considered an important aspect of democratic politics for sometime (Suleiman, 2012).

The concept of Elitism was propounded as a counter to the revolutionary theorists and it is concerned mainly with the institutions of democracy and realities of western liberal democratic political system. It provides a description, explanation and justification of the existing political systems in western democracies. The exponents of elite theory are Vilfredo Pareto, Gaetano Mosca, Robert Mitchels and Mannhein, e.t.c. (Mahajan, 2000). For the purpose of this study, Robert Mitchel's work on elite theory particularly the iron law of oligarchy was adopted.

Robert Mitchel's theory of the elite is focused on organization, particularly political party organizations. In his view, party organization is controlled by a group of leaders who cannot be checked or held responsible by persons who elect them. That is due to organizational factors such as party funds, control over the press and control over the media by the party or candidate in power as well as other psychological factors such as the apathy of the majority, technical incompetence, e.t.c,. He also enunciated the "Iron Law of Oligarchy" which he described as "one

of the iron laws of history, from which the most advanced parties, in most democratic modern societies have been unable to escape". He asserts that "whoever speaks organization, speaks Oligarchy". And that, "whatever form of government is adopted or formed, in practice it is inevitably reduced to oligarchy or the rule of the chosen few.

Mitchels (1952) observes that, "imminent Oligarchic tendencies exist in every kind of human organization which strives for the attainment of definite ends". He also argues that leaders or elites usually take advantage of the fact that the majority of human beings are pathetic, indolent, slavish, susceptible to flattery, servile in the face of strength and force, and are permanently incapable of self-government (Mahajan, V.D; 2000). This can also explain the character of Nigerian party politics. Political leaders take advantage of the harsh economic condition of the country to buy the will of masses during elections. They make promises prior to their emergence and distribute "peanuts" to the people. For instance, prior to the 1999, 2003, 2007 and 2011 elections, elites under the umbrella of their different political parties distribute rice, salts, money, etc, to the people in order to get their mandate and support.

The iron law of oligarchy maintained that, there is an inevitable tendency for political organizations and by implication all organizations to be oligarchic in nature. Participating democratic structure cannot check oligarchic tendencies; they can only disguise them. He advanced a number of arguments in support of this view:

i. Elite groups result from the need for specialization. This simply means that, Elite have greater expertise and better organizational skills than those possessed by ordinary members.

ii. Leaders formed cohesive groups because they recognize that this improves their chances of remaining in power.

iii. Rank-and-File members of an organization tend to be apathetic and are therefore generally deposed to accept subordination and venerate leaders (Mitchels, 1952).

The elite exercises power and influence because of their superior qualities, such as intelligence, ability, administrative capacity, military power or moral authority. Influence of powerful elite is to a greater extent a hindrance to candidates' selection procedure of most political parties especially with the wave of democratisatiion process in Africa. That was why elite theorisst deny the fact that there can be in any real sense government by the people. This argument suggests that, in any society which is large and complex, democracy can only be representation, not direct. And the representatives are a minority who clearly possesses greater political power than those whom they represent. Democracy will therefore, in this case means the rule of the political elite which has been elected by the people (Nnoli; 2003).

One of the effects of political party competition in Nigeria is lack of political tolerance among the political elite. Some of the political elites emerged from authoritarian traditions that have no tolerance for any form of opposition. For them, opposition is treason. Thus, political party competition is a "battle" where the "adversaries" must be eliminated or denied space to compete. It is not seen as a contest where winners and losers would emerge but must cooperate to build and develop the country. Political intolerance often leads to abuses of human rights. The political elite have not drawn lessons from the past experience of Nigeria. This also has implications for intra-party politics as well as the deepening of democracy in the country (Bande, 2014).

In discussing political parties, Mitchel cited (in De Grazia, 1952: 222) asserts that, "whatever their raison d'être, political parties are susceptible to certain conservative and oligarchic influences". He further states that, "in an age of universal suffrage, political parties,

may employ many democratic symbols and try the best they can to sound sincere". Each party invariably claims that it is the most democratic and has welfare of the whole nation at hand. With regards to the PDP, it claims to be more democratic than others especially as it was recognized as the largest political party in Africa, but these oligarchic tendencies as observed by Michels denies the party to adopt the direct election by all the registered members in its primary elections of pre-2003, 2007, 2011 and 2015 general elections in Kaduna State.

But equally, parties not only tend to grow bureaucratic and conservative as they grow older, they also become oligarchic. More and more of the important decisions are made by the leaders with ever more feeble, formal and informal communication with party membership; and even less communication with the party's general following in the electorates, as in the case of the PDP in Nigeria, particularly in Kaduna state. The elite within the party assume they know what is best for the registered members, as such decisions were taken without due consultations or contrary to what they have already agreed upon at the congress meeting, e.g imposition or substitution of contesting candidates some weeks to election.

Thus according to Mitchels (1952), the fundamental sociological law of political parties may be formulated in the following terms: "It is organization which gives birth to the dominion of the elected over the electors, of the mandataries over the mandators, of the delegates over the delegators. Who says organizations, says oligarchy."(De Grazia, 1952).

Furthermore, this research established the fact that, for intra-party politics to prevail especially with regard to Gubernatorial Primaries, in Kaduna State, Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) should have defined ideologies or world views that would serve as signposts for the policies to be enunciated. Political parties are also to imbibe the ''culture of debates'' as a necessity in decision making and policy formulations. These views were judged as salutary and

good for the revitalization of political parties to make them discharge their tasks of modernizing and developing the polity. The necessity for parties to be identified with ideologies or world views in terms of economic and social policies they seek to pursue cannot be wished away. At the minimum, an ideology gives a party its character as to whether it is conservative or radical or liberal. Nigerian political parties in the existing democratic dispensation have discountenanced the role of ideology entirely.

This theory is justified in this research for a simple reason that, Nigerian elites wherever they are generally come from the same group-those of wealth or intelligent. Political parties in Nigeria, be it PDP, APC, APGA, etc., are controlled by very few individuals in the party that have besieged the available post and positions in the upper hierarchy of the parties. These few influential and powerful individuals who are in the minority make all the decisions while others follow. They are the elites.

The elite theory has been criticized on many grounds. Firstly, they point out that the theory has no faith in the people. It has faith only in the elite who discourage the participation of the people in politics. Secondly, they consider political apathy as a virtue. They also believe that the participation of the people will destroy the equilibrium and stability of the political system and enable the unscrupulous politicians to run the government for their selfish end. Not only that, the theory gives too much importance to leaders and politicians but did not give importance to politics and the electorate forgetting the fact that there is always tendency of misusing the power by the political elite (Mahajan, 2000). As a matter of fact these views are not accepted because the people are the soul of democracy and they must be given a share to run the government. Democracy does not flow out of ballot boxes. It is based on the active developmental participation of the people. Mitchels' Iron Law of Oligarchy is also criticized on the ground that,

he confuses an iron law of bureaucracy with an iron law of oligarchy. He is not clear about the distinction between oligarchy and organization.

Inspite of the criticism, the elite theory particularly the iron laws of oligarchy as profounded by Mitchels is still relevant in this research because it contains the truth regarding the working of western democracies. It cannot be denied that, there is political apathy among the people and that; Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) is controlled by elites of one type or another (Simbine, 2014). Concurring with Simbine's argument, Mahajan (2000) observed that, "All democracies are controlled by elites of one type or another and that, general and equal participation seems like a temporary aberration. Inequality preached by elite theory is a universally accepted fact. The elite theory is an interesting theory so long as it is understood as a description of contemporary liberal democracies. Its value lies in the fact that it exposes the undemocratic nature of contemporary western democracies.

In our final analysis here, we can say that, oligarchic tendencies within the political parties are usually what make party structure and leadership to grow stronger and manipulative. For the purpose of this work, it could be deduced from the foregoing review of the literature that, those oligarchic tendencies among PDP and a do-or-die affair of politicians within PDP result to intra-party conflicts that are capable of limiting democratic practices in a country.

2.4 Gaps in the Literature:

Many literature were reviewed by this study especially on political parties and intra-party politics, internal democracy, candidates' selection, political parties and Nigerian democracy, intra and inter-party squabbles in Nigeria, political parties and internal democracy in Katsina i.e the work of Moveh (2015), Salih (2003), Omojuwa and Odofin; (2007), Siddique (2007), Olaniyan; (2009), Rahat and Hazan (2001), Suleimen (2012), (Michael, 2013) and Mukhtar,

(2014). Other empirical literature reviewed examined Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) and Democratisation Process as well as the causes of their internal wrangling and carpet-crossing in Nigeria's Fourth republic. For instance, Dunmoye (2013), observed that, PDP divisions was as a result of the structural problem of the constitution of the party which is more of unitary type as well as the distribution of federal positions which cannot go round, especially the top and powerful positions. Tenuche (2014), noted that, idiosyncratic character of chief executives, godfatherism, poverty of ideology as well as the authoritarian nature of political parties were some of the reasons for the wrangling. Similarly, Simbine (2014), looked at PDP Constitution's problem, party primaries which was dominated by powerful influence of godfathers, imposition of candidates and lack of political ideology as sources of conflict within the party. Haruna (2007) described PDP primaries as a great travesty of justice and a mockery of democratic tenets in all PDP states. This study therefore, used the intellectual guidance as well as theoretical analysis and explanations of these scholars in examining gubernatorial primaries of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Kaduna State from 1999-2015 which constitutes our point of departure from the existing literature and at the same time contribution to the body of knowledge. Infact, there is no documented academic research to the best of my knowledge that has attempted to critically examine the realities about PDP gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State as at the time we started writing this dissertstion. This is simply because; PDP internal wrangling in Nigeria's fourth republic is a recent as well as on-going phenomenon. It has not been sufficiently studied by enough academic research. The available literature on PDP is yet to essentially deal with the realities of the party in Nigeria, particularly in Kaduna State. Therefore, the study has come to fill this huge academic gap created.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

Research methodology refers to a body of principles and organisational framework aimed at guiding deductions and generalisations in the process of searching for, collecting, analyzing and interpreting data. Survey research was used in this study using personal interview as a major source of data complemented by questionnaire administration.

3.2 Research Design

Survey research was employed for the purpose of this research as it provides a veritable tool for the critical assessment of the status of a political phenomenon at a given time. Survey research involves collecting data from a selected part of a larger population in order to draw inferences about the population of the study due to the impossibility of studying the entire population. This is based on the assumption that, if a sample has a proper representation of the entire population, then the findings of the smaller sampled group can be a true representative of of a lager population (Biereenu-Nnabugwu, 2006).

For the purpose of this study, survey research enables us generate data about respondents' view on the nature, conduct and manifestation of gubernatorial primaries by the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Kaduna state from 1999-2015. Not only that, it also enables the researcher to critically examine the challenges facing PDP's intra-party politics in Nigeria, particularly in Kaduna state.

The use of survey research in this study is justified due to its suitability in unraveling events in descriptive research. Furthermore, it brings researcher into intimate contact with the

respondents which allows for the observation of emotional impacts. Survey research also allows for thorough and critical assessment of phenomena.

3.3 Sources of Data Collection

Data for this research were gathered from two major sources, i.e. primary and secondary sources. Under the primary source, two instruments of data collection were used i.e. personal interview which was the major source of primary data in this research supported by the administration of questionnaires.

3.3.1 Primary Sources:

a. Unstructured Interview: - Here, the researcher made use of oral interview. To be specific, personal interviews conducted within the three (3) Senatorial districts that made up of Kaduna State. The study intends to interview PDP Delegates from 1999-2015 in Kaduna State but due to some ground bottlenecks, only the names of delegates for the 2014/2015 gubernatorial primaries were made available to the researcher, that was why he had to interview other stakeholders within the party to complement data for 1999, 2003, 2007 and 2011. As a result therefore, the party chairmen and their secretaries in the six selected local government areas were selected and interviewed. The selection of this category of people was made possible due to the fact that, the local government party chairman and his secretary participate as statutory delegates in all gubernatorial primaries of PDP from 1999-2015 (Anonymous; Interview, 2015).

Moreover, PDP Gubernatorial Aspirants, former executive governors under PDP, former PDP state chairmen, INEC Resident Commissioner, PDP State Administrative Officer who served for good sixteen years (1999-2015) as well as few aggrieved members who defected to the opposition party were also interviewed.

Thus; 20 out of 201 delegates who participated in the 2014/2015 Gubernatorial Primaries of PDP in Kaduna State were systematically selected and interviwed in the six local government areas under study. This was done by dividing two hundred and one by twenty (201/20=10.5), thus; 10 was our nth number which was the unit of analysis. We started the selection processes by arranging the names of the delegates serially up to 201 thereby randomly selecting the first respondent (i.e number 9^{th} on the list). We then continued to select every tenth person on the list till we got the required number of the respondents which was arranged as follows; 9^{th} 19^{th} 29^{th} 39^{th} 49^{th} 59^{th} 69^{th} 79^{th} 89^{th} 99^{th} 109^{th} 119^{th} 129^{th} 139^{th} 149^{th} 159^{th} 169^{th} 179^{th} 189^{th} 199^{th}..... And this made the total number of respondents for the interview to be 43 (i.e 20 among the delegates and 22 from the stakeholders).

b. Structured Questionnaire: - Apart from the personal interview method, the study also administered 604 structured questionnaires. The questionnaires were closed-ended, and were administered within the three (3) Senatorial Districts of Kaduna State. Therefore, three research assistants and six other PDP members were employed to help in the distribution of the questionnaires and other important aspects of this study.

Furthermore, respondents from the three (**3)** Senatorial Districts with regard to the questionnaires were mainly PDP members and few others who decamped to the opposition parties. Most of these questionnaires were distributed at the congress meetings using simple random sampling method.

3.3.2 Secondary Sources:

The Secondary data for this study were sourced from the existing literature documented in academic books, journals of social sciences, published articles, magazines, newspapers, government publications and internet materials. These materials were accessed and collected

from the Kashim Ibrahim Library (KIL) ABU Zaria, Arewa House Library Kaduna, Postgraduate Library of the Department of Political Science, Library of the Faculty of Social Sciences, ABU Zaria, Centre for Democratic Development Research and Training, Zangon-Shanu, Zaria, Documentary sources from the PDP Secretariat, Kaduna, Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) and other sources available and accessible by the researcher.

3.4. Sampling Procedure:

The researcher made use of the multi-stage sampling technique to get the sample of interest for this study due to time and logistics constraints. This technique involves sampling in successive stages such that at each stage, selection is made by using any of the well known probability sampling methods (Biereenu-Nnabugwu, 2006).

The first stage was the use of cluster sampling to divide Kaduna State into three Senatorial Districts so as to ensure geographic representation. The second stage has to do with the selection of two (2) local governments areas (each) from the three Senatorial Districts of Kaduna State using simple random sampling technique. The third step adopted was the selection of PDP delegates as well as stakeholders for personal interviews through systematic sampling procedure. The last stage has to do with the distribution of questionnaires to the PDP card carrying members in the six selected local government areas using simple random sampling procedure.

3.5 Population and Sample Size of the Study

Population of the study in this research refers to the total registered members of PDP in the six selected local governments which is 126,588 going by the Party membership register according to PDP state administrative officer (Anonymous, Interview; 2015). However, the

populations of the study in this research are mainly PDP members and few other members who decamped to the opposition parties as a result of internal wrangling.

The target population of this study was made up both male and female among PDP members in Kaduna State. Therefore, two local government areas were selected from each of the three Senatorial Districts using simple random sampling technique. Here, the names of the local government areas in each senatorial district were written down one after the other and folded in sheet of papers and then put into three different containers (i.e one for each senatorial district). The researcher shuffled the container up and down, side-by-side, and then selects one local government area and writes down the name in a paper. He then folds the same paper again and put it back into the same container and followed the same processes to select the second local government area. The researcher continued using the same procedure in the two other senatorial districts and finally came out with the following local government areas namely; Birnin-Gwari, Kajuru, Kauru, Lere, Zangon-Kataf and Zaria local government area respectively. 604 questionnaires were administered to the members of the party throughout the six selected local governments at the congress meetings using simple random sampling technique.

The sample size of this study was 604 for the questionnaire and 43 for the interview, which is considered to be representative enough to the total population of the six local government areas as it conforms to the Morgan and Kreiche's criterion that a sample of 384 and above can represent the total population of 1,000,000 (Morgan and Kreiche, 1970).

The following are the local government areas of each of the three Senatorial Districts that made up of Kaduna state today:

Table 3.1: 23 Local Government Areas of Kaduna State

S/N	**ZONE I**	**ZONE II**	**ZONE III**
1	Ikara	1.Birnin-Gwari	1.Jaba
2	Kubau	2.Chikun	2.Jema'a
3	Kudan	3.Giwa	3.Kachia
4	Lere	4.Igabi	4.Kagarko
5	Makarfi	5.Kaduna North	5.Kaura
6	Sabon-Gari	6.Kaduna South	6.Kauru
7	Soba	7.Kajuru	7.Sanga
8	Zaria		8.Zangon-Kataf

Source: KAD-SIECOM, (2014), Survey Research (2015).

Table 3.1 above shows the three senatorial districts of Kaduna State i.e zone i, ii and iii. From the table, one can understand that, there are twenty three local government areas in Kaduna State, eight (8) from zone i, seven (7) from zone ii and eight (8) from zone iii. Out of these twenty three, six local government areas were selected for study using simple random sampling technique.

Table 3.2: 6 Selected Local Government Areas under study

S/N	**Name of the LGA/ No of Wards**		**Population Per LGA**	**No. of Delegates.**
1	Birnin-Gwari	11	19806	33
2	Kajuru	10	16050	30
3	Kauru	11	18789	33
4	Lere	11	25988	33
5	Zangon-Kataf	11	28526	33
6	Zaria	13	17429	39
	TOTAL	**67**	**126588**	**201**

Source: PDP Document, (2015), Survey Research (2015).

Table 3.2 above indicates the distribution of the total registered members and the number of delegates who participated in the 2014/2015 gubernatorial primaries in the 6 Local Government Areas under study. Thus; 33 delegates were from Birnin-Gwari Local Government

Area, 30 delegates from Kajuru, 33 delegates from Kauru, 33 delegates from Lere, 33 delegates from Zangon-Kataf and 39 delegates from Zaria.

Table 3.3: PDP Registered Members in the 6 Local Government Areas under study.

S/N	Name of the LGA	Population Per LGA	No. of Questionnaires.
1	Birnin-Gwari	19806	99
2	Kajuru	16050	100
3	Kauru	18789	100
4	Lere	25988	100
5	Zangon-Kataf	28526	102
6	Zaria	17429	103
	TOTAL	**126588**	**604**

Source: KAD-SIECOM, (2014), Survey Research (2015).

Table 3.3 above explains the distribution of the total registered members and the sample size according to the six selected Local Governments Areas under study as presented in the above table. 604 questionnaires were distributed throughout six sampled local government areas in which 99 questionnaires were administered at Birnin-Gwari, 100 in Kajuru, 100 in Kauru, 100 in Lere, 102 in Zangon-Kataf and 103 in Zaria Local Government Area.

Table 3.4: PDP Registered Members of Birnin-Gwari Local Government Area.

S/N	No of Wards of the LGA	Total Population Per Ward of the LGA	Sample Size Per Ward of the LGA
1	Magjin Gari I	2106	11
2	Magajin Gari II	1985	10
3	Magajin Gari III	1677	8
4	Gayam	1543	8
5	Kuyello	1254	6
6	Kazage	1423	7
7	Kakangi	2040	10
8	Tabbanni	1956	10
9	Dogon Dawa	1778	9
10	Kutemeshi	1811	9
11	Randagi	2233	11
Total	**11**	**19806**	**99**

Source: KAD-SIECOM, (2014), Survey Research (2015).

The above table indicates the distribution of the total registered members and the sample size according to the wards of the Birnin Gwari Local Government Area. The ward sample size of the study was obtained through the use of simple percentage formula as follows:

Ward Sample Population = $\frac{No.\ of\ Ward\ Population}{No.of\ the\ Total\ population\ of\ the\ LGA} \times 100/1$

Using the above formula, the ward's sample population size was obtained by dividing the number of population (i.e registered members) per ward with the total population (registered members) of the local government multiplied by 100. This is what gave the sample size of each ward in proportion to its population.

Table 3.5: PDP Registered Members of Kajuru Local Government Area

S/N	No of Wards of the LGA	Total Population Per Ward of the LGA	Sample Size Per Ward of the LGA
1	Kajuru	1563	10
2	Kasuwan Magani	1281	8
3	Afogo	1802	11
4	Kufana	1464	9
5	Tantatu	1774	11
6	Kallah	1336	8
7	Idon	1716	11
8	Rimau	1506	9
9	Buda	1691	11
10	Maro	1917	12
Total	**10**	**16050**	**100**

Source: KAD-SIECOM, (2014), Survey Research (2015).

Table 3.6: PDP Registered Members of Kauru Local Government Area

S/N	No of Wards of the LGA	Total Population Per Ward of the LGA	Sample Size Per Ward of the LGA
1	Kauru West	2016	11
2	Makami	1474	8
3	Dawaki	1311	7
4	Kwassam	2077	11
5	Bital	1386	7
6	Geshere	1643	9
7	Damakasuwa	1759	9
8	Badurum	2067	11
9	Kamaru	1319	7
10	Pari	1545	8
11	Kauru East	2192	12
Total	**11**	**18789**	**100**

Source: KAD-SIECOM, (2014), Survey Research (2015).

Table 3.7: PDP Registered Members of Lere Local Government Area

S/N	No of Wards of the LGA	Total Population Per Ward of the LGA	Sample Size Per Ward of the LGA
1	Sabon Birni	1856	7
2	Yar' Kasuwa	2998	12
3	Garu	2113	8
4	Kayarda	1794	7
5	Lere	2897	11
6	Ramin Kura	2158	8
7	Saminaka	2954	11
8	Lazuru	2089	8
9	Abadawa	1954	8
10	Dan-Alhaji	1858	7
11	Gure/Kahugu	3317	13
Total	**11**	**25988**	**100**

Source: KAD-SIECOM, (2014), Survey Research (2015).

Table 3.8: PDP Registered Members of Zangon-Kataf Local Government Area

S/N	No of Wards of the LGA	Total Population Per Ward of the LGA	Sample Size Per Ward of the LGA
1	Gora	1987	7
2	Zonzon	2161	8
3	Zaman Dabo	1856	7
4	Unguwan Gayya	1969	7
5	Zonkwa	3087	11
6	Madakiya	2556	9
7	Unguwan Rimi	2154	8
8	Gidan Jatau	2879	10
9	Kamanton	3065	11
10	Kamaru/Ikulu North	3134	11
11	Zango Urban	3678	13
Total	**11**	**28526**	**102**

Source: KAD-SIECOM, (2014), Survey Research (2015).

Table 3.9: PDP Registered Members of Zaria Local Government Area

S/N	No of Wards of the LGA/ Code		Total Population Per Ward of the LGA	Sample Size Per Ward of the LGA
1	Kwarbai A	001	1276	7
2	Kwarbai B	002	1178	7
3	Unguwan-Juma	003	1049	6
4	Lmancin-Kona	004	1287	7
5	Kaura	005	1397	8
6	Tudun Wada	006	1076	6
7	Gyallesu	007	1143	7
8	Unguwan-Fatika	008	1357	8
9	Tukur-Tukur	009	1145	7
10	Dambo	010	1642	9
11	Wuciciri	011	1875	11
12	Dutsen-Abba	012	1681	10
13	Kufena	013	1701	10
Total	**13**		**17429**	**103**

Source: KAD-SIECOM, (2014), Survey Research (2015).

3.6. Method of Data Presentation and Analysis

After collecting the data through both primary and secondary sources, the data were analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative descriptive methods of analysis. This was done through tabulation method, which is a method of transferring data from its gathering instruments to a tabular form. The data was analyzed so as to summarize the results of the subject under investigation. Through quantitative descriptive analysis method, the researcher made use of simple percentage method and frequency distribution tables to sum the mass of the information generated during the field work. The interviews were tape-recorded, transcribed and analyzed through the use of qualitative method of analysis.

3.7. Methodological Challenges

The great challenge to the research has to do with the data collection. All efforts have been made due to repeated visits to PDP state secretariat to get the lists of delegates who participated in the PDP Gubernatorial Primaries of Kaduna State from 1999-2015 but proved abortive. The only one available was that of 2014/2015. The researcher then met INEC Resident Commissioner for the same purpose and still the lists were not available even in INEC. That was why the researcher administered 604 questionnaires and interviewed Party Chaimen and their Secretaries in the six selected local government areas. This is for a simple reason that, Party Chairmen and their Secretaries served as statutory delegates in all Gubernatorial Primaries conducted by the party from 1999-2015 (Anonymous, Interview; 2015). Others interviewed include the gubernatorial aspirants as well as former state party chairmen. This was done purposely to complement the data for 1999, 2003, 2007 and 2011 gubernatorial primaries since the lists of delegates were not available.

It was difficult to collect the data in most of the local government areas due to the fact that some respondents could only speak if they get a formal clearance from their party headquarters in Kaduna. I was asked in both Kauru and Lere local government areas to bring a clearance from the state headquarters before the conduct of interview but subsequently with the intervention of PDP state administrative officer, Malam Sama'ila Sani approval was given.

Interviews before the 2015 general elections were lively, always running to hours. Party members saw this as an opportunity to publicise their manifesto. Post election interviews were totally different due to the failure of the party. Sometimes the researcher had to sponsor respondents to and from their residences to the PDP Local Government Office for the interview. It was not possible to fix a date of interview with members since they will not be seen easily. An example of this kind was the problem I had in locating the immediate past governor of Kaduna State after been defeated in 2015 elections. When I arrived at Kaduna I got news that he was in town. I tried to locate him only to hear that he had left for Abuja. One of his house boys in Kaduna took us to his residence in Abuja and on arrival we heard that he had left for abroad. But fortunately to us, two weeks later we met him at his recidence (Shehu Cresent, Kaduna) and even there we had to wait for good five hours before we see him. At the end, we ate and prayed together before given us audience.

CHAPTER FOUR

HISTORY AND FORMATION OF PEOPLES DEMOCRATIC PARTY (PDP) IN NIGERIA

4.1 Background to the Formation of Political Parties in Nigeria

The origin of political parties in Nigeria can be traced back to the Clifford constitution of 1922 when elective principle was introduced and the need for Nigerians to elect four representatives into the Legislative Council in Lagos arouse. Prominent among the numerous parties created to contest the seats was Herbert Macaulay's Nigerian National Democratic Party (NNDP) inaugurated on 24 June, 1923. The next significant milestone in the Nigeria's Party History was the formation of the Nigerian Youth Movement in 1938 by Mr. H.O Davies and Dr. Nnamdi Azikwe (Oyediran and Nwosu, 2005).

The nature and pattern of party politics during colonialism was to a great extent determined by the constitutional concessions permitted by the British Colonial System. For instance, while the 1922 Clifford Constitution gave birth to the first political party in Nigeria known as the Nigerian National Democratic Party (NNDP) in 1992, party politics in the State was restricted to just two cities; Lagos and Calabar. The implication was that party politics during this era was restricted to two cities, and even in the cities, franchise was restricted because of property qualification coupled with the fact that the system was purely one party system. However, shortly before the 1946 Richards Constitution, party politics was widened with the birth of the Nigerian Youth Movement (NYM) in 1938. As a result, Nigerians in the two cities of Lagos and Calabar had the opportunity of choice between the NNDP and the NYM. With the operation of the 1951 Macperson Constitution, the Action Group (AG), the Northern People's

Congress (NPC), e.t.c., were registered and they became major players with the NCNC in the march towards Nigeria's independence (Adigwe, 1997).

In the First Republic, there were parties like National Council of Nigerian Citizens (NCNC), Northern People Congress (NPC) and Action Group (AG). The National Peoples Party (NPP), National Party of Nigeria (NPN), Great Nigerian People's Party (GNPP), Unity Party of Nigeria (UPN), People Redemption Party (PRP) and later the Nigerian Advance Party (NAP), which was later registered in 1982, were formed in the Second Republic (Osaghae, 1998; Omotola, 2010). Nigeria had Social Democratic Party (SDP) and National Republican Convention (NRC) during the abortive Third Republic. In the present dispensation (Fourth Republic), a lot of political parties have emerged with PDP who stood and remains comfortably in charge of the government for good sixteen years (1999-2015), while the opposition during these years continued to fragment into smaller parties with trifling electoral impact judging by the number of states they captured in 2007 and 2011 elections (Ojo, 2009).

4.2 Origin and Formation of Peoples Democratic Party

The genesis of PDP was the G18 who were mostly northern politicians and academics that vehemently opposed General Abacha's planned self-succession. The G18 was later enlarged to G34 to include people from other regions who were equally opposed to Abacha's military rule and particularly his self succession political design (Kura, 2011).

Following the death of Abacha in June 1998 and the unveiling of the transition programme under his successor, General Abdussalam Abubakar, the G34, along with other established political associations such as Peoples Democratic Movement (PDM) formed by late Shehu Musa Yar'adua and but later headed by

Atiku Abubakar of All Nigeria Congress (ANC), the Social Progressive Party (SPP), South-South Group (SSG), New Era Alliance (NERA), National Centre Party (NCP), National League for Good Governance (NLGG), Peoples National Forum (PNF), National Summit and Hope '99, came together ot form the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP). The leaderships of these political associations set up a steering committee, chaired by Alex Ekweme and Jerry Gana respectively. This was to support the creation of the party. Accordingly, on August 19, 1998, over 125 political associations endorsed the formation of PDP. The party was formally inaugurated on 31st August, 1998" (Kura, 2011).

That was why Reilly (2008) was of the view that, PDP is a mixed bag of persons with diverse political background with one and only one purpose. It was meant to send a message to the military that the political class meant business with sending the military back to the barracks. To this extent, the founders covered political sundry and political persuasion: conservatives, radicals and progressives.

4.3 The Manifesto of the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP)

PDP has had only one edition of its manifesto since it was established in August 1998 and presented along with other application documents to INEC for registration as a political party. The original edition of the manifesto is a twenty eight (28) pages booklet with thirty one (31) provisions covering the following issues (PDP Manifesto, 2015):

1. Resolution on party formation
2. Political objectives of the party
3. Indivisibility of the Nigeria polity
4. The judiciary and the administration of justice
5. Economy

6. Agriculture
7. Rural development
8. Industrialisation
9. Health
10. Education
11. Science and Technology
12. Defence
13. Transport
14. Communication
15. Internal Security
16. Energy
17. Water Supply
18. Labour Employment and Wages
19. Natural Resources
20. Iron and Steel
21. Youth and Sports
22. Nigerian Culture
23. Women
24. Human Rights
25. Environmental Obligations
26. Civil Service
27. Traditional Rulers
28. Housing
29. Tourism
30. Land and,
31. Foreing Policy

The manifesto spells out the mission statement of the party, its programs and how the party plans to carry out such programs. The Manifesto is prefaced by a preamble which laments the chequered political history of the country. The preamble is followed by the resolution on party formation passed at the Sheraton Hotel Abuja on Wednesday August 19th 1998. The section on the Directive Principles and Mission Statement of the Party makes a strong assuarance to the people of Nigeria about the party's commitment to democracy and party politics. The statement says;

> *We of the Peoples Democratic Party affirm our belief in the supremacy of the constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria and the sovereignty of the Nigerian people. Having examined the relevant provisions of the constitution of Nigeria, we hereby affirm our commitment to strict observance and enforcement to the provisions. As a political party, we shall conform to the spirit and the later of the Provisions of the Manifesto (PDP Manifesto, 2015).*

Other section of the manifesto is committed to qualitatively transform the Nigerian economy and society where it promised to tirelessly work towards the creation of a dynamic economy designed to serve the people's interest, and in which market forces are combined with the forces of partnership, solidarity and co-operation to create wealth and produce goods and services for all; The establishment of a free and democratic society, in which the powers and actions of Government are lawful, and where those in authority are held accountable to the people; Building a just society, which provides basic needs, ensures equal opportunities for self-development through eradication and gainful employment; defends the dignity of the human person; judges its strength by the condition of the weak; provides security against fear; and delivers the masses from the tyranny of poverty, oppression and abuse of power; Sustained implementation of people-oriented programs, with particular emphasis on war against poverty, integrated rural development, rapid industrial growth, excellency in education, science and technology, rebuilding and expanding basic infrastructure.

Looking at the above manifestos as well as strategies adopted to achieve them (See appendix 21 for more details), one can say that truly PDP has something good to offer to the

electorate especially as its Mission Statements presents what ideally should be the most desirable indication and intention of political party. But the most important question here to ask is that to what extent has Peoples Democratic Party achieved the above objectives? This is fundamental to the existence of any democratic political party especially as the party ruled the country for good sixteen years. This Manifesto has been designed to guide public policy formulation as well as the conduct of elected representatives, but in practice it has only been good enough in theory as contained in documents and shelved in party offices.

In an interview with respondents and other party functionaries, they confirmed that the manifesto has neither guided public policy formulation nor regulated the conduct of elected representatives as a result of what they called implementation of unplanned policies and programmes as well as despotic character of leaders. No wonder that Odofin and Omojuwa (2007) notes that political parties of Nigeria's fourth republic are not organized into any distinct principles or programmes, they are neither coherent nor focused, and they lack internal democracy and party discipline. They have not been able to offer the electorate real choice. These problems therefore, will not be unconnected to the authoritarian nature of the party as well as idiosyncratic character of its leaders.

4.4 The Constitution of the Peoples Democratic Party

The constitution of PDP was made after many years of Military rule during which individual freedom, electoral democracy and the rule of law were severely and fundamentally damaged and when members realized that, the challenges facing the nation, as it advances into the 21st century include: the re-creation of civil political institutions, the reconciliation of our various people, the re-kindling of the spirit of unity and brotherhood in the nation and the revitalization of the powers of the people to build a prosperous industrial democracy (PDP Constitution, 2006).

To meet these challenges, the leaders of like-minded political associations assembled in the Federal Capital Territory Abuja on July 28, 1998 and resolved as follows:

i. To bring together all patriotic and like-minded Nigerians into a single formidable political party capable of renewing and re-focusing the loyalties and productive energies of the nation.

ii. To work together under the Party for the achievement of national reconciliation, economic and social reconstruction, respect for human rights, and the rule of law.

iii. To restructure Nigeria in the spirit of true federalism in order to ensure a fair and equitable distribution of power, resources, wealth and opportunities to conform with the principles of Power-shift and power-sharing, rotation of key political offices, and an equitable devolution of powers to the zones, states and local governments so as to create socio-political conditions conducive to national peace and unity.

iv. To defend the sanctity of electoral democracy, enunciate an enforceable code of conduct among political office-holders and establish a moral social order guided by the core values of performance, probity and justice.

v. To mobilize all Nigerians under the leadership of the Party, to build a Nation answerable to the dreams of Nigerians and the hopes of all the Black People of the World, as well as the expectations of humanity (PDP Constitution, 2006).

It was for the realization of this vision that the, patriotic and progressive Nigerians had come together to form PDP to usher the nation into the 21st century and design this Constitution for the purpose of effective administration of the country and the promotion of the ideals, aims and objectives of the party at all levels.

The PDP constitution has been the document guiding the conduct and behavior of members since its establishment. The constitution has had five major amendments between August 1998 and May 2015. The first edition was submitted with the application form for the registration of the party with INEC in September 1998. The second edition was adopted at the 1999 convention; the third edition came into being in 2001, the fourth edition came into effect in 2004 and the last edition was in 2006 (Haruna; 2007).

However, it appears from the above that almost every National Executive Committee of the party has produced an edition of the constitution starting from Chief Solomon Lar to Chief Audu Ogbeh. The revisions of this constitution have been at the heart of intra-party feuds that have bedeviled the party since its establishment. These revisions have always been initiated and executed by the party caucus (including the president or governors) therby manipulating the processes for the control of party machinery to foist on the party anti-democratic tendencies.

In this regard, it is important to note that only the National Convention has the power to elect or remove the National Officers of the party as in Article 24, Section 12 (ii) (b) of the PDP's constitution. Question of dissolution of NEC or setting up of a care-taker committee will not arise. It should be made known to all elected political office holders including public Office holders, that the National Executive Committee of the party has supervisory roles over their functions. Section11 subsection Vii of Article 24 states that the National Executive Committee shall examine the actions, policies and programmes pursued and legislation made by government in the Federation from time to time in order to determine whether or not they are in accord with the principles, policies, programmes, aims and objectives of the party, and the constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria and if not, to make recommendation to the National Convention for its action or take such action as are necessary (See appendix 21 for more details).

Notwithstanding, the frequent amendments of PDP constitution have shown that the document is still far from being clearly and unambiguously formulated. Most of these provisions as explained above are hardly enforced. The constitution is replete with ambiguities, open ended provisions and loosely defined concepts

Finally, in consideration to the above provisions (See Appendix 20), one can say that PDP is really a national party and has all characters of a democratic political party if these provisions are fully implemented at all levels. Infact, the democratic order can only be achieved if party members adhere strictly to the rules governing internal democratic procedure. But the only problem is that, there is no commitment among members to actualize the desired objectives

of the party as stated above as a result of the authoritarian nature of political parties, idiosyncratic character of politicians, the quest for power among PDP powerful elite, godfathers as well as money bags which always disrupts the proper observance of these constitutional provisions. For instance, the conduct of PDP governorshp primary elections in Kaduna State from 2003-2015, were contrary to the provisions of electoral act, indices or framework for systematic evaluation of internal democratic procedure and administration provided by Salih (2006), Manning (2005), Mainwarring and Scully (1991) as well as Rahat and Hazan (2007), as reviewed in this work. Democratic Primary Elections are conducted in an atmosphere devoid of harassment or intimidation of voters and according to constitutional provisions. It must be guided and assessed by a systematic framework or indicators so as to distinguish it from a mere selection of candidates and capricious allocation of votes. For instance, the Electoral Act 2010 with 2011 Ammendments and Allied Matters provided that, In the case of nominations to the position of Governorship candidate, a political party shall:

(i) Hold special congress in each of the local government areas of the States with delegates voting for each of the aspirants at the congress to be held in designated centres on specified dates.

(ii) The aspirant with the highest number of votes at the end of voting shall be declared the winner of the primaries of the party and aspirant's name shall be forwarded to the Independent National Electoral Commission.

(iii) A political party that adopts the system of indirect primaries for the choice of its candidate shall clearly outline in its constitution and rules the procedure for the democratic election of delegates to vote at the convention, congress or meeting.

(iv) No political appointee at any level shall be a voting delegate at the Convention or Congress of any political party for the purpose of nomination of candidates for any election.

(v) Where a political party fails to comply with the provisions of this Act in the conduct of its primaries, its candidate for election shall not be included in the election for the particular position in issue.

From the above therefore, one can deduce that PDP in Kaduna State contravened most of the provisions of the Electoral Act interms of conducting governorship primaries from 2003-2015. For instance, the first provision of the Electoral Act as stated above contradicted Article 17 sub-section B of PDP constitution that says; "In the conduct of primaries for the party's candidate for the post of Governorship of a state, the primary shall be held at the state congress of the party specially convened for that purpose". This contradiction manifests because PDP in Kaduna state has not been governed by ideologies. It is bias and authoritarian in terms of nomination processes and procedures, throwing all the democratic tenants and elements especially during primary elections. They engaged in the subversion of the internal democracy within the party in the critical area of choosing candidates for election purpose and other forms of determining "Unopposed or Consensus Candidates". This simply indicates that, the political elites within the party in Kaduna State do not believe in the conduct of free and fair primary elections as a key element in the process of nurturing our democracy.

4.5 Intra-Party Politics in Peoples Democratic Party (PDP)

Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) has been the ruling political party in Nigeria from 1999-2015. The party controls the National Assembly that is made up of the Senate and House of Representatives. Out of the 36 States in Nigeria, the party was in control of about 26 States. The political objective of the party as stated above include, to seek political power for the purpose of protecting the territorial integrity of Nigeria and promoting the security, safety, welfare of all Nigerians; to promote and establish political stability in Nigeria and foster national unity and integration; to provide good governance that ensures probity and participatory democracy; to offer equal opportunities to hold the highest political, military, bureaucratic and judicial offices in the country to all citizens; and to provide the political environment that is conducive to economic growth and national development through private initiative and free enterprise (PDP Constitution; 2006). Not only that, the party won the presidential elections of 1999, 2003, 2007 and 2011. In the 2007 National Assembly Elections, the party won 85 out of 109 senatorial seats representing 77.98% and in 2011; the party won 72 (66.05%) senatorial seats. The party also won 222 out of 360 seats in the House of Representatives in 2007. In the gubernatorial elections, PDP maintained a ccomfortable lead by winning 27 states in 2007 and 23 in the 2011 general elections respectively. The party was able to hold the reign of power at the centre since the commencement of the fourth republic till 2015 when it was defeated by the opposition party (PDP Document; 2015).

In terms of internal organizational structure, the party is divided into three major levels- National, State and Geopolitical Zones. The National level is headed by the National Chairman of the Party. The office rotates, among the six geo-political zones of the country. The Northwest was the last to occupy the position of chairmanship of the party before 2015 general elections, with Alh. Ahmed Adamu Muazu. The State level is headed by any elected party member of the State and such an individual is addressed to as the Chairman of the State Party. The leader of the party in a geopolitical zone of the party is addressed as Vice-Chairman. Other important organs

of the Party are the 'Board of Trustee' (BOT), and the National Working Committee (NWC) and National Executive Committee (NEC). These organs oversee the smooth running of the Party, its policies, programmes and operations (PDP Constitution; 2006, PDP Document, 2015).

As Simbine (2014) notes, under a power sharing arrangement adopted since 1999 by the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP), the six most important political positions in the federation have been shared among six geo-political zones (three each in the north and south) as follows: President of the Federal Republic (Southwest zone), Vice President (Northeast zone), Speaker of the House of Representatives (Northwest zone) and Deputy Speaker of the House of Representatives (South-South zone). The expectation was that at the end of the maximum two terms of Olusegun Obasanjo in 2007, the presidential slot would shift to another geo-political zone of the country, with consequential adjustments in the zonal allocation of the other key political positions. He argues that a major attraction of this kind of power sharing arrangement was its flexibility and informality which helped to prevent the kind of ethno-sectarian polarization and gridlock that tarnished more rigid or constitutionally entrenched power sharing arrangements in countries like Lebanon and the former Yugoslavia.

As stated earlier, the Nigerian political parties are associations governed by the constitution and statutes. Their operations therefore are strictly governed by law. These being so, the politicians with the means to finance its establishment and operations take advantage of the ordinary members who, like ordinary shareholders of publicly quoted limited liability companies take advantage of the insignificant voting powers of the said members to exploit the system to their own benefit. As in the said public liability companies likewise the political parties; the actual owners are the rich men who contribute significant amount to the establishment and financing of the party operations, and by so doing invariably acquire controlling shares in the control and operation of the party as it were. Where the party has public officials such as

Governor, President or Chairman of councils or such other elective or appointive offices these public officials jointly finance the party. But the bulk of the financing and operational logistics fall on the governor or the president due largely to the enormous resources available to him for dispense as political goodwill and patronage (Oddih, 2007).

On accession to power, the Governor or the president having been the humble beneficiary of the party goodwill by virtue of the anointing by his predecessor, which act clothes him with garb of a vassal promptly deploys his incumbent power to hijack the party structure to shake off that encumbrance. And in accomplishing this strategic political act nothing is spared in realizing this object, including deliberately sidelining and rubbishing his erstwhile benefactor or godfather including all those related to him except they buy into his new power calculus. This was the origin of the political crises between General Olusegun Obasanjo and some members of the PDP led by the late Chief Sunday Awoniyi who shared the defunct National Party of Nigeria political tendencies. President Obasanjo had utilized his deputy's (Alhaji Atiku Abubakar) PDM faction to neutralize that group. When Alhaji Atiku Abubakar was using the PDM to gain certain advantages, General Obasanjo became politically matured enough to neutralize him; he sprung Chief Audu Ogbeh to displace Chief Gemade, whom Alhaji Atiku had installed through PDM. Chief Ogbeh was later to be rubbished and replaced with Col. Ahmadu Ali when Chief Ogbeh refused to dance to his tunes (Nnoli, 2003).

When the late President Musa Yar'Adua took over from General Obasanjo he replaced Col. Ahmadu Ali with Chief Ogbulafor whom President Jonathan inherited from him on his demise. However, Chief Ogbulafor was singing a tune of PDP zoning formula different from President Jonathan's ambition of running for the presidency after completing the Yar'Adua

tenure; he was promptly rubbished and replaced with Chief Okwesilieze Nwodo. President Jonathan by this act displaced General Obasanjo and other stakeholders. This weird political stratagem is replicated in the 36 states of the federation in greater or equal measure. Once the president or governor is in control of the political structure his political kingdom is assured smooth sail or less turbulence in the shark infested and muddy waters of Nigerian politics (Olaniyan, 2009).

The control of the party structure leverages the position of the Governor or the President in many ways; the most important being that during the party primaries the members of the Executive Committee at the Ward and Local Government Levels are members of the congress for the election of the chairman in a local government election. For the state congress for the nomination of the governorship candidate of the party the delegates consist of all the wards' Chairmen, Secretaries, the three-man delegates, local government chairmen, vice chairmen, secretaries, youth leaders, woman Leaders and the organizing secretaries are statutory delegates. So, it is the electoral value of these party officials during primaries that make the control of the party structure from the ward to the national levels a prized possession in the political kitty and arsenal of any political leader, be he the president or the governor (Olaniyan, 2009).

However, in the control of the party structure, the governor or the president remains impregnable except there arise a force of greater or equal control of resources (money and goodwill from the presidency or high echelon of the party) and in that case, a challenge could be sustained against his interest. It was the rise of some forces and the control of resources equal or greater to that of the various governors or senators and others that gave rise to the electoral

misfortunes of some of the governors, senators and so on which created the impression of change in the electoral culture of the parties.

After the National Party Executive of the PDP and governors had given the president automatic ticket and the presidency and the national party office had presumably conceded to the second term governors the right to nominate their successors and the added right to aspire to the position of a Senator for others, the governors went home celebrating. Governors are potentates and dictators in their various states but this assurance from the presidency and the national party office literally elevated them to the status of emperors whose words were laws and so some discountenanced any form of consultations or advice from stakeholders on the choice of candidates to succeed them and other positions. In their respective states they were used to running roughshod on their hapless party members and they hardly beheld to anybody in terms of advice or consultations in the management of the parties (Rourke, 2010).

Meanwhile, it has to be noted that the successes of the winners of the various PDP primaries were sometimes not as a result of any credible, free and fair contest where the candidates were afforded equal opportunities. Nothing as such happened from 1999-Date. What transpired was that during the filing of nomination forms for the election of the various delegates to the party congresses and convention, each faction prepared a list of its own delegates and obtains forms for them. At the end it is the list accepted and validated by the national party office that wins. So, once your list of delegates is not accepted by the national office of the party you are as good as a loser. What remained for you was to make as much noise as possible and perhaps explore the avenue of utilizing the various judicial remedies such as injunction or declaration to harass the party and your opponent (Tenuche, 2014). For instance, before the 2015

general elections, Peoples Democratic Party (PDP), had said that it only printed one form for the presidential post, meant for the then incumbent president Goodluck Jonathan. Expectedly, some members of the party, who also wanted to contest the presidential election, threatened to head to court to challenge the party's stance and this manifested during election as he was endorsed as a consensus candidate (Tenuche, 2014).

4.6 PDP and the Internal Wrangling in Nigeria's Fourth Republic:

Opinions diverged among scholars as well as politicians on why the divisions among PDP members in Nigeria's Fourth Republic and each scholar depends upon his/her ideological perspectives. Some people even went further to relate internal wrangling in PDP as one of the factors responsible for its failure in the 2015 general elections, some of those factors as discussed by scholars include; party ideological foundation, candidate selection problem, zoning formula, godfatherism, money politics, powerful influence of political elite and incumbency factor. These problems will be citically examined below:

i. Party Ideological Foundation

Ideology is one ingredient that consolidates and stultifies any political party. It is like a foundation upon which every other thing is built on. Party ideology precedes party structure, manifesto, and organisation. By party ideology, it is meant a set or body of ideas, representations and beliefs common to a specific social group. It consists of ethical interpretations and principles that set forth the purposes, organisations and boundaries of political life. Nnoli (2003), argues that ideology is a very crucial aspect of politics because it arises from the people's understanding, emotional identification with, and evaluation of reality'. In other words, it guides, supports, retrains and rationalises political actions (Michael, 2013). Political parties are formed by individuals that share the same political ideology, that hold a common vision and mission statement. Unfortunately, Nigeria, from inception as a sovereign state, has not been lucky to

evolve political parties that have strong ideological foundation and this lapse has consistently constituted lack of internal democracy in parties (Michael, 2013).

The earliest political parties in Nigeria, the National Council of Nigerian Citizens (NCNC), the Northern Peoples Congress (NPC) and the Action Group (AG) were rather ethnic driven or characterised by the interplay of primordial political loyalties and forces, hence bereft of viable political ideology on which the nation's political future could be anchored. As Nwankwo points out, this bankruptcy in ideology and vision has made party politics in Nigeria to be a bread and butter game where monetisation of the political process is the bedrock of loyalty and support. The NPC was a party with the philosophy of 'One North, One Destiny and One God' while the NCNC hung on to its universalistic pan-Nigeria vision and dreams until the carpet crossing episode practically reduced it to a regional party. Today, almost sixty registered political parties are functioning without any 'identified' ideology. The question to ask is thus; what is the ideology of the Peoples Democratic Party? Is the party progressive, conservative, leftist, rightist, reactionary', revolutionary'? Until this is addressed, problem of internal democracy will persist in PDP and other political parties in Nigeria (Olaniyan, 2009).

In tandem to the above argument, Tenuche (2014) notes that, poverty of ideology, the idiosyncratic character of executives, godfatherism, improper conduct of primaries, e.t.c were the critical issues as well as factors responsible for the current internal wrangling in Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Nigeria's fourth republic. Again, Anthonia (2014) observed that, problem of PDP today has to do with the party's constitutional defects, imposition of candidates on members, lack of political ideology, godfatherism as well as the conduct of faulty primaries. These according to them were the features of most Nigerian political parties today.

ii. Candidate Selection Problem

The question is who selects the party members that desire to contest in an election? What are the laid down processes for selecting a candidate in a party'? Is the selection based on their credentials and loyalties to the party or based on their deep pockets (power of the wallet) or

popularity of their godfathers? As Scarrow (2005) notes, recruiting and selecting candidates is a crucial task for parties, because parties' profiles during elections and while in office, are largely determined by which candidates are chosen and where their loyalties lie. Whichever procedure is adopted, it is the responsibility of the party to decide who is eligible to contest or participate in the election. The assumption is that selection should be based on good standing of members. In other words, selection of candidates should be devoid of prejudice, class and ethnic chauvinism. This is a serious problem in PDP. Amusan (2010) argues that, to ascribe undue influence, especially self-serving influence to the parliamentary group of the party in the selection of candidates would seriously undermine the democratic process.

Haruna (2007) made a comprehensive study of Peoples Democratic Party and democratisation process in Nigeria where he observed that the party has grappled with the problem of conducting free and fair intra-party elections which according to him is one of the hallmarks of democracy. According to Haruna (2007), the primary elections of December 1998/1999 were plagued with much contention that the party lost in a number of states as a result of frauds that were perpetuated. For example, the lost of governorship position in Jigawa, Kebbi, Zamfara and Kogi states for the party were directly attributable to the contentious conduct of the governorship primaries in those states as well as the inability of the national leadership of the party to mediate and bring about harmony.

A striking example was what happened in Anambra State chapter of the PDP where Professor Chukwuma Soludo was imposed on the chapter as the selected governorship candidate for the Anambra State by the National executive of the party. This was not only rejected by the State chapter, but it also triggered a spate of petition writing and prosecution which in effect brought about factions in the part and last minute crosscarpeting of some members to other parties. According to the Vice-Chairman of the southeast zone of the PDP, "Internal party wrangling denied our great party the governorship seat in the February 6 governorship election in Anambra State. The Anambra election is a litmus test to the party and we will not tolerate such

development in any of the remaining States in the southeast zone. We are going to put all the machinery in place to ensure that PDP wins the remaining States in the zone come 2011" (Metuh, 2010).

One can deduce from the above that, conducting primary elections, no doubt is one of the means of testing the tenacity and authenticity of any party's internal democracy. It is the first litmus test for political parties. Primaries are only effective in contributing to intra party democracy and maintaining party's stability if some conditions are upheld. Some of these conditions include, having a basic party structure, some cohesiveness within the party, and the ability of rank and file members to participate in elections. It has been proven from many studies that some primaries conducted in some political parties are sheer promotional agenda as they do not contribute positively to empowerment of the rank and file in those parties. The point is, if primaries are reduced to mere 'de-jure' or,'de-facto' process open only to the same old rich and powerful elite that mainly take care of their own or if members are not well informed about the choices they face, then, such intra-party democracy can be questioned.

Perhaps, the drama that was displayed by PDP in December 16, 2006 at the Eagle's Square, Abuja during the presidential primaries is still fresh in memories. Studies revealed that days prior to the primaries, it was obvious to many perceptive minds that Umaru Musa Yar'Adua, the then Governor of Katsina State and late entrant for the presidential race for the party would emerge winner. This was not unconnected with the alleged 'behind-the-scene' deals that played out before the primaries. The development perhaps, made to support Yar'Adua's candidacy. Anyhow, the party' submitted that it only adopted 'consensus' approach at the eleventh hour. But consensus exists only when people agree on something and they are more likely to agree when they share the same facts, assumptions, raw materials, methods, conclusions and rules for arriving at those conclusions or inferences (Akinola, 2009).

Be that as it may, in 2014, Goodluck Jonathan sent a bill to the National Assembly during his tenure for the amendment of the 2010 Electoral Act. He was demanding for an amendment of

Section 87(8) of the Electoral Act to allow political parties to have a freehand to include political appointees of the President and the Governors as delegates at party conventions or primaries. Studies revealed that there were fears that the section in question may deny the President and the Governors a significant number of cheap votes from their political appointees. This suggests that some politicians are using their advantaged positions in government to pervert democratic practice, particularly the autonomy of political parties to determine their owm political framework. Interestingly, the upper chamber, at the end of the day, rejected the bill on the ground that it was laden with 'toxic provisions' (Punch, 2014).

iii. Zoning Formula

Before 2015 general elections, the issue of zoning the office of the presidency in PDP had increasingly bifurcated members of the party particularly between the North and South. While some members of the party from the North argued that it was still the turn of the region or geo-political zone to produce the president of the country under the PDP platform, other members from the same North and virtually all members from the South hold that the demise of the former President-Umaru Musa Yar'Adua marked the end of the zoning formula. Some also claim that the issue of zoning was never discussed in any PDP fora; hence the party should support any PDP credible candidate from any part of the geopolitical zones. The worry was not only that the issue had succeeded in heating up the polity and fanned embers of ethnicity but also portrayed some lacunas in the party's internal democracy, which has generated a lot of internal wrangling, acrimony, bickering, recrimination, schism, cut-throat competition between the supporters of zoning formula and those of 'open candidacy'. The likely negative effect of this development may be the inability to produce a consensus candidate for the presidency by the party (Lere, 2011).

This became the case which seriously affected the party and at the end of the day and the reason why the party was not able to produce the next Nigerian president. According to Dunmoye, (2013), there are two issues behind the current divisions and cross-carpeting among

PDP members in Nigeria. Firstly; the constitution of the party is more of unitary type because it gives enormous powers to the Board of Ttrustees (BOT) and National Executive Committee (NEC), contrary to the Nigerian constitution which is federal. Secondly; the federal posts cannot go round, especially the top and powerful positions.

iv.. Godfatherism

Godfatherism is a symbiotic relationship between two persons namely; the godfather and the godson, where the godfather uses his political power and wealth to secure political position for the godson, who upon ascension into power, pays gratification to his mentor in kind or in cash. Godfatherism has become a norm in Nigeria's political environment; because some politicians have a belief that, without a godfather, an individual candidate feels cannot secure a political position.

Godfathers are political group endowed with affluence and financial power to carry out some political wheeling and dealing like sponsoring political party campaigns but with the hope of receiving rewards at the end of the day. This group of people relies on hierarchy, patronage, the spoils system and 'behind the scenes' control of the party. The group is corrupt and undemocratic though somehow organized and responsive. Political machine dates back to late 19th Century and early 20th Century in the United States where it existed in some municipalities and States such as, Boston, Chicago and New York City (Mukhtar, 2014). Kleptocrats and plutocrats on the other hand, are those individuals (scattered all over political parties) that steal from the State coffers and practice extortion as their modus operandi. They do not only appropriate State wealth and the benefits that accrue but also use their elected and appointed offices in the government to enrich themselves and their cronies (Lere, 2011).

To be specific, between 1999 and 2003, Chief Emeka Offor not only tormented Dr. Chinwoke Mbadinuju, then governor of Anambra State but also dominated the running of the affairs of the State because he was his godfather and need to be rewarded. It was a similar case between 2003 and 2005 when Dr. Chris Ngige was the Governor of Anambra State. Chris Uba

attempted to colonize the State on the ground that he single- handedly sponsored Ngige's candidacy. The climax of the ugly scenario was the abduction of the governor in July 2003 by a group of hired police team. Interestingly, the ruling party then, PDP did not bother either to carry out any investigation or take any disciplinary actions; instead, the Governor was abashed, taunted and made to leave the party with ignominy. This, it may not be out of place to infer that Peoples Democratic Party has been perhaps, inadvertently hijacked by political machines, kleptocrats and plutocrats (Butler, 2010).

v. Money Politics

What makes any political party solid is funding, that is, the amount of financial backing it enjoys from members. That is why most times founders of political parties are more interested in attracting members who have economic power than those who have the intellectual capital. This buttresses Marx's argument on the 'materialist conception of history', that it is the economy (economic power) that serves as the foundation upon which is erected the superstructure of culture, law and government. Similarly, Mills (1956) in Ake (2001), in his famous work, 'The Power Elite' argues that political power resides in the controlling positions of powerful institutions. The means of exercising power in any institution or social groups are narrowly concentrated in a few hands. He puts it thus:

> They rule the big corporations; they run the machinery of the State, Political Parties and claim its prerogatives. They direct the military establishment and occupy the strategic command posts of the social structure in which are now centred the effective means of the power and the wealth and celebrity which they enjoy... To be celebrated, to be wealthy, to be in power requires access to major institutions, for the institutional positions men occupy determines in large part their chances to have and to hold valued experience. (Ake, 2001; 147).

As Ukeh (2014) advances, money and democracy have a complex relationship, especially since the affluent role of private money in politics can have many distorting effects such as, corruption, buying of votes and clientelism. When a party is well funded, it may be able

to achieve a lot of things. But the financiers usually have some strings attached to it. International IDEA (2006) expatiates this when it argued that the 'illiberal' nature of the legal framework that governs party activities in Nigeria is empowering those individuals within a party who, through political (including violent means or thuggery) or financial control, wield enormous power on how parties function. They ultimately determine who is nominated or elected within the party or to public offices. In 2002, preparatory to the 2003 general elections, Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) campaign team organised a launching to boost the campaign. This attracted a wide range of technocrats, captains of industries, political elites and bureaucrats. In that event, over six billion naira was realised. While some of the donors were key political actors and members of the PDP, others were not, but well connected to the presidency and the party. The party at the end of the day usually compensates or rewards such donors with contracts and political appointments. Drawing on Anambra State chapter of PDP, Chief Emeka Offor and Chris Uba, between 1999 and 2006 made the State ungovernable simply because they were one of the outstanding financiers of PDP.

Irregular use of money for political activities in Nigeria dates back to the colonial period. However, today more than ever, money exerts far-reaching influence over electoral politics in the country. The emergence of new breed politicians has further introduced complexity into the relationship between money and politics in Nigeria. This group enjoys overwhelming financial power and tacit support of the military elite class that dominated the political space until 1999. The domination of the major political parties by the moneyed elite has continued to depress participation by the rank and file voters (Yaqub; 2003:289).

The influences of money bags as observed by scholars have continued to dominate the political space to the detriment of representation and participation in the electoral politics. Infact, it is fast shrinking the political space, becoming a key variable in determining who participates in electoral politics in Nigeria. For example, the nomination fees for party members seeking

elective positions have become so high that only the rich few political entrepreneurs can participate in party primaries. There are no available records on the amount of money spent by candidates and political parties during the elections so far in Nigeria. This has also been the tradition in Kaduna state since 1999. Although the challenge of money politics in Nigeria has generated considerable discussion, there are however, little useful empirical evidences available on the impact of money politics on the electoral processes which also reveals the significance of this research work.

vi. Powerful Influence of Political Elite

There is no gain saying that the problems of internal democracy in PDP took roots in party executives arrogance as well as powerful influence of elite since 1999. This affirms the common saying that when the head of the fish is bad, the entire body becomes bad as well. The assumption is that some PDP executives, especially at the National level, feel that they have the latitude to turn things around as they wish in the party. That was why between 1999 and 2007, the then President of Nigeria, Olusegun Obasanjo, took total control of the running of the affairs of the National Assembly. Within that dispensation there emerged five presidents of the Senate; Evans Enwerem, Chuba Okadigbo, Pius Anyim Pius, Adolphus Wabara and Ken Nnamani. He also fought some key actors and players of the party who were not ready to compromise and tolerate his whims and caprices. Some of these personalities were, Chief Audu Ogbeh, Atiku Abubakar, Orji Uzor Kalu, Ghali Naaba, Ibikunle Amosun, Chief Tony Anineh, Aruthur Nzeribe and Uche Chukwumereije. The inability of the party to manage the crisis and conflicts led to decamping of many of the founding fathers and respected chieftains of the party to other political parties (Ukeh, 2014).

Problem of executive arrogance prevails in many States occupied by the PDP; a situation where State Governors solely dictates what goes on at the State level. As Metuh (2010) points out, “One thing I have noticed in States where there are crisis, is that the governors don’t

want to let go their grips on the party structures and other stalwarts insist that there must be separation of party from government. The governors fund the party but I don't subscribe to it that the governors should run the party. The party should be the conscience of the people, the party should be able to control the governor and say, you haven't done enough roads, and you haven't done this and that. But it isn't happening especially where the legislature isn't acting as checks and balances on the Executive abuse of power. It is only the party that can do that, but the party isn't doing that. "Perhaps, that was why Ogun State House of Assembly was at the level of abysmal collapse before 2015 elections. In an attempt by the Governor to have an upper hand in the State Assembly affairs, the Assembly was factionalised into two groups, G.9 and G.15, while G.9 was in support of the then governor; G.15 was against his method of administration. Suffice it to say that the firm grip of governors on party structures occasioned the move by the National Assembly to amend the Electoral Act 2010. The amendment was to pave the way for legislators to become automatic members of the National Executive Committees (NECs) of their parties. One of the legislators puts it thus: "We are aware of fears being raised by some Nigerians and the opposition but the Truth is that our democracy will be endangered if we do not expand the NEC of parties. We are actually on a mission to save Nigeria's democracy. Most governors have hijacked the party structures at the ward, local government, state and zonal levels. They also call the shots at NEC meetings, especially in the Peoples Democratic Party, where the bidding prevails. We want NEC of our parties to become a robust platform (not mere rubberstamping) with alternative views. That is why we are bringing more members on board. A clique cannot be taking decisions on behalf of the majority'' (Alii, 2010).

vii.. Incumbency Factor

PDP internal wrangling became more pronounced after its zoning formula was manipulated in favour of President Goodluck Jonathan in 2010, following the death of Umaru Musa Yar'adua who died in 2010 and was expected to spend two terms of eight years as a

candidate representing the north after the former President Olusegun Obasanjo, a southerner completed his tenure.

After much debate and pressure, President Goodluck Jonathan, another southerner was supported to run for the position after getting a promise from him that, he will be going for only one term of four years. A communique' signed by 20 PDP governors which was read by Shema said; "At the emergency meeting held on Thursday, December 16, 2010 and having deliberated extensively on democratic practices the world over observed as follows:

i. Democratic system all over the world recognizes the principle of incumbency and continuity.

ii. That, entrenched democratic culture and its persistent in presidential system and our constitution entitles our president to go for the second term which the PDP governors supported.

iii.. The governors also recognize the Yar'adua/Jonathan ticket and therefore support President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan to co test the 2011 election as the PDP presidential candidate for a period of four years only" (Tenuche, 2014). She further observed that, two months after the resolution former governor of Niger State, Alhaji babangida Aliyu raised the issue of one-time pact at the PDP caucus meeting in Abuja, but his argument was dismissed by the presidential aides.

The implication of all these is that, section 87 of the electoral Act, 2010 (As amended) relating to the conduct of party primaries and nominations are ceremonial. When the president and the governors cannot get their candidature through the party primaries, they revert back to the provision of of section 31 (1) of the Act which says "every political party shall not later than 60 days before the date of appointed for a general election under the provisions of this Act, submit to the INEC in the prescribed forms, the list of candidates the party proposes to sponsor at the elections, provided that the commission shall not reject or disqualify candidates for any reason whatsoever.

The above is an indication on impact of incumbency in the internal procedure of the Peoples Democratic Party. Not only that, it seems no national chairman of PDP has served his tenure properly starting from Chief Solomon Lar, Chief Barnabas Gemade, Chief Audu Ogbeh, Dr. Ahmadu Ali, Prince Vincent Ogbulafor, Dr. Okwesilieze, Nwodo, Alhaji Bamanga Tukur and Alhaji Ahmad Adamu Mu'azu. The question to ask is that, why have all PDP chairmen been facing crises of one kind or another? It is a sign of lack of independence of the party from the presidency or simply power of incumbency.

The power of incumbency as examined above was not only limited to the presidency but all over the nation, office holders used government resources, logistics and property for electoral purposes. Agencies and instruments that were conscripted included official media outlets, vehicles, funds, facilities and goodwill. The recklessness of some incumbent governors has led to the complete castration of local government councils. This is simply because they dissolved at will and some chairmen are removed at the discretion of the governor. Where elections are organized, the state independent electoral commissions are rendered impotent and programmed to return predetermined verdicts in local government elections (Amusan, 2011).

Because of the opaque nature of accountability in Nigeria, the weakened power of National and State Assemblies, the limitations relating to the spending limit of candidates is taken for granted. Incumbents use security votes and other channels to spend over and above the spending limits and the electoral management body does not have the means and the capacity to check these excesses. Therefore the sanction for contravention provided in section 91 (10) and (11) of the Act becomes meaningless. Nigeria is cash based economy where it is easy to move money around and it is difficult to trace dirty electoral money as some of the incumbents, their friends, fronts and cronies have their own banks, Bureau de Change and cash officers in different banks and finance houses (Okoye, 2014).

Election expenses however incurred can only attract sanctions if incurred by a candidate before the notification of the date fixed for the election and excludes any expenditure incurred before the notification of the date fixed for the election with respect to any deposit made by the candidate on his/her nomination in compliance with the law. This enables incumbents use security votes and funny allocations and expenditure by ministries, departments and agencies of government to prepare in advance for elections. This unregulated expenditure enables most incumbents to hire and party political thugs, party agents, private security outfits and opinion leaders before the notification of the day of the election in contravention of law and constitution. These political thugs engage in myriad of electoral crimes and are shielded by executive thugs using power of incumbency (Sanda, 2011).

Furthermore, at the federal level, attempts were made and continue to be made by incumbents to use different arms of the security services and enforcement agencies to harass, intimidate and disqualify candidates for both primary and general elections. Those that are in the group of the incumbent president are assured of immunity from investigation and prosecution from any form of corruption or abuse of power while those that have refused to fall in line are hounded and in some cases removed from office. On Election Day, orderlies are used to harass and rig elections. They are used in collaboration with political thugs to engage in targeted attacks against their opposition, staff of INEC, agents of political parties and election observers (Sanda, 2011).

4.7 Intra-Party Politics in Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) Kaduna State Chapter

Nigeria's democracy is anchored on party politics and participation of the people in the electoral process which is mainly expressed when political parties present issues of national concern to the electorate. It is on this note that one can simply assume that political parties occupy a special place in the democratic equation of the country. Today, it is a common fact that the role of political parties in consolidating democracy has left much to be desired as evidenced in their modus operandi which has often stimulated controversies within the Nigeria's body-politic. For instance, in Kaduna state, political parties often struggle to win election contests by all means. In the process, they are faced with the challenge of choosing legitimate means to actualize this end. The over ambition to acquire and control of political power by the two major political parties in the state (i.e. PDP and APC) left them with the choice of engaging in all sorts of activities, both legal and illegal, moral and immoral to ensure that each captures political power (Punch, 2014).

In matured democracies, political parties are not seen as mere platform for contesting elections or political appointments, rather, their functions should include providing political education for their members and informing them about public opinion on national issues as well as maintaining a strong ideological base that would ensure its survival in future elections. Therefore, before examining the nature and character of intra-paty politics in Peoples Democratic Party (PDP), Kaduna state chapter, there is need to briefly discuss the background of politics and governance in Kaduna state before the commencement of the fourth republic.

4.7.1 Politics and Governance in Kaduna State Before 1999

Kaduna State Started as the North Central State with Kaduna as its capital. Kaduna had two military governors between 1967 and 1977 (Abba Kyari; 1967 – 1975) and (Usman Jibrin; 1975 – 1977). Since the inception of the state as Kaduna in 1976, it has had 9 military governors and 7 civilian governors till date. Group Captain Mukhtar Muhammad was the military governor of Kaduna from 1977 – 1978. Group Captain Ibrahim Mahmud Alfa who held the position from 1978 – 1979, the year the Second Republic began under a civilian government led by President Shehu Shagari that replaced Group Captain Mukhtar Muhammad. Alhaji Balarabe Musa was elected as the first civilian governor of the state under the platform of the People's Redemption Party (PRP). He served from 1979 to 1981, when the Kaduna State House of Assembly controversially impeached him. His deputy, Abba Musa Rimi who completed the tenure till 1983, succeeded him (Omotola; 2010).

In 1983, Lawal Kaita was elected as the Governor of Kaduna State on the platform of the National Party of Nigeria (NPN). However, another military coup took power from civilian authority once again in 1984. The new military regime of General Muhammadu Buhari appointed Air Vice Marshall Usman Muazu as the Military Governor of Kaduna. He served from 1984-1985. Two years later, another coup led by General Ibrahim Babangida appointed Colonel Dangiwa Umar as the Military Governor of Kaduna from 1985 to 1988. Abdullahi Sarki Mukhtar replaced Colonel Dangiwa Umar and ran the state from 1988 to 1990 (Omotola, 2010).

The last Military Governor appointed by General Ibrahim Babangida regime was Abubakar Tanko Ayuba who ran the state from 1990 to 1992 and handed over power to a civilian elected governor in the ill-fated and short-lived Third Republic. Mohammed Dabo Lere

became the third elected civilian governor of Kaduna State. He emerged victorious from the 1992 elections under the platform of the National Republican Convention (NRC). His rule was short-lived due to the last military coup in Nigeria's political history, which was engineered and led by General Sani Abacha. As a result, Colonel Lawal Jafaru Isa was appointed as the 7th military governor of Kaduna. He ruled the state from 1993 to 1996.

General Sani Abacha appointed Colonel Hamid Ali as the 8th Military Governor. The current Director General of Nigerian Customs ran Kaduna from 1996 to 1998. The sudden death of General Sani Abacha and the emergence of General Abdulsalam Abubakar as the Head of State led to the appointment of Umar Faruk Ahmed as the Military Governor of Kaduna in August 1998. He served until 1999 and handed over to a civilian Governor after the end of the transitional regime.

4.7.2 Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) and Intra-Party Politics in Kaduna State

The Fourth republic began in 1999 and has continued to endure till today. Ahmed Mohammed Makarfi of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) emerged victorious in the 1999 gubernatorial primaries as well as general elections. After serving two consecutive terms of four years, Makarfi was succeeded by Architect Mohammed Namadi Sambo who ran the state from 2007 to 2010. After the death of President Umaru Musa Yar'adua, President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan appointed Governor Mohammed Namadi Sambo as his Vice President. Thus, Patrick Ibrahim Yakowa, (his deputy) took over as the Governor of Kaduna State (Sunday-Trust, 2014).

The incumbent state governor then in person, Patrick Ibrahim Yakowa, emerged the PDP standard-bearer for the 2011 governorship election in the state. This was the first time a

Christian won gubernatorial primaries in the state on the PDP platform. Other aspirants defeated by Yakowa were Alhaji Suleiman Usman Hunkuyi, Alhaji Shuaibu Idris Mikati, e.t.c. He polled 1098 votes. In the National Assembly primaries, Caleb Zagi (PDP Kaduna South) lost the senatorial ticket to Esther Nenadi Usman, a former finance minister; while Mohammed Kabir Jibrin lost the Kaduna central PDP ticket to Abubakar Hamisu Mairago. Alhaji Ahmed Muhammed Makarfi retained his senatorial ticket (Sunday-Trust, 2014).

However, the death of Governor Patrick Ibrahim Yakowa in a tragic helicopter crash led to the emergence of his deputy, Mukhtar Ramalan Yero as Governor and he ran the state from 2012 to 2015. Governor, Mukhtar Yero, contested and won the governorship primary election of Peoples Democratic Party, (PDP) in 2015. Indications emerged early that the then incumbent governor may have been endorsed as a consensus candidate of the party, this was supported when three out of the five aspirants cleared for the primary, former secretary to Kaduna state government, Samaila Lawal Yakawada, ex-minister of state for aviation, Felix Hassan Hyat and Air Comm. John Boko Ajeye (rtd) all stepped down ahead of the primary. The consensus issue was however debunked when Sen. Aziz stood his ground for the election to hold. Though, the landslide victory at the end of the process gave credence to the fact that all the other aspirants may have agreed to lend their support to Governor Yero (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

Declaring the result of the contest, the chairman of the PDP governorship primary election panel in the state, Steve Oruh, said Mr. Yero polled 902 votes to defeat a Senator, Haruna Zego, who got only one vote. Three aspirants had earlier withdrawn from the contest at the commencement of the primary. Mr. Oruh announced the withdrawal of Ajie Bako, Lawal Sama'ila Yakawada and Felix Hyet. The election, which was held at the Murtala Square Kaduna,

was attended by the Nigerian Vice President, Mohammed Namadi Sambo, the state Deputy Governor, Ambassador Nuhu Audu Bajoga as well as two former senators, Ahmed Mohammed Makarfi and Esther Nenadi Usman, who lost her own seat at the party's senatorial primaries, among other party stalwarts (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

Mukhtar Ramalan Yero unsuccessfully ran for re-election in the recently concluded 2015 general elections but lost out to Mallam Nasir Ahmad El-Rufai of the All Progressive Congress (APC). Nasir El-Rufai became the first opposition politician to govern Kaduna since the birth of the Fourth Republic. He is the incumbent Governor of the state after being sworn in on May 29, 2015.

PDP neglect the principles guiding their internal democracy in terms of nomination of party leaders. Infact, only Ibrahim Yaro and other executive members were elected at the convention when the branch of the party was launched in Kaduna state in 1998. Whan Makarfi assumed office as Governor of Kaduna state; he imposed Yaro Makama on the members as the new party chairman who served for good eight years. Mohammed Namadi Sambo appointed Hon, Ya'u Usman Sa'in Jema'a as a new PDP chairiman on his assumption to office in 2007. Late Patrick Ibrahim Yakowa influenced the appointment of Ambassador Nuhu Audu Bajoga as new PDP chairman after his assumption to office as governor. The same thing with Muktar Ramalan Yero who influenced the emergence of Hon. Abubakar Gayya Haruna as a new charman between 2012 and 2015 (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

As a result of internal wrangling within the party nation wide and the division of the party into new and old PDP in 2013, a total of 75 leaders of Peoples Democratic Party in Kaduna state defected to the All Progressives Congress (APC) and another 2300 members later joined them. Those who defected included former PDP chairmen Yaro Audi Makama and Ibrahim

Yaro, former commissioners, Ibrahim Iro (finance), Hassan Shekarau and Musa Baba Zaria, Ambassador Sule Buba, Gideon Morik (former chairman of Jema'a local government), Wan Yan Zazzau (former chairman of Kudan local government), Suleiman Abdu Kwari (former member of house of representatives and now commissioner of finance under APC) and Aisha Mairago (former PDP women leader). Others are former local government chairmen Sabo Uba (Sabon Gari) and Auwal Tafoki (Kaduna South), Ibrahim Yahaya, Isa Tunau as well as 5 councilors (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

From the above therefore, one can understand that, PDP as a ruling political party in Kaduna state between 1999 and 2015 had failed to put in place internal democracy that can be equated with minimum global standards. Its activities were dominated by what Michael (2013) refers to as a single individual or a tiny caucus with the reserved right to flag bearers of the party. It is not only PDP, but most of the parties in the state especially the dominant ones, have posed serious challenges to democratic survival. It is obvious that, parties that imposed candidates will definitely have problems with other party members who felt cheated or marginalized. In most occasions, this results into violence among the supporters of each candidate. Assassinations and attempted assignations were not ruled out within the parties involved in the imposition, in some instances, this is responsible for the endless cross-carpeting by party members who were aggrieved by the obvious injustice meted out to them by some powerful political elite and have no option than to seek their polity fortunes elsewhere.

Not only that, it is also an indication that, since 1999, the process of nominating PDP candidates for various elective positions in Kaduna state was anchored on the decision of political Godfathers as well as political elite. The actions of these godfathers hinder the effective

operations of political parties as driving force of democracy. In Kaduna state, godfathers play the role of political gatekeepers who dictate to the participants in politics as well as the conditions under which they can operate. They monetize elective positions to the extent that the highest bidder gets their nod which forces the cost of elections. The powerful influence of political elite also keeps ideological candidates out of the race.

What the above explains is that Challenges of internal democracy in PDP is not only peculiar to Kaduna state in particular, but the country at large that was why Haruna (2007) conclude that, "the possibility of PDP to sustain democracy and democratic ideals in Nigeria seems to getting neglected by the day because of contradictions in its internal power relations, the authoritarian disposition of its members as well as its inability to be guided by any discernible ideological policy prescriptions and finally asserted that, if acronyms must be rigidly applied, PDP is in fact, the Peoples Dictatorial Platoon".

CHAPTER FIVE

ANALYSIS OF GUBERNATORIAL PRIMARIES OF PEOPLES DEMOCRATIC PARTY (PDP), KADUNA STATE 1999-2015.

5.1 Introduction:

Data for this research was gathered from two major sources, i.e. primary and secondary sources. Under the primary source, two instruments of data collection were used i.e. personal interview which was the major source of primary data in this work complemented by the administration of questionnaires. For the secondary source, journals, books, newspapers and magazines were used.

The key informants for the personal interview includes: PDP Delegates for the 2014/2015 Gubernatorial Primary Elections. This is due to inability of the researcher to have the list of delegates for other study periods from both INEC and PDP Sedretariat. To complement the data for 1999, 2003, 2007 and 2011, Party Chairmen and their Secretaries in the six selected local governments were also selected and interviewed. Other respondents interviewed include; former and present executive members of PDP, former executive governors under PDP, Gubernatorial aspirants as well as few aggrieved members who defected to the opposition party.

Apart from the personal interview method, the work also administered 604 structured questionnaires. The questionnaires were closed-ended and were administered within the three (3) Senatorial Districts of Kaduna State. Therefore, three research assistants and six other PDP members were employed to help in the distribution and retrieval of the questionnaires and other important aspects of this study. Not only that, respondents in this research appeared anonymous because we promised not to write their names boldly in both the text and the appendix.

5.2 Data Analysis and Interpretaion

TABLE 5.2.1:Local Government Areas of Respondents:

S/No	Name of LG Areas	LG Code	No of Questionnaires Distributed	Questionnaires Returned	Questionnaires Not Returned	Valid Questionnaires
1.	Birnin Gwari	001	99	95	4	95
2.	Kaduna North	009	100	93	7	93
3.	Kauru	014	100	95	5	95
4.	Lere	017	100	98	2	98
5.	Zangon Kataf	022	102	93	9	93
6.	Zaria	023	103	100	3	100
7.	**Total**		**604**	**574**	**30**	**574**

Source: Survey Research (2015).

Table 5.2.1 above indicates that, six hundred and four (604) questionnaires were distributed in the six local government areas under study in which only five hundred and seventy four (574) questionnaires were duly completed and returned while thirty questionnaires were not returned. Therefore, our analysis in this study was based on **574** questionnaires.

TABLE 5.2.2: Gender of Respondents

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
MALE	456	79.0
FEMALE	118	21.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.2 indicates that, four hundred and fifty six respondents representing seventy nine percent (79**%)** of the total respondents are males, while one hundred and eighteen respondents representing twenty one percent (21**%)** of the total respondents are females. This shows that, men filled the questionnaires more than their female counterparts and it is still an

indication that there is a wide gap between male and female in terms political participation in the study area.

TABLE 5.2.3: Age of Respondents

Age Range	Frequency	Percentage
18-28	126	22.0
28-38	157	27.0
38-48	175	30.0
48 and above	112	20.0
No response	4	1.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.3 above shows that one hundred and twenty six respondents representing twenty two percent (22%) of the total respondents fall between the ages of eighteen and twenty eight years (18-28 yrs); one hundred and fifty seven respondents representing twenty seven percent (27%) of the total sample frame fall between the ages of twenty eight and thirty eight years (28-38yrs).

However, one hundred and seventy five respondents representing thirty percent (30%) fall between the ages of thirty eight and forty eight years (38-48 yrs), one hundred and twelve respondents representing twenty percent (20%) of the total respondents fall between the ages of forty eight and above (48 yrs and above), while four respondents representing one percent (1%) of the total sample did not respond to the question.

This implies that data was obtained from all the categories of adult population of the Local Government Areas under study in order to examine the conduct of gubernatorial primaries of Peoples Democratic Party in the study area.

TABLE 5.2.4 Marital Status of Respondents

Marital Status	Frequency	Percentage
Single	140	24.0
Married	378	66.0
Divorced	32	6.0
Widowed	18	3..0
No response	6	1.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

From the table 5.2.4 above, one hundred and fourty respondents representing twenty four percent (24%) of the total respondents are not married; three hundred and seventy eight respondents representing sixty six percent (66%) of the total respondents are married; thirty two respondents representing six percent (6%) of the total respondents are divorced; eighteen respondents representing three percent (3%) of the total respondents are widowed; while six respondents representing one percent (1%) of the total respondents did not respond to this question.

This implies that the researcher was able to get data from people who are considered responsible in their respective families to express their view on the study under review. Not only that, married people dominate because, early marriage is a common practice amongst the Hausa-Fulani, and they are the dominant ethnic group in the study area with average of 14-18 years for female and 18-20 years for male, especially in rural communities. Majority of the respondents were married and therefore directly or indirectly concerned with the gubernatorial primaries of Peoples Democratic Party.

TABLE 5.2.5 Religious affiliation of the Respondents

Religious Affiliation	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Islam	394	69.0
Christianity	178	31.0
No response	2	0.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.5 indicates that, three hundred and ninety four respondents representing sixty nine percent (69%) of the total respondents were Muslims; one hundred and seventy eight respondents representing thity one percent (31%) of the total respondents were christians, while two respondents representing zero percent (0%) of the total respondents did not respond to the question.

This also shows that the majority of the respondents of this study were Muslims because Islam is the dominant religion of the study area. Not only that, it is an indication that religion has to do with internal democracy especially with regards to gubernatorial primaries of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP), Kaduna State Chapter. That is why electorates consider the religious inclination of aspirants before accepting his/her candidacy, though this is anti-democratic. Nevertheless, the researcher was able to get data from different people cutting across the whole major religions practiced in the study area.

TABLE 5.2.6 Occupations of Respondents

Occupation	Frequency	Percentage
Civil Service	136	24.0
Politicians	154	27.0
Business	80	14.0
Farming	132	23.0
Studentship	69	12.0
No response	3	1.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.6 shows that, 106 respondents representing eighteen percent (18%) of the total respondents are civil servants; one hundred and fifty four respondents representing twenty seven percent (27%) of the total respondents are politicians; eighty respondents representing fourteen percent of the total respondents are traders, one hundred and thirty two respondents representing twenty three percent (23%) of the total respondents are farmers; ninety nine respondents representing seventeen percent (17%) of the total respondents are students, while three respondents representing one percent (1%) of the total respondents did not respond to the question.

This also indicates that over 45% of the respondents were civil servants and farmers. This might be due to the fact that, Kaduna State was historically known to be a colonial creation and it was also well-known for accommodating workers working in colonial establishments. This historical fact has informed a significant number of the people of the state engage in civil service and farming.

TABLE 5.2.7 Qualifications of Respondents

Qualification	Frequency	Percentage
Pri. Sch. Leaving Cert.	142	14.0
GCE/SSCE	195	26.0
Diploma	107	23.0
N.C.E	65	18.0
First Degree & above	56	16.0
No response	9	2.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.7 indicates that, one hundred and forty two respondents representing fourteen percent (14%) of the total respondents are holders of primary school certificate; onen hundred and ninety five respondents representing twenty six percent (26%) of the total respondents are secondary school certificate holders.

However, one hundred and seven respondents representing twenty three percent (23%) of our total sample size are diploma holders; sixty five respondents representing eighteen percent (18%) of our total respondents are holders of National certificate of Education. Moreover, fifty six respondents representing sixteen percent (16%) of our total respondents are holders of first degree and above while nine respondents representing two percent (2%) of the total respondents did not respond to this question.

This implies that effort was made by the researcher to seek the opinion of people that possess enough knowledge of western education by having first degree and those that have possessed only first leaving school certificate in the areas under study because such people were considered enlightened enough to understand and appreciate the phenomena under investigation

and hence offer correct views that could lead to reliable findings regarding the conduct of gubernatorial primaries of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Kaduna state.

TABLE 5.2.8 Employment Status of Respondents

Employment Status	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Government Employment	140	24.0
Unemployed	429	75.0
No response	5%	1.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.8 indicates that, one hundred and forty respondents representing twenty four percent (24%) of the total respondents are employed, four hundred and twenty nine respondents representing seventy five percent (75%) of the total respondents are not government workers, while five respondents representing one percent (1%) of the total respondents did not respond to the question.

This also shows that more than seventy percent of the respondents were either self-employed or unemployed; this might be the reason why they were many and became active in the politics of Peoples Democratic Party in Kaduna State. Others were few civil servants comprising of only 140 respondents representing 24% of the total respondents. This might be due to the fact that civil servants are prohibited to engage in partisan politics.

TABLE 5.2.9: Emergence of PDP delegates in 1999 gubernatorial primaries of Kaduna State

PDP Delegates in 1999	Frequency	Percentage
Hand-picked by the governor	54	9.0
Elected by the party card carrying members	370	64.0
Hand-picked by party executives	68	12.0
Consensus	78	14.0
No response	4	1.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.9 indicates that, with regard to the question "How PDP delegates emerged in 1999 gubernatorial primaries of Kaduna State"? fifty four respondents representing nine percent (9%) of the total respondents agreed that, the delegates were hand-picked by the governor, three hundred and seventy respondents representing sixty four percent (64%) of the total respondents said they were democratically elected by the party members, sixty eight respondents representing twelve percent (12%) of the total respondents said they were hand-picked by the party executives, seventy eight respondents representing fourteen percent of the total respondents said, they emerged through consensus among members, while four respondents representing one percent (1%) of the total respondents did not respond to the question.

With the exception of 1999, PDP has been using one criterion (Consensus) for the emergence of delegates for all its governorship primaries in the state. PDP uses consensus as a tool for the emergence of either delegates or candidates for primary elections. According to them, PDP being a national party has to respect the principle of federal character in its

candidates' selection procedure, leadership nomination processes as well as appointment into public offices. This to them is done to ensure equal representations by wards, local governments and constituencies even though some people regarded it as undemocratic (Interview; Anonymous; 2015).

This shows that, the PDP primary election of 1999 was to some extent democratic in nature for a simple reason that card carrying members of the party were allowed to vote for the delegates who will select the gubernatorial aspirants at the primary election exercise. More than sixty percent of the respondents testified to that considering table 6.2.9 above.

Peoples Democratic Party in Kaduna State is not fully operating within the nuance of democratic principles as well as established rules and regulations of its constitution. This tends to affect political competition. Candidates for elective positions are sometimes handpicked and imposed on the parties by the political leaderships arbitrarily without recourse to due process. Thus, a number of political parties are experiencing internal turmoil and revolt because of the arbitrariness that has become the norm of many of them.

TABLE 5.2.10: Emergence of PDP delegates in 2003 gubernatorial primaries of Kaduna State

PDP delegates in 2003	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Hand-picked by the governor	98	17.1
Elected by the party card carrying members	70	12.2
Hand-picked by party executives	88	15.3
Consensus	310	54.0
No response	8	1.4
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.10 above revealed that, out of five hundred and seventy four respondents, ninety eight respondents representing seventeen percent (17%) of the total respondents agreed that, the delegates were hand-picked by the governor, seventy respondents representing twelve point two percent (12.2%) of the total respondents said they were democratically elected by the party members, eighty eight respondents representing fifteen point three percent (15.3%) of the total respondents said they were hand-picked by the party executives, three hundred and ten respondents representing fifty four percent (54%) of the total respondents said, they emerged through consensus among members, while eight respondents representing one point four percent (1.4%) of the total respondents did not respond to the question.

Delegates for PDP governorship primaries were selected among all card carrying members in 1999, but in the subsequent elections we used consensus as a tool to have a fair representation of local governments, constituencies and wards levels so as to respect the principle of federal character which is a guide for any electoral contests as provided by the constitution of the party (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

This indicates that, Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Kaduna State engaged in the subversion of electoral processes for the emergence of unopposed or consensus candidates. This might be due to the fact that, PDP respects faderal character principles (Zoning) in its appointments as well as candidates' selection procedure which has to do with equal representation of states, local government areas and geo-political zones of the country.

TABLE 5.2.11: Emergence of PDP delegates in 2007 gubernatorial primaries of Kaduna State

PDP delegates in 2007	` Frequency	Percentage
Hand-picked by the governor	128	22.3
Elected by the party card carrying members	40	7.0
Hand-picked by party executives	68	12.0
Consensus	333	58.0
No response	5	0.7
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015).

Table 5.2.11 above revealed that, out of five hundred and seventy four respondents, one hundred and twenty eight respondents representing twenty two point three percent (22.3%) of the total respondents agreed that, the delegates were hand-picked by the governor, fourty respondents representing seven percent (7%) of the total respondents said they were democratically elected by the party members, sixty eight respondents representing twelve percent (12%) of the total respondents said they were hand-picked by the party executives, three hundred and thirty three respondents representing fifty eight percent (58%) of the total respondents said, they emerged through consensus among members, while five respondents representing zero point seven percent (0.7%) of the total respondents did not respond to the question.

To support the above, some respondents interviewed by the researcher confirmed that, the conduct of 2007 PDP primary elections in Kaduna state was conducted in disregard of constitutional and electoral guidelines. For instance, according to respondent, party members were not given right to select the candidates of their choice but rather engaged in capricious allocation of votes as well as selection of consensus candidates which is against the tenets of

democracy world-wide. Some party executives always claim that, not all party members are qualified to contest for primary election that was why they try as much as they can to fix candidates that can truly represent the interest of the party at the state and federal level (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

This shows that, Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Kaduna State has adopted the policy of consensus for the emergence of delegates who will select candidates during primary elections. This is simply because it was the formular they used in both 2003 and 2007 gobernatorial primaries as indicated above and supported by more than fifty five percent of the total respondents. Again, more than twenty percent of the respondents testified to the fact that the delegates were selected by the then governor of the state which is also an indication that to some extent an incumbency factor works in the selection of delegates as well as nomination of candidates during primaries.

TABLE 5.2.12: Emergence of PDP delegates in 2011 gubernatorial primaries of Kaduna State

PDP delegates in 2011	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Hand-picked by the governor	102	18.0
Elected by the party card carrying members	21	4.0
Hand-picked by party executives	71	12.0
Consensus	372	65.0
No response	8	1.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.12 above shows that, out of five hundred and seventy four respondents, one hundred and two respondents representing seventeen percent (18%) of the total respondents agreed that, the delegates were hand-picked by the governor, twenty one respondents representing four percent (4%) of the total respondents said they were democratically elected by the party card carrying members, seventy one respondents representing twelve percent (12%) of the total respondents said they were hand-picked by the party executives, three hundred and seventy two respondents representing sixty five percent (65%) of the total respondents said, they emerged through consensus among members, while eight respondents representing one percent (1%) of the total respondents did not respond to the question.

From the above table, one can deduce that more than ninety percent of total respondents agreed that PDP delegates were selected by either incumbent governor, party executive members or emerged through consensus. This can be described as an anti-democratic process because only four percent said they were selected by card carrying members. That was why many respondents during interview noted that the governor, party executive members as well as other political office holders of the party have been the nominating team for the delegates in every election. They are the one to decide on who participate as delegates during primaries. In fact, every political office holder within the party has his/her list of delegates.

TABLE 5.2.13: Emergence of PDP delegates in 2015 gubernatorial primaries of Kaduna State

PDP delegates in 2015	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Hand-picked by the governor	113	20.0
Elected by the party card carrying members	41	7.0
Hand-picked by party executives	60	10.0
Consensus	344	60.0
No response	16	3.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.13 above indicates that out of five hundred and seventy four respondents, one hundred and thirteen respondents representing twenty percent (20%) of the total respondents agreed that, the delegates were hand-picked by the governor, fouty one respondents representing seven percent (7%) of the total respondents said they were democratically elected by the party card carrying members, sixty respondents representing ten percent (10%) of the total respondents said they were hand-picked by the party executives, three hundred and fourty four respondents representing sixty one percent (60%) of the total respondents said, they emerged through consensus among members, while sixteen respondents representing three percent (3%) of the total respondents did not respond to the question.

From 2003 to 2015 there is no doubt that PDP in Kaduna State lacks internal democracy as a result of quest for power among powerful of elite, godfathers and money bags. This is for a simple reason that, card carrying members were not given chance to select the candidates of their choice. A political party can legitimize its activities by practing democratic principles. If to say

that, a political ward was asked to submit names of three delegates for gubernatorial primaries and consensus will be used for their emergence, there must be a contestation among atleast nine connsensus candidates representing their various polling units. This should be more democratic than imposing a candidates or persuading others to decline for somebody because democracy is a game of number.

TABLE 5.2.14: Emergence of PDP Candidates in 1999 gubernatorial primaries of Kaduna State

Governorship Candidates in 1999	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Elected by the party card carrying members	304	53.0
Hand-picked by party executives	70	12.0
Consensus among party members	141	25.0
Nominated by the delegates	50	9.0
No response	9	1.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015).

Table 5.2.14 above indicates that, out of five hundred and seventy four respondents, three hundred and four respondents representing fifty three percent (53%) of the total respondents agreed that, Governorship Candidates in 1999 primary elections were selected by the PDP card carrying members, seventy respondents representing twelve percent (12%) of the total respondents said they were hand-picked by the party executive members, one hundred and fourty one respondents representing twenty five percent (25%) of the total respondents said they emerged through consensus, fifty respondents representing nine percent (9%) of the total

respondents said, they were selected by the delegates, while nine respondents representing one percent (1%) of the total respondents did not respond to the question.

Some respondents interviewed by the reseatcher confirmed that in 1999, after collation of gubernatorial election results at wards level, they were forwarded to the Local Government Party Headquarters for onward submission and conclusion. An open ballot system was used in this type of election. Three candidates contested in persons, Sen. Ahmed Muhammad Makarfi, Sen. Musa Bello, and Alh. Nuhu Babajo. At the end of the election, Ahmed Muhammed Makarfi was declared the winner (Interview, Anonymous, 2015).

The above shows that the 1999 Gubernatorial Primary Election in Kaduna State was conducted by all PDP members or card carrying members of the party who elected their aspirants for the office of Governor. All card members participated in all the elections and the election held at ward headquarters of the Party under the supervision of Ward Chairman and his executives. It can be described as democratic in nature to some extent because more than fifty percent of the respondents testified to the fact that they participated in the selection processes.

TABLE 5.2.15: Emergence of PDP Candidates in 2003 gubernatorial primaries of Kaduna State

Governorship Candidates in 2003	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Elected by the party card carrying members	147	26.0
Hand-picked by the party executives	56	10.0
Consensus among party members	298	52.0
Nominated by the delegates	59	10.0
No response	14	2.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.15 above revealed that, out of five hundred and seventy four respondents, one hundred and fourty seven respondents representing twenty six percent (26%) of the total respondents agreed that, Governorship Candidates in 2003 primary elections were selected by the PDP card carrying members, fifty six respondents representing ten percent (10%) of the total respondents said they were hand-picked by the party executive members, two hundred and ninety eight respondents representing fifty two percent (52%) of the total respondents said they emerged through consensus, fifty nine respondents representing ten percent (10%) of the total respondents said, they were selected by the delegates, while fouteen respondents representing two percent (2%) of the total respondents did not respond to the question.

In 2003 Gubernatorial primary elections, ten adhoc delegates were nominated through consensus in every ward together with all ward executive members. Local Government, State, Zonal, National executive members as well as elected representatives who are indigenes of the state served as statutory delegates to the 2003 gubernatorial primary elections, councillors were also included.

Not only that, All political appointees at local, state and national level also served as statutory delegates to this election which observers saw it as a way that gives the governor undue advantage over other aspirants, but the party reacted by saying that Nigerian democracy was in infantry stage. Therefore, this procedure according to them has to be maintained and sustained. For the party to go back to the conduct of 1999 primaries, that will put Nigerian democracy in jeopardy as a result of insecurity. Yusuf Hamisu Mai-Rago and Sen. Ahmed Mohammed Makarfi contested though the former withdrew some hours before the election and was compensated with the appointment as chairman, Petroleum Trust Development Fund (PTDF) (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

The 2003, 2007 and 2011 PDP governorship Primary Elections in Kaduna state were conducted in disregard of constitutional and electoral guidelines. This is for a simple reason that, they were not conducted at the local government headquarters as provided by the constitution. Many Party Members at wards and local government areas were not given right to select the candidates of their choice but rather engaged in capricious allocation of votes as well as selection of consensus candidates at the state headquater which is against the tenets of democracy world-wide. (Interview, Anonymous; 2015). For instance, Makarfi emerged as a consensus candidate in 2003 having overwhelming support of party elite while other aspirants were reconciled either with an appointment or huge amount of money that was why immediately after the primary I decamped to ANPP and got ticket to challenge Makarfi though the election was massively rigged and I was defeated. The same thing repeated itself in 2011 when I contested with late Patrick Ibrahim Yakowa, the names of the delegates were changed a day to the primary. I had to work out of that venue because of irregularities in the processes. (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

In contrast to the above argument another respondent argued that; PDP doesn't impose candidates on the electorates but rather uses principles and other constitutional provisions in dealing with internal democratic procedures of the party. For instance, regarding the emergence of candidates for party primaries, we normally apply one of the first two factors (i.e Domination, Compromise or integration) of Mary Parker Pollet's theory of conflict resolution so as to reconcile the emergence of competent candidates for good representation. Infact, not all party members are qualified to contest for primary or a general election that was why we try as much as we can to fix candidates that can truly represent the interest of the party at the state or federal level (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

From the above therefore, we can understand that more than fifty percent of the respondents agreed that PDP gubernatorial candidate in 2003 emerged through consensus. No wonder that some respondents described the process as undemoctic. But this might also be due to the fact that Makarfi, the then executive governor of the state used power of incumbency to emerge as the only candidates for gubernatorial primaries of the party. This may be true because some aspirants declined some hours to the exercise.

TABLE 5.2.16: Emergence of PDP Candidates in 2007 gubernatorial primaries of Kaduna State

Governorship Candidates in 2007	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Elected by the party card carrying members	92	16.0
Hand-picked by the party executives	103	18.0
Consensus among party members	276	48.0
Nominated by the delegates	97	17.0
No response	6	1.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.16 above shows that out of five hundred and seventy four respondents, ninety two respondents representing sixteen percent (16%) of the total respondents agreed that, Governorship candidates in 2007 primary elections were selected by the PDP card carrying members, one hundred and three respondents representing eighteen percent (18%) of the total respondents said they were hand-picked by the party executive members, two hundred and seventy six respondents representing fourty eight percent (48%) of the total respondents said they emerged through consensus, ninety seven respondents representing seventeen percent

(17%) of the total respondents said, they were selected by the delegates, while six respondents representing one percent (1%) of the total respondents did not respond to the question.

In 2007 Gubernatorial Primary Elections to the office of Governor, 25 adhoc delegates emerged from each ward through consensus. Local Government, State, Zonal and national executive members (all) who are indigenes of the state also participated as statutory delegates to this election. Councillors were excluded. In that contested election, Late Sen. Isaiah Balat, Shuaibu Idris Mikati, Arc. Mohammed Namadi Sambo, Lawal Samaila Yakawada and Suleiman Usman Hunkuyi contested, but Namadi Sambo was at the end declared the winner (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

As such we can understand from the above that the policy of consensus was the one that guided the conduct of 2007 gubernatorial primaries of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) especially with regards to the emergence of candidates. Proper election was not conducted but Namadi Sambo was imposed on the party and therefore emerged as consensus candidates and a winner among party executive members and other political office holders. This has been the response of so many members during interview.

TABLE 5.2.17: Emergence of PDP Candidates in 2011 gubernatorial primaries of Kaduna State

Governorship Candidates in 2011	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Elected by the party card carrying members	30	5.0
Hand-picked by the party executives	96	17.0
Consensus among party members	317	55.0
Nominated by the delegates	118	21.0
No response	13	2.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.17 above shows that, out of five hundred and seventy four respondents, thirty respondents representing five percent (5%) of the total respondents agreed that, Governorship Candidates in 2011 primary elections were selected by the PDP card carrying members, ninety six respondents representing seventeen percent (17%) of the total respondents said they were hand-picked by the party executive members, thrre hundred and seventeen respondents representing fifty five percent (55%) of the total respondents said they emerged through consensus, one hundred and eighteen respondents representing twenty one percent (21%) of the total respondents said, they were selected by the delegates, while thirteen respondents representing two percent (2%) of the total respondents did not respond to the question.

In 2011 Governorship primaries, only 3 adhoc delegates from each ward were nominated and 3 statutory delegates from local government (Party Chairman, Youth Leader and Women Leader). All elected officers (From LG Chairman-President), all former elected officers. Local government, state, Zonal and national executive members also participated as statutory delegates. Suleiman Usman Hunkuyi and Late Sir Patrick Ibrahim Yakowa contested but the latter was declared the winner at the end of the election (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

This shows that PDP in Kaduna state has no any criteria for selection of candidates during gubernatorial primaries. For instance, ten adhoc participated in the selection process of 2003, twenty five in 2007 and three delegates in 2011. What does that means? Each incumbent governor as well as party caucus have their way in order to make sure that the policy will suit their interest and also facilitate the installation of their candidates.

TABLE 5.2.18: Emergence of PDP Candidates in 2015 gubernatorial primaries of Kaduna State

Governorship Candidates in 2015	Frequency	Percentage
Elected by the party card carrying members	62	11.0
Hand-picked by the party executives	81	14.0
Consensus among party members	288	50.0
Nominated by the delegates	134	23.0
No response	9	2.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.18 above shows that, out of five hundred and seventy four respondents, sixty two respondents representing eleven percent (11%) of the total respondents agreed that, Governorship Candidates in 2015 primary elections were selected by the PDP card carrying members, eighty one respondents representing fourteen percent (14%) of the total respondents said they were hand-picked by the party executive members, two hundred and eighty eight respondents representing fifty percent (50%) of the total respondents said they emerged through consensus, one hundred and thirty four respondents representing twenty three percent (23%) of the total respondents said, they were selected by the delegates, while nine respondents representing two percent (2%) of the total respondents did not respond to the question.

In 2015 PDP Gubernatorial Primaries, only 3 adhoc delegates from each ward were nominated and 5 statutory delegates from local government (Party Chairman, Secretary, Treasurer, Youth Leader and Women Leader). All elected officers (From LG Chairman-President) who are indigenes of the state. Mukhtar Ramalan Yero, Sen. Haruna Ziego Aziz, Lawal Samaila Yakawada and Hon. Felix Hassan Hyat contested though the last two contestants

withdrew some hours before the election. Yero was at the end declared the winner with almost 98% of the total votes cast as against Ziego Aziz who scored only one vote (Intervtiew, Anonymous; 2015).

The above indicates that, Ramalan Yero, the then incumbent governor of the state contested with three other aspirants though two of them declined some hours to the election. But the question need to be asked why has these events keep on repeating itself? Why must party caucus force an aspirant to decline for incumbent governor? This may be due to the fact there is every hope that incumbent governor be able to defeat an opposition party during election more than any other aspirants because of the resources at his disposal. One the aspirants refused to decline as the researcher observed and scored only one vote as indicated above. As such, one of the two aspirants who was forced to decline cross-carpeted to the opposition party immediately after the exercice.

TABLE 5.2.19. **Existence of equal participation of all PDP members in gubernatorial primaries of the party in respondents' wards or local government areas from 1999-2015.**

Equal Participation	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Yes	188	33.0
No	372	65.0
No response	14	2.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015).

Table 5.2.19 has shown that, out of the total of five hundred and seventy four (574) respondents, one hundred and eighty eight respondents representing thirty three percent (33%) agree that there has been equal participation of all PDP members in their respective wards as well as local government areas with regard to governorship primaries, three hundred and seventy

two respondents representing sixty five percent (65%) of the total respondents did not agree, while fourteen respondents representing two percent (2%) did not respond to the question.

The 1999 constitution of the federal republic of Nigeria specified that the rules and procedure of any political party should make provision for open and periodic elections on democratic bases of the principal officers, members of the executive committee and other governing bodies of the political party. This has been our problem in PDP today and infact; there have been divergent views among us that PDP lacks internal democracy which led to its failure in sustaining democracy in the State. For instance there were no criteria for delegates' selection in each primary election of the party but your connection with the governor or party caucus will give you automatic ticket to participate. Problem of internal democracy especially unequal participation of members as well as the imposition of candidates are some of the reasons for the 2013 inter-party defections, anti-party politics and finally our failure in 2015 General Elections (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

What the above explains is that, electoral fraud have traditionally been used by Peoples Democratic Party to gain electoral victories with the degree varying with party capacity, resources and access to state power which means that ruling parties at different governmental levels are the major culprits. This survey research confirmed that about 65% of respondents believed that members were not given equal opportunity to select the candidates of their choice but were only selected and imposed by the elite.

TABLE 5.2.20 An Analysis of whether rules governing PDP gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State are commonly observed, widely understood and confidently anticipated

Rules governing gubernatorial primaries	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	226	39.0
No	340	59.0
No response	8	1.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.20 indicates that, out of five hundred and seventy four (574) respondents, two hundred and twenty six respondents representing thirty nine percent (39%) of the total respondents agreed that the rules governing PDP gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State are commonly observed, widely understood and confidently anticipated from 1999-2015, three hundred and fourty respondents representing fifty nine percent (59%) of the total respondents did not agree, while eight respondents representing one percent (1%) did not respond to the question.

For instance, Artile 16 sub-section 4 of the PDP Constitution 2006 (as amended) provides that: "No member of the party shall be qualified for nomination or election or even appointment into any of the offices of the party, unless he or she has been a registered member for atleast 18 months and is of good financial standing in the party except there is a waiver by the appropriate executive committee". This according to many respondents was designed to favour some members at the expense of others. What contradicted the above was the fact that, Arc. Mohammed Namadi Sambo's Candidacy in 2007 was totally against constitutional provisions but he was imposed on the party by the PDP National Working Committee and other forces within the state. Not only that, Malam Nasiru El-Rufa'i possessed his PDP membership card a week to his appointment as Minister of FCT, Abuja. The then executive members of the party

were asked to process his membership card immediately to facilitate his appointment as a minister of FCT, Abuja. Many conditions were not fulfilled in that regard (Interview, Anonymous, 2015).

Sometimes, the constitution of the party serves as a barrier for participation and not a vehicle for political representation. Political parties are somewhat an agglomeration of local party machines run by party chieftains. Rules governing party competition in PDP are not only commonly observed by party leadership but not known by most members even among the aspirants. This sometime led to conflicts between patrons and clients and among politicians within the party.

TABLE 5.2.21 **Decentralization of political power among all PDP members in Kaduna State with regard to selection of candidates for governorship primaries from 1999-2015**

Decentralization of political power	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Yes	206	36.0
No	358	62.0
No response	10	2.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.21 indicates that out of five hundred and seventy four (574) respondents, two hundred and six respondents representing thirty six percent (36%) of the total respondents agreed that, with regard to selection of candidates for governorship primaries in Kaduna State, power has been decentralized among all PDP members from 1999-2015, three hundred and fifty eight respondents representing sixty two percent (62%) of the total respondents did not agree, while ten respondents representing two percent (2%) did not respond to the question.

This shows that, Political elites Kaduna state chapter of the PDP do not have faith in the conduct of election as a process of managing political change. They do not want gubernatorial primary election to hold in the proper sense of the word. That is why the employ any means (fair

or foul) to be victorious at any election. More than sixty respondents observed that power was only centralized and dominated by elite at the expense of rank-and file members. Democracy in the state reflects what Anthony Downs and Joseph Schumpeter described as "a market mechanism". Politics is seen as a vehicle for making quick and easy money. This mentality of politicians can be seen from the desperation of the incumbents to hold on to power by any means. This is one of the reasons why they employ any means (fair or foul) to be victorious at any election.

TABLE 5.2.22 **An Analysis of whether PDP leaders in Kaduna State recognize the legitimacy of electoral competition as the only route to political office from 1999-2015**

Legitimacy of electoral competition	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Yes	305	53.0
No	264	46.0
No response	5	1.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.22 revealed that, out of five hundred and seventy four (574) respondents, three hundred and five respondents representing fifty three percent (53%) of the total respondents agreed that, PDP leaders in Kaduna State recognize the legitimacy of electoral competition as the only route to office from 1999-2015, two hundred and sixty four respondents representing fourty six percent (46%) of the total respondents did not agree, while five respondents representing one percent (1%) did not respond to the question.

Respondents of equal proportion testified to the fact that party leaders recognized the legitimacy of electoral competition, but as a matter of fact, not only PDP, most political parties in the state today believe in zero sum nature of politics where winner takes all and looser loose all because they were not established based on ideologies. They are bias and authoritarian in terms of their nomination processes and procedures, throwing all the democratic tenants and

elements especially during primary elections. Poverty, illiteracy and unemployment in Kaduna state, also pose a great challenge to the conduct of primary elections.

TABLE 5.2.23: **The conduct of gubernatorial primaries at the convention or state congress of the party in each of the twenty three local government areas of Kaduna state from 1999-2015**

Regular Convention	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Yes	105	18.0
No	466	81.0
No response	3	1.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015).

Table 5.2.23 shows that out of five hundred and seventy four (574) respondents, one hundred and five respondents representing eighteen percent (18%) of the total respondents agreed that, PDP primary elections for the post of governorship hold regularly at the convention or state congress of the party in each of the twenty three local government areas of Kaduna state from 1999-2015. Four hundred and sixty six respondents representing eighty one percent (81%) of the total respondents did not agree, while three respondents representing one percent (1%) did not respond to the question.

The above shows that PDP gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State contravened section twenty of electoral Act that says " primary elections for the post of governorship should hold regularly at the convention or state congress of the party in each of the twenty three local government areas of the state". The only primary election that had a bottom-up approach in the history of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Kaduna State was that of 1999 though with irregularities here and there as observed by this research. Intra-Party Politics in PDP will provide an avenue for new ideas and foster a culture of deliberation, compromise and consensus among the party leaders and cadres and also makes organizational structure of the party more cohesive

in competition for power. It will also enable members to controls the discretionary power and authoritarian behavior of leader, reflects the preference of broader electorates on agenda-setting and contributes to political democratization.

TABLE 5.2.24 **INEC supervision and monitoring of Gubernatorial primary elections of PDP Kaduna State from 1999-2015**

INEC Supervision	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Yes	302	53.0
No	277	48.0
No response	5	1.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.24 shows that, out of five hundred and seventy four (574) respondents, three hundred and two respondents representing fifty three percent (53%) of the total respondents agreed that, INEC supervises the gubernatorial primary elections of PDP from 1999-2015, two hundred and seventy seven respondents representing fourty eight percent (48%) of the total respondents did not agree, while five respondents representing one percent (1%) did not respond to the question.

With regard to the above question, a respondent observed that; "I had expected really after disappointing governorship primary elections in 2003, 2007 and 2011, that PDP would have something better now. But we have not seen that and the credibility is not there. The whole thing was not at all living up to the hopes of the Nigerian people and i would say it left them demoralized".(Interview; Anonymous, 2015). Though INEC was assigned to supervise as well as monitor the conduct of party primaries in the state, but they have no power to nullify or cancel the outcome of such election if it is rigged. Many atimes political parties do not even invite them to witness the conduct of their primaries; they only submit names of their

consensus candidates after ratification by the party elites. Infact, sometimes, names of candidates who won party primaries used to be changed a week to the general elections. They conduct parallel elections as was the case with 2007 governorship primaries. PDP has strategies in conduting its primaries to manipulate election results and decide the winner. For instance, they hardly notify INEC 21 days to election. They conduct elections at cities for easy coverage by observers but refuse to do so at wards and local governments' headquarters that are far away from the cities and submit a false result to INEC. No criterion for the emergence of delegates as every political appointee is a delegate to each primary election in his or ward or local government (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

The fulfillment of promises as well as good representation between political party and the electorates can only be achieved in an atmosphere of broad based democratized party system. Not only that internal democracy promotes equality and fairness in treating party members especially in an atmosphere devoid of godfatherism and money policies. Internal democracy in PDP will enable it select more capable and competent leaders to have responsive policies and as a result to enjoy greater electoral success and strengthen democratic culture generally. It also encourages political equality by creating a level playing ground in candidate selection and policy development within the party. It also ensures popular control of government by extending democratic norms to party organizations such as transparency and accountability and it improves the quality of public debate for fostering inclusive and deliberative practices within the party (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

What the above explains is that INEC has no absolute power to regulate the conduct of political parties in Nigeria because the constitution that empower them to monitor activities of political parties, the same constitution says political parties should be autonomous

interms of their operations, management and funding. Unless and until these statements are clarified, their must be confussion and conflicts of hegemony among political institution in Nigeria. Intra-Party Politics in PDP will build political socialization and makes the Party members have confidence in the party leadership and in turn promote smooth transition from one set of leadership to the other without political rancor, factionalism and decamping. It also works effectively in terms of conflict management within a political party over interest and values. This is simply because, democratization at every level of a party system tends to have laid down procedure of handling such crisis through working committees, from the grassroot to the national level with some degree of separation of power and functional delegated legislation within the party in question.

TABLE 5.2.25 **An Analysis of whether Godfatherism has a negative effect on governorship primaries of PDP in Kaduna state from 1999-2015**

Godfatherism	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Yes	323	56.0
No	245	43.0
No Response	6	1.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015).

Table 5.2.25 reveals that, out of five hundred and seventy four (574) respondents, three hundred and twenty three respondents representing fifty six percent (56%) of the total respondents agreed that, godfatherism has a negative effect on governorship primaries of PDP in Kaduna state from 1999-2015, two hundred and forty five respondents representing forty three percent (43%) of the total respondents did not agree, while six respondents representing one percent (1%) of the total respondents did not respond to the question.

Some respondents argued that, Dr. Mukhtar Ramalan Yero (the Former Governor of the State) was a client or godson to the Former Vice President (Namadi Sambo) that was why he

fixed him as the Deputy Governor and later a governor after becoming the Vice President as well as the death of Late Governor Patrick Ibrahim Yakowa. This to them, was against the tenets of liberal democracy because the internal democratic procedures were neglected by Mohammed Namadi Sambo at the expense of their choice. In tandem to the above argument, other respondents also observed that, Mukhtar Ramalan Yero settled some billions of Naira to Mohammed Namadi Sambo the first six moths he spent in office as Governor (Umar; 2014). In fact, according to other respondents, what to be done throughout the State in terms of political development, award of contracts as well as political appointments were considered and decided by Arc. Mohammed Namadi Sambo. Party members complained bitterly over the issues but there was nothing they could do that was why in their view, many active members of the party even among the founding members cross-carpeted in 2013 to other political parties as an alternative (Interview, Anonymous; 2015) .

This shows that influence and power of godfathers have continued to shape and reshape the nature of internal democracy in PDP of Kaduna State and this continues to play a significant role in understanding the crises in political parties in Nigeria. Not only do godfathers influence politics within the party but also sought to influence other civil societies that could become instruments in their bid to perpetuate their political powers.

TABLE 5.2.26 **An Analysis of whether financial inducement has a negative effect on governorship primaries of PDP in Kaduna state from 1999-2015**

Financial inducement	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Yes	329	57.0
No	235	41.0
No Response	10	2.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.26 above shows that, out of five hundred and seventy four (574) respondents, three hundred and twenty nine respondents representing fifty seven percent (57%) of the total respondents agreed that, financial inducement has a negative effect on governorship candidate selection methods and democratic governance in Kaduna state from 1999-2015, two hundred and thirty five respondents representing forty one percent (41%) of the total respondents did not agree, while ten respondents representing two percent (2%) of the total respondents did not respond to the question.

There are many reports about money-related scandals among political parties that easily provoke questions about the prospects of democracy in Kaduna State. PDP gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State for instance is bedeviled by the problem of Money bags, poor political culture and lack of political education especially among most card carrying members of the party who are unaware of the cardinal principles of democracy and international standards governing internal democracy. They also said that, between 1999 and 2015, they contested for various postitions in government but realized that, politics or voting per se is viewed as a way making money especially among delegates that was why some members give bribe or fight one another in the process of nomination. Many atimes the delegates call or send text informing us that they were nominated as delegates for our primary election. They sometimes request for huge amount of money before the scheduled date of the primary election and denial might affect the outcome of that election. (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

This shows that the activities and influence of ‘money bags’ within the party have continued to dominate the political space to the detriment of representation and participation in the electoral politics. Indeed money politics is fast shrinking the political space, becoming a key variable in determining who participates in electoral politics in Kaduna State. For example, the nomination fees for party members seeking elective positions have become so high that only the rich few and the daring “political entrepreneurs” can participate in party primaries. There are no

available records on the amount of money spent by candidates and political parties during the elections so far held in the state. Proper record-keeping is not yet part of the organizational culture of most political parties in the country. But more importantly there are no strict regulations on disclosure and reporting of election expenses. Also, the election management bodies lack the capacity to effectively monitor and supervise campaign expenses. Vote buying has been reported in all the gubernatorial priamaries held in the state since 1999. Sponsorship of campaign materials, clothing materials, badges, household utensils e.t.c. by candidates and their friends is a common practice especially in election year. Strange enough, some politicians use food items and other edibles to bribe voters in addition to buying of votes with cash.

Not only that, the desperate struggle for political offices by political parties is for the pre-requisites of the offices and what those offices can offer to the candidates. In Nigeria for instance, Governors have become essential players and are in very high demand by political parties because of the enormous resources at their disposal, including those of their local governments. Usually, substantial sums of money are siphoned to the political parties. To make it even more convenient for the Governors, they are also the leaders of their parties in their various states. There is no hazy line of demarcation between the ruling party headquarters and the Government Houses. Similarly, the President is also the Leader of the party at the national level with no clear separation between the 'ruling party" and the Presidency. Political competition has become excessively monetized without established mechanisms for effective regulation and monitoring.

TABLE 5.2.27 **An Analysis of whether political elite within PDP in Kaduna State decide and dominate decisions regading its gubernatorial primaries from 1999-2015**

Dominance of political elite	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Yes	362	63.0
No	200	35.0
No response	12	2.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.27 shows that, out of five hundred and seventy four (574) respondents, three hundred and sixty two respondents representing sixty three percent (63%) of the total respondents agreed that, political elite within PDP in Kaduna State decide and dominate decisions regading its gubernatorial primaries from 1999-2015, two hundred respondents representing thirty five percent (35%) of the total respondents did not agree, while twelve respondents representing two percent (2%) did not respond to the question.

PDP gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State was characterized by flawed, irregularities, manipulation as well as imposition of candidates, due to powerful influence of political elite and exclusion of rank and file members in the selection processes to the extent that some-aggrieved card members asked the court to restrict the party from submitting candidate's names to INEC barely a week to the General Elections. Such was the case with PDP gubernatorial Primaries of the state in 2003 and 2007. Again, it was also a case in Kaura, Kajuru, Lere, Makarfi, Sanga and Zangon-Kataf Constituencies in 2003, 2007 and 2011. A number of parallel elections by parallel executive members were conducted for the PDP House of Assembly Elections in the state with different aspirants declaring victory for themselves. In both 2011 and 2015 also, contestation over the gubernatorial candidacy for the party ended up in a stalemate, leading to the imposition of Late Sir, Patrick Ibrahim Yakowa (in 2011) and Dr. Mukhtar

Ramalan Yero (in 2015) on party members as well as denying other aspirants to purchase forms for that primary election (Interview,Anonymous; 2015).

In tandem to the above therefore, other respondents noted that, manipulation of primary election results is not a new thing in PDP of Kaduna State, infact, it originated right from 1999. Party caucus and other elite may sometimes strategize to intentionally postpone the date of primary election in the present of party members and plan to conduct it secretly the next day in different venue. This was the case with PDP governorship primaries of 2007 in Kaduna State that was why when the new date was fixed many party members contested against it. In their view, it is in record that, the results of PDP 1999 primary election in Zone I senatorial district was changed. This was simply because the candidate pre-determined to win that contested election failed. Hon. Aliyu Yahaya Sa'ad was the winner but the influence of the Emir of Zazzau and other key party officials favoured the second aspirant in person, Dr. Dalhatu Sarki Tafida and submitted his name to INEC. Not only that, the 2012 primary election of local government chairmen in Zaria was conducted two times, first in Zaria and second in Kaduna. After the conduct of the first primaries Hon. Nuhu Suleiman was declared the winner but the party elite vehemently rejected the results, another primary election was re-scheduled and conducted in Kaduna where Hon. Magaji Alhassan (Magaji Boss) was declared the winner. The party elite again rejected the results. At the end, Arc. Mohammed Namadi Sambo invited the aspirants to his house in Abuja to resolve the matter thereby imposing on them another candidate as an aspirant for local government council election of 2012 who neither purchases the form nor do shows interest for the primaries in person, Hon. Lawal Balarabe (Usama) (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

In an interview with respondents, they observed that, the PDP 2015 Gobernatorial Primary election was faulty because, almost all delegates were forced by elite within the party to vote for the then incumbent governor in person, Dr. Mukhtar Ramalan Yero who scored more than one thousand votes against one vote of Senator Haruna Ziego Aziz. They stressed further that, during the 1999 general elections, local government elections were conducted first before election into the national assembly. PDP in Zaria delayed the conduct of its primary election till after seeing the outcome of the local government election. Late Honourable Alhaji Musa Iya emerged as a consensus or unopposed candidate of PDP in Zaria Local Government.

They added that, Late Hon. Musa Iya had been an obedient politician. He contested five times, but the influence of elites denies him right to win the primary elections. So in 1999, he was nominated as the consensus candidate of PDP. He contested and won the election, immediately after assuming office, PDP fixed a date for the primary elections of the members of the House of Representatives. During the conduct of that primary election, Hon. Nuhu Sani Ibrahim, and Hon. Abdulkadir Usman Global Contested. Late Hon. Musa Iya, used his power as a chairman elect, at BATC Nagoyi Zaria, (where the primary election was conducted) to influence the votes of the then councilors (who were part of the delegates or Electoral College). He was observed saying that, "any councilor who needs to be given office should vote for Nuhu Sani Ibrahim. At the end of the primary election, Hon. Nuhu Sani Ibrahim won with three votes ahead of Hon. Abdulkadir Usman Global. Eventually, Hon. Abdulkadir Usman Global was cleared by the PDP caucus at the state level as a PDP candidate for the House of Representatives elections of 1999. Electorates were put in confusion as two candidates were claiming for one seat. Official memos, reports and posters were going round throughout Zaria local government declaring Hon. Abdulkadir Usman Global today, and Hon. Nuhu Sani Ibrahim tomorrow. Hon.

Abdulkadir Usman Global was cleared at the end, while Hon. Nuhu Sani Ibrahim was compensated with an appointment as a Director General (DG), Kaduna State media Corporation (K.S.M.C) (Interview, Anonymous; 2015)..

Supporting the above argument, other respondents asserted that, in 2008 local government election in Zaria, the major reason why Alh. Dan-Asabe, Raba-Gardama (Reconciliator) was later on supported by some elites to contest for chairmanship election was that, the well known contestants of PDP in Zaria, in persons, Hon. Yahaya Aminu (who wanted to rule for the second term) and Hon. Lawal Balarabe (Usama) were in conflict. This internal conflict within the party led to the crises among supporters of the two candidates (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

Not only that, initially, the party promised Hon. Lawal Balarabe (Usama) to be their unopposed candidate in 2008, if Hon. Yahaya Aminu finishes his tenure. This was to compensate him for losing his seat as a member of Kaduna State House of Assembly in 2003 general elections. But the situation changed, as Hon. Yahaya Aminu wanted to go for the second term in 2008, this to them, was the genesis of the crisis within the party. Eventually, with the intervention of the then Governor, Alh. Muhammad Namadi Sambo, Hon. Yahaya Aminu was backed and a foul primary election was conducted where Hon. Lawal Balarabe was defeated. Though, the problem was resolved by the Governor and he was compensated with an appointment as a senior Special Assistant to the Governor, but according to them, it was one of the reasons for the disorganization and destabilization of the 2008 local government election in Zaria, as his supporters engaged in Anti-party politics during election. That was why it had to be cancelled (Interview, Anonymous, 2015).

Contrary to the above therefore some respondents noted that; "we do not impose candidates on the party members but rather we only advise the delegates on whom to vote so as to avoid what he calls "Zaben Tumun Dare" (i.e Voting for incompetent candidates) that was why we always consider five conditions before any member should qualify for the electoral contests. Those criteria according to them include; Popularity of Candidates, Financial Viability, Active Participation in Politics of PDP, Ability to challenge an opposition party at the general election as well as capability to fully represent the interest of the party anywhere. As far as we are concerned, the only problem of PDP today is goal incompatibility as well as powerful influence of elite. It is only in PDP that you have former president, former vice president, former governors, former ambassadors, former senators and members of National Assembly" (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

The above explains that, one of the effects of political party competition in Peoples Democratic Party (PDP), Kaduna State Chapter is lack of political tolerance among the political elite. Some of the political elites emerged from authoritarian traditions that have no tolerance for any form of opposition. For them, opposition is treason. Thus, political party competition is a "battle" where the "adversaries" must be eliminated or denied space to compete. It is not seen as a contest where winners and losers would emerge but must cooperate to build and develop the state. Political intolerance often leads to abuses of human rights. The political elite have not drawn lessons from the past experience of Nigeria. This also has implications for intra-party politics as well as the deepening of democracy in the country.

TABLE 5.2.28 **An Analysis of whether incumbency factor has a negative effect on governorship primaries of PDP in Kaduna state from 1999-2015**

Incumbency factor	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Yes	362	63.0
No	212	37.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.28 shows that, out of five hundred and seventy four (574) respondents, three hundred and sixty two respondents representing sixty three percent (63%) of the total respondents agreed that, incumbency factor has a negative effect on governorship primaries of PDP in Kaduna state from 1999-2015, two hundred and twelve respondents representing thirty seven percent (37%) of the total respondents did not agree.

Respondents observed that when Governor Ahmed Makarfi's tenure expired, he successfully planned and manipulated all political structure within PDP and strategized to install Alhaji Umaru Balarabe Kubau (the then Commissioner of Works) to succeed him as godson, but died before the conduct of 2007 general elections and Mohammed Namadi Sambo was imposed on Makarfi from Federal Government as well as other pressures from Tijjani Hashim (the then Galadima of Kano) (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

In 2015, Party caucus denied many competent candidates to buy form and contest against the then incumbent governor of the state in person, Dr Mukhtar Ramalan Yero. Some candidates were bribed while others decamped to the opposition party as an alternative. Infact, only Senator Haruna Ziego Aziz Challenged him and scored one vote at the end of the election. PDP primary elections were not held in many local government areas of Kaduna State especially that of members of the House of Assembly. For instance, Yakubu Salisu and Umaru B. Dikko (Zaria Contituencies), Danladi Angulu Kwasau and Kantiok Irimiya Isiyaku (Zangon-Kataf and Zonkwa Constituencies), Nkom Bityong (Kaura), samuel Tanko (Kajuru) and other members

representing Kaduna North, Lere constituencies e.t.c. were all nominated unopposed. Infact other members were denied to purchase forms simply because they were governor's candidates. This according to them was one of the reasons why PDP failed in Kaduna State (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

TABLE 5.2.29 **An Analysis of whether exclusiveness of rank and file members in party primaries has a negative effect on governorship primaries of PDP in Kaduna state from 1999-2015**

Exclusiveness of rank and file members	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Yes	298	52.0
No	271	47.0
No Response	5	1.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.29 above shows that, out of five hundred and seventy four (574) respondents, two hundred and ninety eight respondents representing fifty two percent (52%) of the total respondents agreed that, exclusiveness of rank and file members in taking some important decisions of the party has a negative effect on governorship primaries in Kaduna state from 1999-2015, two hundred and seventy one respondents representing forty seven percent (47%) of the total respondents did not agree, while five respondents representing one percent (1%) of the total respondents did not respond to the question.

According to some respondents, rank and file members of PDP in Kaduna state were always neglected in taking some important decisions of the party due to centralization of power among few elite. Most of the delegates that participated in gubernatorial primaries from 2003-2015 were either selected by the party chairman under governor's instruction or hand-picked by the party executives. This leads to internal wrangling among politicians in every round of election. It also has a negative effect on the polity, stability of democracy, primay election

procedure and democratic governance. Not only that, ethno-relgious factor in their view, is another serious problem facing gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015. For instance, whatever qualification you have according to them you wouldn't be presented as candidates for governorship election if you are from Southern Kaduna, you can only be a running mate. That was why throughout the history of PDP as well as democracy in Kaduna State from 1999-2015, only late Patrick Ibrahim Yakowa broke this record and was referred by so many party members as governor by accident (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

This shows that PDP gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State have been characterized by disregard of party procedures and the absence of transparency, the sale of candidature to highest bidders, elimination of popular aspirants and imposition of nominees. Rank-and-file members were denied to actively engage in the processes. As the TMG (2003) Election Report noted, rank-and-file members were subjugated in the gubernatorial primaries of PDP from 2003-2015 because, the incumbent state governors, party big-wigs and political godfathers utilized the undemocratic, corrupt and nocturnal procedures to impose and substitute candidates and expel those that question their procedures. Particularly, the disqualification of un-favoured candidates and the imposition of unelected favoured candidates which created conditions of illegality, illegitimacy, impropriety and irregularities which have been major sources of party conflicts and crises since 1999.

TABLE 5.2.30 **Respondents' view about the interests and intrigues that worked against PDP's gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015**

Interests and intrigues against PDP in Kaduna State	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Imposition of candidates by party caucus	154	27.0
Godfatherism	111	19.0
Centralization of decision making power among powerful political elite	118	21.0
Exclusiveness of rank-and-file members in most important issues affecting the party.	99	17.0
Financial Inducement	87	15.0
No response	5	1.0
TOTAL	**574**	**100.0**

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Table 5.2.30 shows that, out of five hundred and seventy four (574) respondents, one hundred and fifty four respondents representing twenty seven percent (27%) of the total respondents agreed that, Imposition of candidates is a great problem facing internal democracy and democratic governance within PDP in Kaduna State from 1999-2015. One hundred and eleven respondents representing nineteen percent (19%) of the total respondents said no, it is godfatherism, one hundred and eighteen respondents representing twenty one percent (21%) of the total respondents said no, it is the centralization of decision making power among powerful elite within the party, ninety nine respondents representing seventeen percent (17%) of the total respondents said no, it is the exclusiveness of the rank and file members in most important decisions affecting the party, eighty seven respondents representing fifteen percent (15%) of the total respondents said no, it is the financial inducement, while three respondents representing one percent (1%) did not respond to the question.

The above confirm that, intra-party politics in Peoples Democratic Party (PDP), Kaduna state chapter has been confronted with the problem godfatherism, money politics, imposition of candidates as well as exclusion of rank-and-file members to participate in the conduct of gubernatorial primaries.

5.3 Discussion of Major Findings

5.3.1 Nature and Charater of PDP Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015:

The study was able to find out that, apart from constitutional provisions concerning the criteria to be met before any member is qualified as candidate for election, PDP also has its own conditions to be fulfilled which are listed below;

i. Popularity of candidate

ii. Financial and other contributions of the candidate to the party

iii. Active participation of candidate in the politics of PDP

iv. His/Her ability to defeat an opposition party at the general election

v. His/Her capability to fully represent the interest of the party anywhere

vi. Zoning formula (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

Secondly, PDP Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State are normally conducted at the convention of the party at the state headquarters and not in each and every local government area of the state as provided by the Electoral Act. The process commences by appointing the returning officer as well as other electoral officials by the PDP executive members and the procedure goes thus; (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

Step 1: The presiding officer will commence the poll by giving the following instructions to the voters or delegates in an audible, firm and polite manner:

- We are about to commence voting.
- If you did not have a membership card and/or your name is not on the list of delegates, you would not be allowed to vote.
- You will be given a stamped, signed and dated ballot paper. Please cross-check that the ballot paper given to you whether it is stamped, signed and dated at the back because if any of these is omitted, your vote would be rejected and would not count.
- When casting your vote, make sure you thumb-print in only one box, which is the box of your chosen candidate.
- A ballot paper should be folded appropriately after thumb-printing to ensure that your thumb-print does not smear on the name of another candidate and render your vote invalid.
- Do not write or make any mark apart from your thumb-print on the ballot paper or else it would be rendered invalid.
- Make sure you cast your ballot paper in the appropriate ballot box.
- Priority would be given to physically challenged persons, nursing mothers and elderly persons who cannot stay long on the queue.
- Please cooperate with us so that we can all complete this exercise in good time.
- Let us now form a queue and remain orderly as we commence voting (PDP Document, 2015).

Step 2: The presiding officer will then invite all voter to form a single queue after placing the posters of all candidates openly to the view of all members.

Step 3: He/She requests a security agent to stand behind the last person on the queue to prevent any unaccredited person from joining the line.

Step 4: He/she opens the ballot box and display it in the full view of all persons present at the polling or voting point to show that the box is empty.

Step 5: He/she will then lock the ballot box with seal provided and place it in the open and most suitable position within the voting point.

Step 6: He/she places the ballot paper on the table and declares the poll open thereby inviting the voters on the queue to approach the Assistant Presiding Officer in an orderly manner.

Step 7: On the presentation of the membership card, the Assistant Presiding Officer will check his/her name on the list of delegates and on being satisfied, he will issue the endorsed ballot paper to the voter and tick the list of voters in the appropriate box against voter's name to indicate that he/she has been issued with ballot paper for the election. He then requests the voter to proceed to the voting cubicle to thumb-print the ballot paper in secret, in the space provided beside the logo or name of candidate of voter's choice.

Step 8: The delegates or voters are free to remain within the polling station to witness the sorting and counting of votes as well as the announcement of result.

Step 9: When the poll has come to an end, the presiding officer will announce the closure of voting. He/She then sorts out the ballot papers by candidate and thereafter loudly count the votes scored by each candidate in the presence of the polling agents and observers. The rejected ballot papers will also be counted to the hearing of all members present.

Step 10: After counting the votes scored by each candidate, the number of spoilt ballot papers, rejected ballot papers as well as valid votes will be recorded to allow for cross-checking and verification. The presiding officer will then submit the result to the returning officer (R.O) for announcement.

Sep 11: The returning officer will then call the attention of all members present at the voting point and announce the results of the poll. He/She also gives a duplicate copy of the result sheet to the candidate's agent and police or any other security agent present at the polling unit.

The above therefore has answered our first research question that says; What is the nature of Intra party politics in PDP Kaduna state chapter with regards to its gubernatorial primaries from 1999-2015?

Thirdly, the research was also able to make a comparative study of the conduct of PDP gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna state from 1999-2015 in order to critically examine the democratic health of the conduct and to also ensure the party's conformity to the democratic principles regarding primary elections. This can be explained as follows;

The 1999 Gubernatorial Primary Elections in Kaduna State were conducted by all PDP members or card carrying members of the party who elected their aspirants for the office of Governor. All members of the party participated in all the elections and the election held in ward headquarters of the Party under the supervision of Ward Chairman and his executives.

After collation of election result at wards level, they were forwarded to the Local Government Party Headquarters for onward submission and conclusion. An open ballot system was used in this type of election. Three candidates contested in persons, Sen. Ahmed Muhammad Makarfi, Sen. Musa Bello, and Alh. Nuhu Babajo. At the end of the election, Ahmed Muhammed Makarfi was declared the winner with almost sixty percent of the total votes cast.

In 2003 Gubernatorial Primary Elections, ten adhoc delegates were nominated through consensus in every ward together with all ward executive members. Local Government, State,

Zonal and national executive members who are indigenes of the state served as statutory delegates to the 2003 gubernatorial primary elections Councillors were also included.

Not only that, All political appointees at local, state and national level also served as statutory delegates to this election which observers saw it as a way that gives the governor undue advantage over other aspirants, but the party reacted by saying that Nigerian democracy is in infant stage. Therefore, this procedure according to them has to be maintained and sustained. For the party to go back to the conduct of 1999 primaries, that will put Nigerian democracy in jeopardy as a result of insecurity. Yusuf Hamisu Mairago and Sen. Ahmed Muhammed Makarfi contested though the former withrew some hours before the election and he was compensated with the appointment as chairman, Petroleum Trust Development Fund (PTDF).

In 2007 Gubernatorial Primary Elections to the office of Governor, 25 adhoc delegates emerged from each ward through consensus. Ward, Local Government, State, Zonal and national executive members (all) who are indigenes of the state also participated as statutory delegates to this election. Councillors were excluded.

In that contested election, Lale Sen. Isiaiah Balat, Shuaibu Idris Mikati, Arc. Mohammed Namadi Sambo, Lawal Samaila Yakawada and Suleiman Usman Hunkuyi contested, but Namadi Sambo was at the end declared the winner.

In 2011 Governorship primaries, only 3 adhoc delegates from each ward were nominated. All elected officers (From LG Chairman-President), all former elected officers. Local government, state, Zonal and national executive members also participated as statutory delegates. Suleiman Usman Hunkuyi and Late Sir Patrick Ibrahim Yakowa contested but the latter was declared the winner at the end of the election.

In 2015 Gubernatorial Primaries, only 3 adhoc delegates from each ward were nominated and 5 statutory delegates from local government (Party Chairman, Secretary, Treasurer, Youth Leader and Women Leader). All elected officers (From LG Chairman-President) who are indigenes of the state. Mukhtar Ramalan Yero, Sen. Haruna Ziego Aziz, Lawal Samaila Yakawada and Hon. Hassan Hyat contested though the last two contestants withdrew some hours before the election. Yero was at the end declared the winner with almost 98% of the total votes cast as against Ziego Aziz who scored only one vote.

Table 5.2.31 **PDP Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015:**

Name of Election	**PDP Chairman**	**Delegates**	**Methods of selecting delegates**	**Voting System**	**Outcome**
1999-gubernatorial elections	Hon. Ibrahim Yaro	-PDP card carrying members	Election	Open Ballot System	**2**
2003-gubernatorial elections	Alh. Yaro Makama Audi Rigachikun	-10 Adhoc delegates from each ward -Ward executive members -L.G executive members -State executive members -Zonal executive members -National executive members (who are indigenes of the state) - All political appointees (at the local government, state and national level) - All elected officers - Councillors were included	Consensus (for-adhoc delegates)	Secret Ballot System (for ratification of candidate only because he emerged as **unopposed**)	**0**
2007-gubernatorial	Alh. Yaro Makama Audi	-25 Adhoc delegates from each ward -Ward executive members	Consensus (for-adhoc delegates)		1

elections	Rigachikun	-L.G executive members -State executive members -Zonal executive members -National executive members (who are indigenes of the state) - All elected officers - Councillors were excluded		Secret Ballot System	
2011-gubernatorial elections	Ambassador Nuhu Audu Bajoga	-3 Adhoc delegates from each ward -L.G executive members -State executive members -Zonal executive members -National executive members (who are indigenes of the state) - All elected officers - All former elected officers	Consensus (for-adhoc delegates)	Secret Ballot System	**1**
2015-gubernatorial elections	Mr. Abubakar Gayya Haruna	-3 Adhoc delegates from each ward -5 Statutory delegates at L.G * Party Chairman * Secretary * Treasurer * Youth Leader * Women Leader - All elected officers	Consensus (for-adhoc delegates)	Secret Ballot System	1

Source: Survey Research (2015)

Key: 1 Represent "Less Pure Primary Election"
2 Represent "Pure Primary Election"
0 Represent "Primary Election recording widespread irregularities"

The above analysis is based on Rahat and Hazan (2001) Categorisation of Party Primaries, Indices for systematic evaluation of intra-party politics as provided by Mainwarring and Scully (1995), Manning (2005), Salih (2006) as well as responses from interviewees during field work.

The above analysis has answered our second research question that says; to what extent has the conduct of PDP's Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State conform to the internal democracy requirements as contained in the Electoral Act, indices of intra-party politics as well as the constitution of the party from 1999-2015?

Furthermore, from the above one can also deduce that, the trend has been the use of consensus formula among executive members in the emergence of adhoc delegates in almost all its gubernatorial primary elections. What we are saying here is that, nobody denies the fact that, Article 21 of PDP constitution says " PDP shall promote the principle of federal character in its leadership nomination processes as well candidates selection procedure in order to ensure a fair and equitable distribution of power, resources, wealth and opportunities to conform with the principles of Power-shift and power-sharing, rotation of key political offices, and an equitable devolution of powers to the zones, states and local governments so as to create socio-political conditions conducive to national peace and unity". But our argument is that, the emergence of adhoc delegates at ward level shouldn't be based on consensus among ward executive members as it has been the tradition from 1999-2015. The process should be democrtatic in nature and character by allowing all card carrying members to vote among themselves those who will represent them in selecting gubernatorial candidates in each political ward. In tandem to the above argument, Rahat and Hazan (2001) observed that;

> A purest party primary is where party members' votes alone decide the composition and rank of the candidates. Less pure types allow the party members to select the party candidates from short-listed, unopposed or consensus candidates determined either by party agencies or by a nominating committee and/or allow party headquarters to veto certain candidates. A candidate must be determined exclusively by votes and not for example, by an agreed-upon list or an allocation that is ratify by a unanimous or majority vote; and second, the voting results must be presented officially to justify and legitimize the candidacy. When candidate is determined without fulfilling these conditions, we refer to this as an appointment system. In a pure voting system, all candidates are selected through a voting procedure and no other selectorate can change the composition of the list (Rahat and Hazan, 2001).

No wonder, in an interview with the former Kaduna state deputy governor, he noted that,

> "we do not impose candidates on the party members during primaries but rather we only advise the delegates on whom to vote so as to avoid (what he calls) "Zaben Tumun Dare" (i.e Voting for incompetent candidates) that was why we always consider five conditions before any member should qualify for the electoral contests. Those criteria include; Popularity of Candidates, Financial Viability, Active Participation in Politics of PDP, Ability to challenge an

> opposition party at the general election as well as capability to fully represent the interest of the party any where. If these qualities are absent in the candidate elected at the primary, he/she may be replaced with a more qualified one even after the conduct of the primary" (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

The above is not unconnected to the fact that, Article 21 (i) of PDP constitution specifies that, the National Executive Committee (NEC) shall be the final authority for resolving all disputes relating to the choice of Party candidates for any elections and for confirming the name(s) or list of names of Party candidates for any elective public offices in the Federation (PDP Constitution, 2006).

Not only that, in an interview with the respondents, the researcher realized that, out of fourty three (43) respondents interviewed by the study, twenty three (24) respondents participated in all gubernatorial primaries of the party from 1999-2015, Six (6) respondents participated in 1999, 2003, 2011 and 2015, five (5) respondents participated in 2007, 2011 and 2015 while the remaining eight (8) participated in only 2015 gubernatorial primaries. That was why the researcher was in doubt about the democratic nature of the procedure for the emergence of these delegates and regarded it undemocratic for allowing the same group of PDP delegates to participate in almost all Gubernatorial Primaries. Not only had that, as an observer, the researcher participated in PDP Primaries in 1999 and 2015.

Fourthly, the research also found out that, there was no proper internal democracy in PDP in Kaduna State between 1999 and 2015 but the party has tried a lot by making people aware of their political rights to become politically conscious citizens, nurturing our nascent democracy and above all ruling the state for good sixteen years. Not only that, Intra-party politics in PDP with regard to gubernatorial primaries exists in theory as contained in the party's constitution, but practically it has been bedevilled by many factors. This also answered our third research question that says; what are the factors that influence party members to vote for a particular candidate during Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party in Kaduna State between 1999 and 2015? These challenges can be critically examined as follows:

Godfatherism

This is another problem facing PDP Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State. It is the relationship in which the patron provides protection, services or reward to the client who becomes the patron's political follower.

According to some respondents, politics of patronage is found as an alternative structure for interest representation in Kaduna State. Powerful political figures try to mobilize support through personal connections with subordinates who may themselves serve in a corresponding role of patron for set of clients. The end result of this was in contract inflation in favour of the patron or the looting of public treasury; election of incompetent candidates who cannot deliver well to the public.

The implication of these is that, the electorate is denied their choice and opportunity to enjoy the dividend of democracy, hence democratic governance is hardly attained. According to the respondents, this factor retards economic and political development of Kaduna State between 2010 and 2014.

Furthermore, looking at table 5.2.25, one can understand that, this agrees with our first research assumption that says, Godfatherism has negatively impacted on the Intra-Party Politics of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Kaduna State with regard to its Gubernatorial Primaries from 1999-2015.". This assumption was supported by 323 respondents representing 56% of the total respondents.

Another respondent observed that, when Governor Ahmed Makarfi's tenure expired, he successfully planned and strategized to install Alhaji Umaru Balarabe Kubau (the then Commissioner of Works) to succeed him, but died before the conduct of 2007 election and

Mohammed Namadi Sambo was imposed on Makarfi from Federal Government as well as other pressures from Tijjani Hashim (the then Galadima of Kano) (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

Not only that, to them, Dr. Mukhtar Ramalan Yero (the Former Governor of the State) was to them a client to the Former Vice President (Namadi Sambo) that was why he fixed him as the Deputy Governor and later a governor after becoming the Vice President as well as the death of Late Governor Patrick Ibrahim Yakowa. This to them, was against the tenets of liberal democracy because the internal democratic procedures were neglected by Mohammed Namadi Sambo at the expense of their choice. In tandem to the above argument, Umar Shehu (2014) observed that, Mukhtar Ramalan Yero settled some billions of Naira to Mohammed Namadi Sambo the first six moths he spent in office as Governor. In fact, according to him, what to be done throughout the State in terms of political development, award of contracts as well as political appointments were considered and decided by Mohammed Namadi Sambo. Party members complained bitterly over the issues but there was nothing they could do that was why in his view, many active members of the party even among the founding members cross-carpeted in 2013 to other political parties as an alternative.

Financial Inducement

Another problem of PDP Gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State is the financial inducement and lack of ideology by the members which facilitates votes-buying, cross-carpeting and decamping to other parties especially the opposition. In fact, according to a respondent, one thing with party politics of Kaduna State in particular is that, politics is viewed as vehicle for making quick and easy money that was why some PDP members give bribe so as to be nominated as delegates in every round of election. Once nominated as delegate, he/she will start

making promises especially to those who made him a consensus candidate. They vote according to ability of contestants to pay (i.e whoever pays higher, will be given highest votes).

Moreover, most of the members decamp to opposition parties just to achieve their personal interest and not the interest of the entire citizens. The most important function of an ideology in a political system according to him is to legitimize the political structure and the distribution of political power within that system; ideology facilities symbolic communication between leaders and the led and enables them to struggle with each other in terms of principles instead of personalities. It also refines the values of the society and enables the governor and the governed to avoid bad policies but encourage or propagate people's oriented programmes.

Not only that, considering table 5.2.26 we can say that, this finding agrees with our second assumption that says "Financial Inducement has immensely contributed to the irregularities in the conduct of Gubernatorial Primaries of PDP in Kaduna State from 1999-2015." supported by 329 respondents representing 57% of the total respondents.

Influence of Powerful Political Elite

This research has also found out that, elite have greater influence on who should contest for various positions within and outside the party and that, most of the party decisions are taken by very few influencial and powerful citizens who are elite and have no faith in the conduct of proper primaries as a process of managing political change. Politics is seen as a vehicle for making quick and easy money. That is why they employ any means (fair or foul) to be victorious at any election. This was the reason why many gubernatorial primary elections were not hold or held in a place unknown to members. In an interview with the respondents she affirmed that "Our problem was that PDP is sometimes bias and authoritarian in terms of nomination processes and procedures, throwing all the democratic tenants and elements especially during

primary elections. In fact, not only PDP, almost all the registered political parties in Kaduna State right from 1999 to date failed to hold proper primary elections. They engaged in the subversion of the internal democracy within their parties in the critical area of choosing candidates for election purpose and other dubious forms of determining "Unopposed Candidates".

This also agrees with our third assumption that says, "Political Elite decide and dominate decisions regarding PDP Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015", supported by 376 respondents representing 66% of the total respondents in table 5.2.27 above.

Other respondents also supported the argument where they observed that, the PDP 2015 Gobernatorial Primaries were faulty because, almost all delegates were forced by very elite within the party to vote for the then incumbent governor in person, Dr. Mukhtar Ramalan Yero who scored more than three thousand votes against one vote of Senator Haruna Ziego Aziz. He stressed further that, during the 1999 general elections, local government elections were conducted first before election into the national assembly. PDP in Zaria delayed the conduct of its primary election till after seeing the outcome of the local government election. Late Honourable Alhaji Musa Iya emerged as a consensus or unopposed candidate of PDP in Zaria Local Government.

He added that, his friend, Late Hon. Musa Iya had been an obedient politician. He contested five times, but the influence of elites denies him right to win the primary elections. So in 1999, he was nominated as the consensus candidate of PDP. He contested and won the election, immediately after the election, PDP fixed a date for the primary elections of the members of the House of Representatives. During the conduct of the primary elections, Hon. Nuhu Sani Ibrahim, and Hon. Abdulkadir Usman Global Contested. Late Hon. Musa Iya, used

his power as a chairman elect, at BATC Nagoyi Zaria, (where the election was conducted) to influence the votes of the then councilors (who were part of the delegates or Electoral College). He was observed saying that, "any councilor who needs to be given office should vote for Nuhu Sani Ibrahim. At the end of the primary election, Hon. Nuhu Sani Ibrahim won with three votes ahead of Hon. Abdulkadir Usman Global. Eventually, Hon. Abdulkadir Usman Global was cleared by the PDP caucus at the state level as a PDP candidate for the House of Representatives elections of 1999. Electorates were put in confusion as two candidates were claiming for one seat. Official memos, reports and posters were going round throughout Zaria local government declaring Hon. Abdulkadir Usman Global today, and Hon. Nuhu Sani Ibrahim tomorrow. Hon. Abdulkadir Usman Global was cleared at the end, while Hon. Nuhu Sani Ibrahim was compensated with an appointment as a Director General (DG), Kaduna State media Corporation (K.S.M.C).

Supporting the above argument, another respondent asserted that, in 2008 local government election in Zaria, the major reason why Alh. Dan-Asabe, Raba-Gardama (Reconciliator) was later on supported by some elites to contest for chairmanship election was that, the well known contestants of PDP in Zaria, in persons, Hon. Yahaya Aminu (who wanted to rule for the second term) and Hon. Lawal Balarabe (Usama) were in conflict. This internal conflict within the party led to the crises among supporters of the two candidates.

He added that, initially, the party promised Hon. Lawal Balarabe (Usama) to be their unopposed candidate in 2008, if Hon. Yahaya Aminu finishes his tenure. This was to compensate him for losing his seat as a member of Kaduna State House of Assembly in 2003 general elections. But the situation changed, as Hon. Yahaya Aminu wanted to go for the second term in 2008, this to him, was the genesis of the crisis within the party. Eventually, with the intervention

of the then Governor, Alh. Muhammad Namadi Sambo, Hon. Yahaya Aminu was backed and a foul primary election was conducted where Hon. Lawal Balarabe was defeated. Though, the problem was resolved by the Governor and he was compensated with an appointment as a senior Special Adviser to the Governor, but according to him, it was one of the reasons for the disorganization and destabilization of the 2008 local government election in Zaria, as his supporters engaged in Anti-party politics during election. That was why it had to be cancelled. No wonder, in an interview with the former Kaduna State Executive Governor, he noted that, "the incompatible interests of political elite as well as godfathers within the party were among factors responsible for PDP failure in 2015 general elections in Kaduna State" (Interview, Anonymous, 2015)

Incumbency Factor and Disregard of Rules Governing the Party

It is a constitutional provision of Peoples Democratic Party that an Executive Governor and his Deputy are the party leaders and at the same time Party Chairman exist. Some Executive Governors try to dictate the Party Chairmen on what to be done in the party even if it goes against the constitution of the Party. That was why every governor tries to influence the nomination of party delegates in every kind of election or influences the appointment of a new Party Chairman immediately after assuming office. According to a respondent, in 2015, PDP primary elections were not held in many local government areas of Kaduna State especially members of the House of Assembly. For instance, Yakubu Salisu and Umaru B. Dikko representing Zaria Contituencies, other members representing Kaduna North, Lere and Zangon Kataf constituencies were all nominated unopposed, infact other members were denied to purchase forms simply because they were governor's candidates. This according to him was one of the reasons why PDP failed in Kaduna State.

This agrees with our fourth research assumption that says, "Incumbency factor has greatly influenced the gubernatorial primaries of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Kaduna State from 1999-2015", supported by 362 respondents representing 63% of the total respondents. See table 5.2.28 for details.

Not withstanding, the first set of Party executive members that were elected at the first convention of the Party (when the party was formed) were dissolved some months after Makarfi's assumption of office as Governor and influenced the appointment of his candidate in person, Alh. Yaro Makama Audi Rigachikun who served the party for good eight years. Mohammed Namadi Sambo didn't go with him but influenced the appointment of Hon. Ya'u Usman Sa'in Jama'a who was said to be his relative and a serving member of Kaduna State House of Assembly. Governor Patrick Ibrahim Yakowa influenced the appointment of Ambassador Nuhu Audu Bajoga as Party Chairman when he assumed office. Dr. Mukhtar Ramalan Yero also, influenced the appointment of Mr. Abubakar Gayya Haruna as the Party Chairman during his tenure. This according to some respondents is against the tenets of democracy because, these party cahairmen were hand-picked by the governors at the expense of their choices and opinions.

Application of the Principle of Federal Character

This research work found out that, the application of the Principles of Federal Character (Zoning) is one of the factors militating against PDP gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State. PDP respects the provisions and rules governing federal character commission especially quarter system in distributing positions as well as selecting candidates for different political offices that was why many regarded their selection processes as undemocratic in nature and character. Infact this gave room for the emergence of consensus candidates in most of their primary elections.

According to a respondent, ‘’ It is well known to everybody that Nigeria is federal state practicing federalism as a guide to its appointments as well as distribution of wealth and resources. PDP being a national political party with national outlook must go by it that was why our selection procedures appeared to many politicians as non democratic’.

Problem of Rural and Cosmopolitan Politics

This research work also found out that, there is a belief among rural dwellers that, people of metropoly like Zaria, Kaduna North, Kaduna South, Kafanchan, e.t.c. if allowed to win the position of Governor will forget about the development of the rural areas and concentrate much about the development of the Urban centres. According to some respondents, the development of Kaduna State suffered after the expiration of Makarfi’s tenure; this is in terms of construction of good roads, bridges as well as rural electrification. That was why PDP members with this believe use whatever resources they have at their disposal and to the best of their ability to disrespect some electoral laws especially those concerning the selection of the candidates during primary elections so as to see to the emergence of their candidates. They don’t mind where Party Chairman comes from.

Ethno-Religious Factor

According to some respondents, PDP didn’t provide a level playing ground for all members to contest for elections. In their view, ethno-relgious factor is also a serious issue of concern in every round of gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State. For instance whatever qualification you have according to them you wouldn’t be presented as candidates for governorship election, you can only be a running mate if you are from southern Kaduna which they considered as anti-democracy. That was why throughout the history of PDP as well as

democracy in Kaduna State from 1999-2015, only late Patrick Ibrahim Yakowa broke this record and was referred by so many party members as governor by accident.

Fifthly, the study also found out that, a lot of irregularities were recorded in the conduct of PDP governorship primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015 ranging from the imposition of candidates, substitution of candidates' names in INEC some weeks to the general elections, as well as submission of names to INEC of candidates who were defeated at the primary elections (Interview, Anonymous; 2015). This also answered our fourth research question that says; Are their manifestations of irregularities as claimed by some party members in the conduct of Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?

The sixth major finding according to this research has to do with the fact that, the absence of the observance of democratic principles in the conduct of PDP in Kaduna state led to the emergence of unaccountable and unresponsive leaders as manifested in different constituencies as well as local government areas of the state. Not only that intra party politics promotes equality and fairness in treating party members especially in an atmosphere devoid of godfatherism and money politics. Intra-party politics in Kaduna state chapter of PDP will enable it select more capable and competent leaders to have responsive policies and as a result to enjoy greater electoral success and strengthen democratic culture generally (Interview, Anonymous; 2015).

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction

Political party is undoubtedly one of the most important political institutions in any democratic polity. They represent the most important medium by which groups within a political system compete in their quest to control the institutions of governance in the state and ultimately determine the formulation and implementation of public policies. It is hardly inconceivable to think of democracy without functioning political parties and party system. Indeed political parties and party system can he taken to be the heart of a stable and viable democracy in view of the numerous functions they perform in the democratic process.

This chapter examines the summary of the work under review, conclusion and recommendations.

6.2. Summary of Major Findings

In summary therefore, political parties in a democratic regime are to exhibit a high level of variation in their ideological and organizational structure. It is agreed that modern political parties perform important functions in the running of democratic states. These functions however depend largely on the type of parties in the system, their history, the party system and the electoral systern. Though contesting and winning elections are the central role of political parties, yet they perform other functions which are also essential to the smooth functioning of a democratic system. Among other things, political parties organize and aggregate public opinion, transmit public demands to the government and vice versa, recruit political leaders, engage in oversights in the implementation of public policies, political mobilization and socialization as well as in the provision of welfare services, particularly in third world democracies.

Political parties also work as intermediaries between the multitude of political individuals and the policy makers in government, build influence into aggregates so that they

will have greater effect on the policy makers and the policies they make. They also codify and simplify information about government, politics and policies as it moves back to the individual. It is by acting as the link between governments and the governed in today's modern democracies that political parties articulate, aggregate, protect and advance the interest of the public.

The study examined intra-party politics in Nigeria with particular reference to Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Kaduna State. The work is structured and designed to contain six chapters as follows: Chapter one examines the general background to the study; this contains the introduction, statement of the problem, aims and objectives of the study, significance of the research, propositions and methodology. Chapter two is the literature review and theoretical framework. The literatures reviewed by the study include the concept of democracy, principles of liberal democracy, Political Parties, intra-party politics, indices of intra-party politics, intra-party politics in Nigeria from first republic to the present democratic dispensation, e.t.c. Chapter three focuses on the Research Methodology. Thus; the sources of data collection and processing were examined in this chapter. Chapter four dwells on the history and formation of Peoples' Democratic Party (PDP) in Nigeria. Chapter five is about the analysis, interpretation and presentation of data. Chapter six being the concluding part, is the summary and conclusion of the major findings on intra-party politics in Nigeria, with particular reference to Kaduna state with a set of recommendations.

The research reveals that, Kaduna state like any other states in Nigeria lack evolving and durable party system that can genuinely provide the pillars for sustainable democratic governance. PDP for instance, has ruled Kaduna state for good sixteen years but the party has failed to provide a level playing ground for all members to select their candidates of choice during primary elections that was why Ukeh (2014) revealed that, present political parties in

Nigeria lack the coherence, ideological will and organizational strength to pilot the affairs of the nation, and transform its numerous human and material resources for the overall well being of its people. These contradictions in our party system and political process had frequently resulted to a cumulous of effects, chiefly amongst which is the truncation of a possible national agenda and the unfortunate intervention of the military in Nigerian politics. In a situation where the dominant interest in the political parties are markedly different, where the ideological divide between parties is not very sharp and the political culture emphasize Machiavellian tactics where the winner takes all approach to politics, the level of hostility on the struggle for political power between the parties cannot but be high, (Tyoden, 1994:14).

A political party must have its manifesto and programmes to sell to the electorate and these must be based on its perception of the role of the state in governance.

By the time the 2003 and 2007 elections were held, many more parties had come into existence. Party politics relegated to "Cash and Carry" affairs. A governor once laughed at an interviewer to scorn when asked to define his (PDP) ideology. The governor argued that no one was interested in such abstract concept, and all that one had to do to win power was to buy his way through the party hierarchy. The PDP fell into the handful of leaders or dealers at every level who bought their way through (Onabule, 2009).

Similarly, what is ever more unethical in party system in Nigeria is decamping / cross carpeting. Cross carpeting has become commonest feature of party politics in Kaduna state especially in 2013. Politics has degenerated into an unrelenting war to acquire, defend or gain access to its office. Umar (cited in Ukeh, 2014) pointed out that many politicians behave like political bats changing party affiliation in response to the political fortunate of their groups. The most interesting immersion of this analysis is the fact that members of a truly and genuine

political parties can never dump their political parties for whatever contradiction or failure of the party may have faced in the past.

6.3 Conclusion

Kaduna State today has more than ten political parties but the difference between these parties is not clear. Most of them have no commitment to their manifastos and the visions for the state. There is no doubt that in a liberal democracy, the freedom of association is provided. But the abuse of that fundamental right comes to the fore when those associations (political parties) are to properly serve the people they represent. Political parties have sadly become hired vehicles for chieftains to move from pillars to post in a desperate move to be in office for power and money rather than for service.

The conduct of gubernatorial primary elections in Kaduna State has been beset by varying degrees of irregularities ranging from uncertain legal and constitutional terrain through the outright manipulation of the electoral process to the production of pre-determined results. This has led to a situation where electoral contests are seen as do or die affair where contestants employ fair or foul means to win. Results declared in these situations are hardly acceptable and the party moves dangerously towards the precipice of confusion and anarchy after every round of election.

The irregularities surrounding the procedure for nominating flag bearers have created serious crises within political parties in Kaduna state and hindered the success of the conduct of cerdible primary elections in the major parties. The candidates, who were deprived opportunities, move to party and the individuals that they perceived to be behind the ordeal. This was the reason behind assassination and attempted assassination which were rampant before the 2007 General Elections.

PDP in Kaduna state have tended to be oligarchic in terms of their nomination process and procedures, discarding most of the liberal and democratic elements. They are impatient with the democratic process. Thus, what is found among all the major parties is for people to join the party today and tomorrow they are put up as candidates to contest for elections under their party's platform. There is no programmatic proclamation or orientation as they operate more like temporary machines for electoral contest. Most of the parties cannot help in the conduct of free and fair elections because; they tend to be disorganized with no focus or direction. Thus, immediately after elections, most of the parties cease to exist as party activities move to where elected officials are, especially if the party is in power.

As a result, it affects political competition as well as stability of democracy in the state. Candidates for elective positions are most atimes handpicked and imposed on the parties by the political leaderships arbitrarily without recourse to due process. Thus, a number of political parties available in Kaduna state are experiencing internal turmoil and revolt because of the arbitrariness that has become the norm of many of them. Of equally importance is that a party that does not respect its own internal rules is a dangerous to the system, it will be incapable of sustaining democracy or the rule of law.

The nature of Nigerian constitution and the Electoral Acts also serve as stumbling blocks to the conduct of transparent and flawless primary elections in Kaduna state. The constitution and the electoral laws have become barriers to participation rather than vehicle for change and democratization. Thus, elections have almost become irrelevant acts which in the end block rather than facilitate the circulation of power among competing forces. This subverts the democratic process.

In any democratic government or political party, the conduct of credible elections require the existence of an independent electoral body, an honest, competent and non-partisan administration to manage, a general acceptance of certain rules of the game throughout the political community and a developed system of political parties, well organized to put their programmes and candidates before the electors as alternatives within which to choose. These requirements are useful in anticipating the outcome of elections and in determining the health of the electoral system. Free and fair primary elections constitute the bedrock of a democratic political party. The challenge of conducting free and fair elections is largely hinged upon the composition and conduct of the body for managing elections, and for creating a level playing ground for the major actors and contestants. It also requires a strong culture of opposition politics and a strong civil society that can play the role of a Watchdog, including the capacity to undertake civic education and monitor all the important stages of elections. Wherever the conditions for the conduct of free and a fair election is lacking, as in Kaduna state and many other states, democracy can never be entrenched.

Political parties are the most obvious feature in a democratic system. The role of parties in modern competitive democracy is as dominant as the role of corporations in modern capitalist economies. It is indeed difficult to conceive modern democratic system without organized political parties and functioning party system. The activities of political parties permeate much of peoples' lives in democratic system. Parties are not just central to elections and policy making, but under their banner, mass public are mobilized for good or evil, revolutions are fomented, political dissidents are arrested, tortured and killed, and ideologies are turned into moral imperatives. Not only in democracies, but all conceivable political systems appear unable to function properly without the presence of one or more parties.

Political parties play significant roles in all political systems; they are however more important in plural democracies, whose health often depends on the success of parties in linking the people to the political process. The nature and functions of parties vary with the nature of governance and the characters of the people, both of which it links. Parties take different forms under different regimes. While their functions and degree of importance varies from nation to nation, party to party and from time to time. Political Parties can be of any size and of any ideological persuasion. Parties may appeal to the narrowest segment of the electorates such as the green party of Western Europe or assume the form of catch-all parties that appeals all and sundry.

6.4 Recommendations

For the successful working of our nascent democracy, the electorate should continue to have faith in the political processes as the present political experiment has largely depends upon them. They must insist on the institutionalisation and the re-structure of both political parties as well as the judiciary in a most comprehensive position. In order to make democracy a reality despite all the obstacles in the path, in Kaduna state in particular, the following recommendations are made:

Political elites and politicians as well in Kaduna state must have faith in the conduct of credible elections as the only way of bringing political change in any political system. They should understand that, there is always one winner in any election. They should also believe that, winning and losing are the two features of any election, so, the employment of a foul means to be victorious at the elections are against the tenants of democracy. PDP in Kaduna state should strive through dialogue to ensure the entrenchment of true justice for all in our body politics and for the emergence of a credible leadership that will give purpose and political direction to the state. To achieve this purpose the leadership and followership of like-minded associations and

groups have to agree to use a formidable, national, broad-based, people-oriented and principled Political Parties with the widest grassroots support, to work for the restoration of democracy and good governance not only in Kaduna state in particular but Nigeria at large.

There should be equal participation of all PDP members of Kaduna state chapter in the democratic processes of the party. This emphasizes on the involvement of the rank-and-file in the party's policies as well as representation at party activities and in party bodies. Democratic policy-making involves a participative process of policy development in debates, consultation meetings and other platforms, and it decentralizes the mandate of decision-making to the rank and file of political parties.

Democracy is all about inclusiveness. If there is no provision for people's inclusion in the party, there may be little participation since one begets the other. Inclusiveness of all PDP members in Kaduna state will give them opportunity to decide on important issues, such as the choice of party leaders or the selection of party candidates. Due to the fact that inclusiveness is a matter of process and formal rule, more inclusive parties will offer more opportunities for open deliberation prior to the decision stage. As it were, this particular variable (inclusiveness) is seriously and visibly lacking in most political parties of the state. For instance, almost all of the major political parties of Kaduna state today are facing one kind of crises or another. The PDP which is our focal point is entangled in the zoning formula as well as leadership problem. This problem has not only led to the formation of so many competing groups and caucuses, but also led to the failure of the party in 2015 gubernatorial election. It is in view of this study that, for any party to brace up for governorship election, it must not go into that election as a divided house.

Party institutionalization in Kaduna state chapter of PDP will also enhance the degree to which internal decisions and procedures are formalized and the extent to which the party has coordinated structures throughout its target constituency. It is believed that parties with high

degree of intra-party democracy are generally highly institutionalized because they need rules that define who is eligible to participate and what constitute victory in internal contest. Beyond all this, the assumption is that internal democracy in political parties thrives more in societies that strongly uphold democratic principles and ethos which Kaduna state is not one of those.

Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) Kaduna state chapter should develop internal procedures for candidate's nomination that are open, transparent, inclusive and democratic and which requires that those seeking nominations do not use intimidation, violence, bribery or similar unacceptable methods to gain nomination or office and that, in each polling unit atleast three adhoc delegates should be democratically elected in which one of them must be a woman. This will definitely encourage participation and representation.

Intra party politics in PDP Kaduna state chapter is very important due to the fact that, it will ensure the control of leadership, its selection, and the participation of its members in decision making processes. To conduct proper gubernatorial primaries, there is need for regular awareness and political education to the party members. Elite and godfathers of whatever type should recognize the legitimacy of electoral competition as the only democratic way to political offices. Party ideology should be established and be a guiding rule of the conduct of PDP members in the state. Party manifesto should be strictly adhered to so as to actively response to the yearnings and aspirations of the electorate. There should be openness and transparency in the conduct of governorship primaries, this is for a simple reason that, proper candidates' selection enhances openness of the political leaders through balanced representative system that cut across various ethnic, religious and marginalized groups based on bottom-up system that would bring about the basic functions of the party. This will go along way in having confidence on the party leaders as the electorates would be adequately represented through civic education, recruitment

of more members, interest aggregation and articulation, mediation of local interest and political communication.

The Party in the state should emphasize on the ability, commitment to the peoples' welfare and accountability in the selection of candidates for public offices and in the conduct of future gubernatorial primaries. A new type of leadership must develop. It must be forward looking and it must be inspiring and possessing a sense of mission. In essence, the party must learn once more to choose the honest, the disciplined, and the selfless and responsive candidates. These choices are not negotiable.

Political elites of whatever type in Kaduna state chapter of PDP should be ready and willing to be governed by the provisions of their party's constitution and Electoral Act. The party should believe that only urgent restoration of participatory democracy, social justice and good governance by a government formed by a strong responsive political party led by patriotic men and women of the highest integrity and outstanding ability and knowledge can save democracy and party politics in Kaduna state from the disaster into which it had been plunged.

REFERENCES

Adigwe, F. (1979), *Essentials Government for West Africa,* Ibadan: University Press Limited.

Agarwal R.C. (2000**)**, *Political Theory,* Ramnagar, New Delhi: S. Chand and Company Limited.

Agbaje, A. (1999), Political Parties and Pressure Groups. In *Elements of Politics* (Eds.) Remi Anifowoshe and Francis Enemuo. Lagos:

Ake, C (1981), *A Political Economy of Africa,* England: Longman Grove limited.

Ake, C. (2001), *Democracy and Development in Africa,* Ibadan. Spectrum Books Limited.

Akinyemi, B. (1974), *Federalism and Nigerian Foreign Policy,* lbadan: Oxford University Press.

Akinola, O. A. (2009), "Godfatherism and the Future of Nigerian Democracy" A Seminar Paper Delivered at the Dept. of PoliticalScience, Ife: Obafemi Awolowo University.

Akinwumi, O. (2005) *Crises and Conflicts in Nigeria: A political History Since 1960.* Germany: Lit Verlag Munster.

Alii Y. (2010), 'Governors, Lawmakers set for showdown over Bill', The Nation, Tuesday November, p. 1-2

Appadorai A. (1975), *Substances of Politics*" London: Oxford University Press.

Asogwa, C. (2003), "Marshal Harry Last Deal With Governor Odilli", Insider Weekly, April 21.

Ayeni-Akeke, O. (2008), *Foundation of Political Science,* Ibadan: Ababa Press.

Ayoade, J.A.A. (2008), Godfather Politics in Nigeria, in International Foundation for Electoral System (IFES). *Money, Politics and Corruption in Nigeria,* Jos and Ibadan: IFES.

Amusan, L. (2011), Intra-Party Politics and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria: Five Decades of Undulating Journey, in Ogundiya I.S. (ed.) (2011). Political Parties and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria, Ibadan: Codat Publications.

Bala, J. T. and Sonni, G. T. (1987), *The Kaduna Mafia,* Jos: University of Jos Press.

Dudley, B. (1982). *An Introduction to Nigerian Government and Politics*, Hong-Kong: Macmillan Press Limited

Biereenu-Nnabugwu, M. (2006), *Methodology of Political Inquiry: Issues and Techniques of Research Methods in Political Science*, Enugu Nigeria: Quintagon Publishers.

Butler, A. (2010), Paying for Politics: Party Funding and Political Change in South Africa and the Global South. (Auckland and Dunkeld:Jacana Media and Konrad Adenauer Foundation).

Beck, P. and Sorauf, F. J.(1992), *Party Politics in America* (7th Edition). New York: Harper Collins Publisher Incorporation.

Coleman, Janies S. (1958), *Nigeria, Background to Vationalism.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

ColIier, P. W. (1995), *Guns and Votes: Democracy in Dangerous Places*. London: Vintage Books.

Dahl, R. (2008), "Inner Party Democracy in Nepal." Paper Presented at a Seminar Organized by FEC, CELCAR and SM College, Pokhona, November 27, 2008.

Daniela,G. (2009), *Intra-Party Politics in Coalition Governments*, Britain: Routledge.

De Grazia, Alfred. (1952), *Political Behavior, Vol.1 Element of politics.* Prentice-Hall Inc.,

Duverger, M. (1954), *Political Parties: Their Organization, and Activity in Modern States*. New York: Wiley.

Dunmoye, R.A. (2013), " Division in PDP, Good Development for Nigerian Democracy, Daily Trust, September 15, 2013.

Eghosa, E. Osaghae (1998), *Crippled Giant: Nigeria Since independence*. London: Hurst and Company.

Electoral Act (2002).

Electoral Act (2010), with 2011 ammendments.

Electoral Reform Commission Report (2008)

Engelrnann, C. and Mudred, A.(1967), *Political Parties and Canadian Social Structure*. Ontario: Prentice Hall of Canada Ltd.

Epstein, L. (1980), *Political Parties in Western Democracies*. New Jersey: Transaction Books.

Fourchard, L. (2010), Lagos, Koolhaas and Partisan Politics in Nigeria, International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, Vol.35 no.1, Pp.40-56.

From Khaki to Agbada (1999), A Handbook for the February 1999 Elections in Nigeria, Lagos: Civil Liberties Organisations.

Gauba, O.P. (1981), *An Introduction to Political Theory*" fourth edition, New Delhi: Raji Beri for Macmillan India, Limited.

The Guardian, December 13, 2004

Haruna, D.K. (2007), Political Parties and Democratisation Process in Nigeria: A Case Study of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP), An Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation Submitted to the Department of Political Science, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) (2003). Trainer's Guide for Training Elections Officials.

International Encyclopedia of Sciences, volume 5

International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. (International IDEA) (2000), "Democracy in Nigeria" Sweden; Viochco A.B

International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. (International IDEA) (2007), Political Parties in West Africa, The Challenges of Democratization in Fragile State

Jega (2014), " Lack of Litigation Hinders INEC Capacity on Party Primary List, A Keynote Address Delivered During INEC-Traditional Rulers National Summit on Peaceful Elections Held in Abuja.

Kura, S.Y.B. (2011), Institutional Designs and Political Party Formation in Nigeria, in Ogundiya, I.S. (2011) (eds.), Political Parties and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria, Ibadan: Cadat Publications, Pp. 26-27.

Lamidi, K.O. (2015), The Character of Party Politics and the Conduct of Primary Elections in Nigeria's Fourth republic, in Habu Mohammed (eds.) The Patterns and Dynamics of Party Politics in Nigeria's Fourth republic, Kano: Hallmark Publishing Nig. Ltd.

Lamidi, K.O. (2010), International Perception on the Conduct of Nigeria's General Elections, Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis Submitted to the Department of Political Science, University of Illorin.

Lapalombara, J. (1974), *Politics within Nation,* New Jersey: Prentice Hall Incorporation.

Lapalombara, J. and Anderson, J. (2001), "Political Parties", Encyclopedia of Government and Politics (Volume I). (Eds.) Mary Hawkesworth and Maurice Kogan. London and New York: Routledge.

Lere, A. (2011), Intra-Party Politics and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria; Five Decades of Undulating Journey, in Ogundiya, I.S. (2011) (eds.), Political Parties and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria, Ibadan: Cadat Publications, Pp. 26-27.

Mahajan, V.D (2000), *political theory*, New Delhi, India: S. Chand and company limited.

Magill, F.N. (1996), International Encyclopedia of Government and Politics, (Volume Two). London and Chicago: Fitzroy and Dearborn Publishers.

Mainswaring, S. and Scully, T.R. (1995), *Building Democratic Institutions*: Party System in Latin America, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Manning, C. (2005), Assessing African Party System after the Third Wave. Vol. 11

Magolowondo A. T. (n.d) Understanding Intra-party democracy in Africa: Issues and Questions. Retrieved on 22 October, 2010 from www.nmd.org/documents/l /intra-partv democracy challenges and implications

Metuh O. (2010), Ebonyi: Things fall apart for PDP, The Nation, Thursday April 1, p. 13'Home Truth ', Daily Sun, Tuesday, November 2, p. 26

Michael, B. A. (2013), Intra-Party Conflicts in Nigeria: The Case Study of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa Volume 15, No.4,

Moveh, D. O. (2015), A study of the Integrative and Regional Tendencies of Political Parties in Nigeria's Fourth Republic, Kaduna Journal of Political Science, Vol.2 No.1, p.3

Mohammad, A.A. (2003) Federalism, Democracy and the National Question under Nigeria's fourth republic.

Mohammed, A.A. (2008), "Intra- Party Relations and Conflicts in Nigeria", *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(1).

Muhammad-Bande, T. (2014), Dynamics of Political Party Competition in Nigeria; Origin and Evolutuion in Olu Obafemi, Sam Egwu, Okechukwu Ibeanu and Jubrin Ibrahim (eds.) (2014). Political Parties and Democracy in Nigeria, Jos: Vintage Art Gallery Limited

Mukhtar, B. (2014), Polical Parties and Internal Democracy in Nigeria; A Study of Congress for Progressive Consensus (CPC) in Katsina State; an Unpublished Msc. Thesis Submitted to the Department of Political Science, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Nnamani C. (2004), "Democratic Experiment and the Menace of Godfatherism in Nigerian Politics", *Tell Magazine*, Nov. 23.

Nnoli, 0. (2003), *Introduction to Politics* (Second Edition). Enugu: Pan- African Centre for Research on Peace and Conflict Resolution.

Nwajukwu, K.C. (2005), Political Parties and Democratic Governance in Africa; The Case of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Nigeria, Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa, Vol.15 no. 4

Oddih, M. (2007), "Electoral Fraud and Democratic Process, Lessons from 2003 Elections, in Jega, A. and Ibeanu, (eds) "Elections and the Future of Democracy in Nigeria" (2007). A publication of National Political science Association (NPSA).

Odofin A.P and Omojuwa, K.A; (2007), "The Challenges of Democracy in Nigeria" A-Y Sule Digital (Nig.) Printers.

Ogundiya, I.S. (2011), 'Political Parties and Democratic Consolidation': in Ogundiya, (ed.) Political Parties and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria, Ibadan: Codat Publications.

Ogundiya, I.S. (2008), "On Democracy, Legitimacy, and Accountability: Lessons from Nigeria", Ibadan Journal of the Social Sciences, Vol. 6. No. 2

Ogundiya, I.S. and Baba, T.K. (2007), Electoral Violence and Democratic consolidation to Nigeria", in Jega, A. and Ibeanu, O. (Ed) Elections and the future of democracy in Nigeria; a publication of the Nigerian political science Association (NPSA).

Ojo, E. E. (2009), *Mechanisms of National Integration in a Multi Ethnic Federal State*; the Nigerian Experience. Ibadan: John Archers.

Ojo, E.E. and Lawal, E.E. (2013), Godfather Politics: The Collapse of the Saraki Dynasty in Kwara State Politics, in John, A. Ayoade and Adeoye , A. Akinsanya (eds), Nigeria's Critical Election, 2011, Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.

Okafor, P. (2003), "Transcending Aridity in Nigerian Politics, The Role of Ideas" in SSAN: Nigerian Social Scientists, Volume, 6 No1, March 2003.

Okoosi S. (2004), The Impact of more Parties on the Democratic Project in Saliu Hassan A. (Eds) *Nigeria under Democratic rule (1999-2003).*

Okoosi, S. (2005), Political Vagrancy and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria in Onu, Godwin and Momoh, Abubakar (Eds)., *Elections and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria*. Nigeria Political Sci. Assoc. pp: 17 – 33.

Okoye, F. (2014), Incumbency and Impunity in the Electoral Process; Securing Democracy Beyond 2015 in Daily Trust, January 22nd 2014.

Olaniyan, A.O. (2009), Inter and Intra-Party Squabbles in Nigeria in Ogundiya (ed.). Re-Democratisation in Nigeria.

Olaniyi J.O. (2004), INEC and the Conduct of 2003 General Elections' in, Saliu, Hassan A. (Ed.) *Nigeria under Democratic Rule (1999-2003).*

Ologbenla, D. (2004), Political Instability, Conflicts and the 2003 General Elections.
Oloyede, D. (2001), *Succession Crisis in History.* www.dokunoloyede.@yahoo.com

Olurode, L., (2004), Prelude to the Elections. Economy, Society and Politics in Olumode. Issues in Nigeria.

Omodia S. M. (2010), "Elite Recruitment and Political Stability in the Nigerian Fourth Republic."Journal of Social Scicnces.

Omotola, j. S. (2009),'Nigerian Parties and Political Ideology," Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences.

Omotola, J. S. (2010), *political parties and the quest for political stability in Nigeria.* Taiwan Journal of Democracy, vol. 6 No. 2: 125-145.

Omoruyi, O. (2007), *Parties and Politics in Nigeria. CEO Advancing Democracy in Africa. Boston University.*

Onabule, D. (2009), *So, Zik and Balewa conspired against Awolowo?* http.www.duroonabule@gmail.com, retieved on 13 feb, 2014

Osaghae, E.E. (2009), *Methodological Notes on Assessing Africa's Democratic Revolution*, in Byfield, J.A. (ed.) Building Bridges Across American and Nigerian Studies, Ibadan: Book Builders.

Owoeye, J. (2010), "Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria: The Challenges of the 2011 General Elections." A paper delivered at the 2nd Distinguished Lecture Series of Political Science and International Relations, Osun State University, 27 October.

Oyediran, O. and Nwosu, H. (2005). *New Approach Government*, Lagos: Longman Nigeria Plc.

Oyeleye, O. (1998), *Nigerian Government and Politics under Military Rule*, Lagos: Macmillan Press Limited.

PDP Constitution, 2006 (As Amended)

PDP Manifesto, 1999-2015

PDP Manifesto, 2015-2019

Pennings, P. and Hazan (2003), *Democratizing Candidate Selection,* Party Politics Vol: 7: 267-75 Ibadan.

Phillips, A. (1995), *The Politics of Presence*. Oxford: Clarendom

Pitkin, H. (1976), *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Punch (2014), "PDP Primaries: Dollar Naira Rain for Delegates". December 13th www.punch.com

Rahat and Hazan (2001), Candidate Selection Methods and Consequences, in Richard and William (eds.) (2006), *Handbook of Party Politics*, India: Sage Publications.

Reilly, B.(2008), "*Political Parties in Conflict-prone Societies: Encouraging inclusive Politics and Democratic Development".* United Nations University Policy Brief, Number 2

Rourke, P. j. (2010), *Don't vote, it just encourages the bastards*', London: Grove-Press.

Salih, M. (2006), *The Challenges of Internal Party Democracy in Africa*: A Handbook on working with political parties. New York: UNDP

Sam, E. (2014), Internal Democracy in Nigerian Political Parties, in Olu Obafemi, Sam Egwu, Okechukwu Ibeanu and Jubrin Ibrahim (eds.) (2014). Political Parties and Democracy in Nigeria, Jos: Vintage Art Gallery Limited

Sanda, U. (2011), *Parties Swim in Endless Conflicts.* Weekly-Trust. http://www.weeklytrust.ng.com retrieved on 5th march 2011.

Scarrow, S. (2005), *Political Parties and Democracy in Theoretical and Practical Perspectives: Implementing Intra-party Democracy*. Washington: NDI

Siddique, A. M. (2007), "Towards ending electoral fraud in Nigeria" a one day conference on Electoral Reform organized by Arewa Media Forum Auditorium, Arewa House, Kaduna.

Simbine, A. T. (2014), Single Party Dominance and Democracy in Nigeria: The Peoles Democratic Party (PDP) in Focus in Olu Obafemi, Sam Egwu, Okechukwu Ibeanu and Jubrin Ibrahim (eds.) (2015), Political Parties and Democracy in Nigeria, Jos: Vintage Art Gallery Limited

Sunday, S. (2012), Political Party Formation and Opposition Politics in Nigeria, Au Unpublished Ph.D. Dessertation Submiitted to the Department of Political Science, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Sunday Trust; (2014), Mu'azu's Daunting Challenges in PDP: 2015 Presidential Ticket.

Tenuche, M. (2014), Ruling Party and Governance in Nigeria, in Olu Obafemi, Sam Egwu, Okechukwu Ibeanu and Jubrin Ibrahim (eds.) (2014), Political Parties and Democracy in Nigeria, Jos: Vintage Art Gallery Limited

Transition Monitoring Group (TMG), (2004). Divining the Peoples will, A report of the 2004 local government elections in Nigeria (A coalition of human rights, non-governmental and civil society organizations) Lagos, Nigeria: Mbeyi and Associates Nigeria Limited.

Transition Monitoring Group (TMG) (2008). Making the votes count, a report of the 2008 local government elections in Nigeria (A coalition of Human Rights, Non Governmental and civil society organizations) Lagos, Nigeria: Mbeyi and Associates Nigeria Limited.

Tyoden S.G, (2002), Inter and Intra Party Relations: Towards a more Stable Party System in Nigeria. The Constitution: A.J Constitutional Dev. 3 : 1 – 33.

Tyoden, S. G. (1994), *Party Relationship and Democracy in Nigeria.* In Omo Omoruyi, Dirk Ber-Schlosserr, Adesina Sambo and Ada Okwuosa (eds.), Democratisation in Africa: Nigerian perspectives vol.1. Benin-City, Nigeria: Hima and Hima Limited.

Ujo, A. A. (1996), *Political Parties and Electoral Competition in Kaduna State*, Kaduna: Passmark International Publishers.

Ujo, A. A. (2000), *Understanding Political Parties in Nigeria*. Kaduna: Kalmidas Company Ltd

Umar, A. (2014), "PDP, Intra-Party conflicts and Nigerian Democracy, Daily Trust, April 5, 2014.

Ukeh, O. (2014), "2015, PDP and Vexed Primary Elections December 19th", sunnewsonline.com, retrieved on 3rd Febuary, 2015.

Unobe, E.A. (2012), Logic and Method of Social Inquiry, Lecture Notes, for Ph.D. Students, Department of Political Science, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Varma, S.P. (1982), *Modern Political Theory, A critical survey.* India: Vikas publishing House, PVT Ltd.

Vermani, R.C. (2006), *An Introduction to Political Theory and Thought.* New Delhi: Gitanjali Publishing House.

William, T. (1984), *Government and Politics in Africa*, Hong-Kong: Macmillan Education Limited

Yaqub, N. O. (2003), "Inter and inra-party conflicts and the future of democracy in Nigeria", in Olasupo, B. A. (eds), *Electoral Violence in Nigeria: Issues and Perspectives.* Lagos: Frederick Ebert Stiftung.

Yaqub N. (2002), The Military, Democratic Transitions and the 1999 Elections in Olurode L. and Anifowoshe, Remi (Eds.), *Issues in Nigeria's 1999 General Elections.* Lagos, Nigeria: John West Publications Ltd and Rebonic Publications Ltd pp: 76 – 105.

APPENDIX 1

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. Please sir, how many times have you participated in PDP gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State?
2. What is the nature of Intra-Party Politics in PDP Kaduna State Chapter with regards to its Gubernatorial Primaries from 1999-2015?
3. To what extent has the conduct of PDP's Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State conform to the internal democracy requirements as contained in the Electoral Act, indices of candidate's selection as well as the constitution of the party from 1999-2015?
4. How did PDP delegates emerged in 1999, 2003, 2007, 2011 and 2015 gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State?
5. How did PDP Governorship Candidates been selected in 1999, 2003 2007, 2011 and 2015 gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State?
6. Is Patron-Client Politics (godfatherism) having negative impact on the Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) Kaduna State, from 1999-2015?
7. Is financial inducement a hindrance to the Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) Kaduna State, from 1999-2015?
8. Do PDP elite decide and dominate decisions affecting Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?
9. Is incumbency a factor that influence the Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Kaduna State from 1999-2015.

10. Have exclusiveness of rank-and-file members in taking decision a great effect on Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) Kaduna State, from 1999-2015?
11. What are the factors that influence party members to vote for a particular candidate during Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party in Kaduna State between 1999 and 2015?
12. Are their manifestations of irregularities as claimed by some party members in the conduct of Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?
13. Was there equal participation of all PDP members in decision making affecting Gubernatorial Primaries in your ward or local government from 1999-2015?
14. Were rules governing PDP Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State commonly observed, widely understood and confidently anticipated from 1999-2015?
15. Has political power been decentralized among all PDP members in their respective local governments or wards with regard to Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?
16. Have PDP leaders in Kaduna State recognize the legitimacy of electoral competition in respect of Gubernatorial Primaries as the only route to office from 1999-2015?
17. Have Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) exists independently of powerful elite within and outside the party in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?
18. Have PDP primary elections for the post of governorship been holding at the convention or state congress of the party in each of the twenty three local government areas of Kaduna state from 1999-2015?

19. Has INEC been supervising as well as monitoring PDP gubernatorial primary elections in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?

20. What are the implications of the absence of the observance of democratic principles in the conduct of political parties to the development of democracy in a developing nation like Nigeria?

21. Why is internal democracy at the level of primary election necessary for PDP's cohesion and democratic enhancement in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?

22. What in your view, are interests and intrigues that worked against PDP gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?

23.. How could free and fair Governorship Primaries be conducted by the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Kaduna State?

APPENDIX 2

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR INEC RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

1. Please sir, how many times have you participated in PDP gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State?
2. What is the nature of Intra-Party Politics in PDP Kaduna State Chapter with regards to its Gubernatorial Primaries from 1999-2015?
3. To what extent has the conduct of PDP's Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State conform to the internal democracy requirements as contained in the Electoral Act, indices of candidate's selection as well as the constitution of the party from 1999-2015?
4. How did PDP delegates emerged in 1999, 2003, 2007, 2011 and 2015 gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State?
5. How did PDP Governorship Candidates been selected in 1999, 2003 2007, 2011 and 2015 gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State?
6. Have PDP primary elections for the post of governorship been holding at the convention or state congress of the party in each of the twenty three local government areas of Kaduna state from 1999-2015?
7. Did the party give INEC 21 days notice for each of its gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?
8. Did the party indicate the venue, time and date for each of its gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?
9. Did the party provide the list of delegates as well as candidates for each of its gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?

10. Has there been any change in the venue and time of its gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?
11. Did the party communicate the said change to the INEC within 7 days?
12. Was there a list of accredited delegates to its gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?
13. Was there a detailed guideline for the conduct of its gubernatorial primaries as well as system of balloting from 1999-2015?
14. Did the party invite independent observers to observe the processes?
15. Were the election results announced at the venue and generally accepted?
16. What are the factors that influence party members to vote for a particular candidate during Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party in Kaduna State between 1999 and 2015?
17. Are their manifestations of irregularities as claimed by some party members in the conduct of Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?
18. What are the implications of the absence of the observance of democratic principles in the conduct of political parties to the development of democracy in a developing nation like Nigeria?
19. Is Patron-Client Politics (godfatherism) having negative impact on the Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) Kaduna State, from 1999-2015?
20. Is financial inducement a hindrance to the Gubernatorial Primaries Methods of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) Kaduna State, from 1999-2015?

21. Do PDP political elite decide and dominate decisions affecting Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?
22. Is incumbency a factor that influence the Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Kaduna State from 1999-2015.
23. What in your view, are interests and intrigues that worked against PDP's Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?
24. How could free and fair Governorship Primaries be conducted by the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Kaduna State?

APPENDIX 3

QUESTIONNAIRE ON "INTRA-PARTY POLITICS AND PRIMARY ELECTIONS IN PEOPLES DEMOCRATIC PARTY (PDP): A STUDY OF THE EMERGENCE OF GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATES IN KADUNA STATE FROM 1999-2015"

INTRODUCTION

Dear respondent, the researcher is a Post-Graduate student of Political Science Department, Ahmadu Bello University (ABU) Zaria, conducting a research on the "Intra-Party Politics and Primary Elections in Peoples Democratic Party (PDP): A Study of the Emergence of Gubernatorial Candidates in Kaduna State from 1999-2015".

INSTRUCTION:

Please, read the questionnaire carefully and tick (√) one of the boxes provided against each of the items, statements or questions below. Kindly feel free to express your views and opinions regarding your responses to the items, statements or questions.

Note also that, there is no right or wrong answers. However you should honestly and sincerely tick (√) the most appropriate opinion that agrees with your views and feelings. Your answer/responses shall be used strictly for the purpose of this research study that is aimed at advancing knowledge and humanity. Also, your responses would be treated with confidentiality.

Section A: Biodata

1. **Gender:** a. Male ( ) b. Female ( )
2. **Age:** a. 18-28 ( ) b. 28-38 ( )
   c. 38-48 ( ) d. 48 and above ( )
3. **Marital Status:** a. Single ( ) b. Married ( )
4. **Religion:** a. Islam ( ) b. Christianity ( )
5. **Occupation:** a. Politician ( ) b. Farmer ( )
   c. Studentship ( ) d. Civil Service ( )
6. **Qualification:** a. Primary Leaving Certificate ( )
   b. GCE/SSCE ( ) c. NCE ( )
   d. First Degree and Above ( )

Section B: Items/Questions

7. How PDP delegates emerged in 1999 gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State?

   (a) Selected by the governor ( ) (c) Elected by the party members ( )

   (b) Selected by party executives ( ) (d) No response ( )

   (e) Consensus ( )

8. What of 2003 gubernatorial primaries?

   (a) Selected by the governor ( ) (c) Elected by the party members ( )

   (b) Selected by party executives ( ) (d) No response ( )

   (e) Consensus ( )

9. How PDP delegates emerged in 2007 gubernatorial primaies in Kaduna State?

   (a) Selected by the governor ( ) (c) Elected by the party members ( )

   (b) Selected by party executives ( ) (d) No response ( )

(e) Consensus ( )

10. What of 2011 gubernatorial primaries?

(a) Selected by the governor ( ) (c) Elected by the party members ( )

(b) Selected by party executives ( ) (d) No response ( )

(e) Consensus ( )

11. How PDP delegates emerged in 2015 gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State?

(a) Selected by the governor ( ) (c) Elected by the party members ( )

(b) Selected by party executives ( ) (d) No response ( )

(e) Consensus ( )

12. How PDP candidates were selected in 1999 gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State?

(a) Selected by the governor ( ) (c) Elected by the party members ( )

(b) Selected by party executives ( ) (d) No response ( )

(e) Consensus ( )

13. What of 2003 gubernatorial primaries?

(a) Selected by the governor ( ) (c) Elected by the party members ( )

(b) Selected by party executives ( ) (d) No response ( )

(e) Consensus ( )

14. How PDP candidates were selected in 2007 gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State?

(a) Selected by the governor ( ) (c) Elected by the party members ( )

(b) Selected by party executives ( ) (d) No response ( )

(e) Consensus ( )

15. What of 2011 gubernatorial primaries?

(a) Selected by the governor ( ) (c) Elected by the party members ( )

(b) Selected by party executives ( ) (d) No response ( )

(e) Consensus ( )

16. How PDP candidates were selected in 2015 gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State?

(a) Selected by the governor ( ) (c) Elected by the party members ( )

(b) Selected by party executives ( ) (d) No response ( )

(e) Consensus ( )

17. Was there equal participation of all PDP members in decision making affecting gubernatorial primaries in your ward or local government?

(a) YES( ) (b) NO ( )

18. Were rules governing PDP gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State commonly observed, widely understood and confidently anticipated?

(a)YES ( ) (b) NO ( )

19. Has political power been decentralized among all PDP members with regard to gubernatorial primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?

(a) YES ( ) (b) NO ( )

20. Have PDP leaders in Kaduna State recognize the legitimacy of electoral competition in respect of gubernatorial primaries as the only route to office from 1999-2015?

(a) YES ( ) (b) NO ( )

21. Has the conduct of gubernatorial primaries of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) exists independently of powerful elite within and outside the party in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?

(a)YES ( ) (b) NO ( )

22. PDP primary elections for the post of governorship hold at the convention or state congress of the party in each of the twenty three local government areas of Kaduna state.

(a) YES ( ) (b) NO ( )

23. INEC supervises the gubernatorial primary elections of PDP from 1999-2015

(a) YES ( ) (b) NO ( )

24,. Is Patron-Client Politics (godfatherism) having negative impact on the gubernatorial primaries of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) Kaduna State, from 1999-2015?

(a) YES ( ) (b) NO ( )

25.. Is Money Politics a hindrance to the gubernatorial primaries of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) Kaduna State, from 1999-2015?

26.. Is Elitism and quest for power among PDP members a motivating factor affecting PDP Gubernatorial Primaries in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?

(a) YES ( ) (b) NO ( )

27.. Is incumbency a factor that influence the gubernatorial primaries of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?

(a) YES ( ) (b) NO ( )

28.. Has exclusiveness of rank-and-file members in taking decision been a great effect on gubernatorial primaries of Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) Kaduna State, from 1999-2015?

(a) YES ( ) (b) NO ( )

29. What in your view, are interests and intrigues that worked against gubernatorial primaries of PDP in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?

a. Imposition of candidates by incumbent Governor (a) YES ( ) (b) NO ( )

b. Centralization of decision making power among powerful elite

(a) YES( ) (b) NO ( )

c. Exclusiveness of rank-and-file members in most important issues affecting the party.

(a)YES ( ) (b) NO ( )

d. Godfatherism (a) YES ( ) (b) NO ( )

e. Money Politics (a) YES ( ) (b) NO ( )

30.. Are their manifestations of irregularities as claimed by some party members in the conduct of Gubernatorial Primaries of Peoples Democratic Party in Kaduna State from 1999-2015?

(a) YES ( ) (b) NO ( )

APPENDIX 4:

TAMBAYOYI GAME DA DIMOKRADIYAR CIKIN JAM'IYA A JIHAR KADUNA, MUSAMMAN ZABEN FIDDA GWANI NA GWAMNA A JAM'IYAR PDP DAGA SHEKARAR DUBU DAYA DA DARI TARA DA CASA'IN DA TARA (1999) ZUWA SHEKARAR DUBU BIYU DA GOMA SHA BIYAR (2015)

GABATARWA:

Malam/Malama, ni dalibi ne mai karatun digiri na uku daga saashin sanin kimiyar siyasa na Jami'ar Ahmadu Bello da ke Zaria. Ina bincike akan "Dimokradiyar cikin gida a jihar Kaduna, musamman zaben fidda gwani na gwamna a jam'iyar PDP daga shekarar dubu daya da dari tara da casa'in da tara (1999) zuwa shekarar dubu biyu da goma sha biyar (2015)".

DOKA/SHAWARA:

Don Allah, ka/ki karanta wadannan tambayoyi a hankali kuma ka/ki zabi (√) daya daga cikin wadannan akwatuna da aka samar ga kowane tambaya ko jumla mai zuwa. Ka/ki saki jikinka/ki wurin fadin ra'ayoyinka/ki gameda amsoshin tambayoyin da aka tambaye ka/ki.

Kuma ka/ki sani cewa, babu wani amsa mai kyau ko mara kyau. Kai/ke dai ka/ki yi kokarin fadin gaskiya wurin zaben (√) amsoshin da suka dace da ra'ayoyinka/ki game da wannan lamari. Kuma lallai za'a yi amfani da amsoshin tambayoyin nan naka/ki ne kawai domin wannan bincike da ake yi don bunkasa fagen ilimi da kuma tunanin al'umma. Kuma za'a yi amfani da su cikin sirri.

Sashin A: Takaitaccen Tarihi

1. Mazakuta: Na miji ( ) b. Na mace ( )

2. Shekara: a. 18-28 ( ) b. 28-38 ( )

c. 38-48( ) d. 48 and above ( )

3. Mastayi: a. Mara-Aure ( ) b. Mai-Aure ( )

4. Addini: a. Musulunci ( ) b. Kiristanci ( )

5. Sana'a : Siyasa ( ) b. Noma ( )

c. Dalibta ( ) d. Aikin Gwamnati ( )

6. Takardan Makaranta: a. Shaidar kammala firamare ( )

b. Shaidar kammala sakandare ( )

c.Shaidar kammala kwalejin ilimi ( )

d. Digirin farko zuwa sama ( )

Sashin B: Tambayoyi

1. Yaya aka zabi wakilai (delegates) na jam'iyar PDP a zaben fidda gwani na gwamna shekarar dubu daya da dari tara da casa'in da tara (1999) a jihar kaduna?

   (a) Gwamna ya zaba ( ) (c) mambobin jam'iya suka zabe su ( )

   (b) Shuwagabannin jam'iya su ka zabe su ( ) (d) Babu amsa ( )

   (e) Yarjejeniya tsakanin mambobin ( )

2. Na shekaran dubu biyu da uku (2003) fa?

   (a) Gwamna ya zaba ( ) (c) mambobin jam'iya suka zabe su ( )

   (b) Shuwagabannin jam'iya su ka zabe su ( ) (d) Babu amsa ( )

   (e) Yarjejeniya tsakanin mambobin ( )

3. Yaya aka zabi wakilai (delegates) na jam'iyar PDP a zaben fidda gwani na gwamna shekarar dubu biyu da bakwai (2007) a jihar kaduna?

   (a) Gwamna ya zaba ( ) (c) mambobin jam'iya suka zabe su ( )

   (b) Shuwagabannin jam'iya su ka zabe su ( ) (d) Babu amsa ( ) (e) Yarjejeniya tsakanin mambobin ( )

4. Na shekarar dubu biyu da goma sha daya (2011) fa?

   (a) Gwamna ya zaba ( ) (c) mambobin jam'iya suka zabe su ( )

   (b) Shuwagabannin jam'iya su ka zabe su ( ) (d) Babu amsa ( )

   (e) Yarjejeniya tsakanin mambobin ( )

5. Yaya aka zabi wakilai (delegates) na jam'iyar PDP a zaben fidda gwani na gwamna shekarar dubu biyu da goma sha biyar (2015) a jihar kaduna?

   (a) Gwamna ya zaba ( ) (c) mambobin jam'iya suka zabe su ( )

   (b) Shuwagabannin jam'iya su ka zabe su ( ) (d) Babu amsa ( )

   (e) Yarjejeniya tsakanin mambobin ( )

6. Yaya aka zabi ‘'Yan-Takara (Candidates) na jam'iyar PDP a zaben fidda gwani na gwamna shekarar dubu daya da dari tara da casa'in da tara (1999) a jihar kaduna?

   (a) Gwamna ya zaba ( ) (c) mambobin jam'iya suka zabe su ( )

   (b) Shuwagabannin jam'iya su ka zabe su ( ) (d) Babu amsa ( )

   (e) Yarjejeniya tsakanin mambobin ( )

7. Na shekarar dubu biyu da uku (2003) fa?

   (a) Gwamna ya zaba ( ) (c) mambobin jam'iya suka zabe su ( )

   (b) Shuwagabannin jam'iya su ka zabe su ( ) (d) Babu amsa ( )

   (e) Yarjejeniya tsakanin mambobin ( )

8. Yaya aka zabi ‘’Yan-Takara (Candidates) na jam’iyar PDP a zaben fidda gwani na gwamna shekarar dubu biyu da bakwai (2007) a jihar kaduna?

(a) Gwamna ya zaba ( ) (c) mambobin jam’iya suka zabe su ( )

(b) Shuwagabannin jam’iya su ka zabe su ( ) (d) Babu amsa ( )

(e) Yarjejeniya tsakanin mambobin ( )

9. Na shekarar dubu biyu da goma sha daya (2011) fa?

(a) Gwamna ya zaba ( ) (c) mambobin jam’iya suka zabe su ( )

(b) Shuwagabannin jam’iya su ka zabe su ( ) (d) Babu amsa ( )

(e) Yarjejeniya tsakanin mambobin ( )

10. Yaya aka zabi ‘’Yan-Takara (Candidates) na jam’iyar PDP a zaben fidda gwani na gwamna shekarar dubu biyu da goma sha biyar (2015) a jihar kaduna?

(a) Gwamna ya zaba ( ) (c) mambobin jam’iya suka zabe su ( )

(b) Shuwagabannin jam’iya su ka zabe su ( ) (d) Babu amsa ( )

(e) Yarjejeniya tsakanin mambobin ( )

11. Shin kowane dan jam’iyar PDP na da ta cewa a duk harkokin da ya shafi jam’iyar musamman zaben fidda gwani na gwamna kamar kowa a gunduma ko karamar hukumarku daga shekarar dubu daya da casa’in da tatra zuwa shekarar dubu biyu da goma sha biyar?

(a) Ei ( ) (b) A’a ( )

12. Shin ana amfani da dokokin jam’iya wurin gudanar da dimokradiyyan cikin gida musamman zaben fidda gwani na gwamna na jam’iyar PDP a jihar Kaduna kuma dokokin nan an bayyana su filla-filla kuma an fahimce?

(a) Ei ( ) (b) A’a ( ) su?

13. Shin kowane dan jam'iyar PDP na da iko na gudanarwa ko na fada a ji a jihar Kaduna daga shekarar dubu daya da dari tara da casa'in da tara (1999) zuwa shekarar dubu biyu da goma sha biyar (2015) ? (a) Ei ( ) (b) A'a ( )

14. Shin shuwagabannin jam'iyar PDP sun yarda da ayi gasa tsakanin 'yan takara domin fidda gwani na gwamna ko neman kujera ko matsayi a gwamnati daga shekarar dubu daya da dari tara da casa'in da tara (1999) zuwa shekarar dubu biyu da goma sha biyar (2015)?

(a) Ei ( ) (b) A'a ( )

15. Shin ana gudanar da siyasar jam'iyar PDP ba tare da katsalandan ba daga wurin 'yan siyasa ko wasu masu fada a ji a jihar kaduna daga shekarar dubu daya da dari tara da casa'in da tara (1999) zuwa shekarar dubu biyu da goma sha biyar (2015)?

(a)Ei( ) (b) Aa ( )

16. Ana gudanar da taron fidda gwani na gwamna a jam'iyar PDP a kowane karamar hukuma daga cikin kananan hukumomi ashirin da uku na jihar Kaduna daga shekarar dubu daya da dari tara da casa'in da tara (1999) zuwa shekarar dubu biyu da goma sha biyar (2015).

(a) Ei ( ) (b) A'a ( )

17. Ma'aikatar kula da zabe mai zaman kan ta (INEC) ita ke lura da zaben fidda gwani na jam'iyar PDP daga shekarar dubu daya da dari tara da casa'in da tara (1999) zuwa shekarar dubu biyu da goma sha biyar (2015) (a) Ei ( ) (b) Aa ( )

18. Zaben yan takara ga gwamna mai-ci na daga cikin abinda ya lalata zaben fidda gwani na gwamna a Jihar Kaduna daga shekarar dubu daya da dari tara da casa'in da tara (1999) zuwa shekarar dubu biyu da goma sha biyar (2015) (a) Ei ( ) (b) Aa ( )

19. Bada ikon yi ko hanawa a jam'iyar PDP ga manyan 'yan siyasa kawai na daga cikin abinda ke kawo cikas ga zaben fidda gwani na gwamna a Jihar Kaduna daga shekarar dubu daya da dari tara da casa'in da tara (1999) zuwa shekarar dubu biyu da goma sha biyar (2015)

(a) Ei ( ) (b) Aa ( )

20. Mayar da sauran 'yan jam'iya saniyar ware na daga cikin abinda ke kawo cikas ga zaben fidda gwani na gwamna a Jihar Kaduna daga shekarar dubu daya da dari tara da casa'in da tara (1999) zuwa shekarar dubu biyu da goma sha biyar (2015)

(a) Ei ( ) (b) Aa ( )

21. Siyasar Ubangida a jam'iyar PDP na daga cikin abinda ke lalata zaben fidda gwani na gwamna a Jihar Kaduna daga shekarar dubu daya da dari tara da casa'in da tara (1999) zuwa shekarar dubu biyu da goma sha biyar (2015) (a) Ei ( ) (b) Aa ( )

22. Siyasar Kudi a jam'iyar PDP na daga cikin abinda ke lalata zaben fidda gwani na gwamna a Jihar Kaduna daga shekarar dubu daya da dari tara da casa'in da tara (1999) zuwa shekarar dubu biyu da goma sha biyar (2015) (a) Ei ( ) (b) Aa ( )

23. A ra'ayinka, wadanne abubuwa ne ke kawo tarnaki kuma suka zamo matsala ga jam'iyar PDP a jihar Kaduna musamman wajen zaben fidda gwani na gwamna daga shekarar dubu daya da dari tara da casa'in da tara (1999) zuwa shekarar dubu biyu da goma sha biyar (2015)?

i. Zaben 'yan takara ga gwamna mai-ci (a) Ei ( ) (b) A'a ( )
ii. Bada ikon yi ko hanawa a jam'iya ga manyan 'yan siyasa kawai. (a) Ei ( ) (b) A'a ( )
iii. Mayar da sauran 'yan jam'iya saniyar ware wurin gudanar da mafi muhimmancin al'amuran da suka shafi jam'iyar PDP (a)Ei ( ) (b) A'a ( )
iv. iv. Siyasar Ubangida (a) Ei ( ) (b) A'a ( )
v. Siyasar Kudi (a) Ei ( ) (b) A'a ( )

APPENDIX 5

LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

S/NO	NAME OF RESPONDENT	DATE OF INTERVIEW	PLACE OF INTERVIEW	POSITION
1	Anonymous	12/01/2015	PDP State Secretariat, NDA Kaduna	Kaduna State PDP Admin. Officer.
2	Anonymous	12/01/2015	PDP State Secretariat, NDA Kaduna	PDP Chairman, Zangon-Kataf LGA
3	Anonymous	12/01/2015	PDP State Secretariat, NDA Kaduna	PDP Chairman, B/Gwari LGA
4	Anonymous	19/01/2015	Lere LG PDP Office, Saminaka	Delegate, Gure/Kahugu Ward
5	Anonymous	19/01/2015	Lere LG PDP Office, Saminaka	Delegate, Dan-Alhaji Ward
6	Anonymous	20/01/2015	Lere LG PDP Office, Saminaka	Delegate, Sabo Birni Ward
7	Anonymous	21/01/2015	Nazangi, Lere	PDP Chairman, Lere LGA
8	Anonymous	21/01/2015	Ramin kura, Lere	PDP Secretary, Lere LGA
9	Anonymous	03/02/2015	Sambo Close, Kaduna	Former Executive Governor, Kaduna State.
10	Anonymous	23/06/2015	Shehu Crescent Ang. Rimi Kaduna	Former Executive Governor, Kaduna State.
11	Anonymous	18/02/2015	Degel Road, Ang. Rimi Kaduna	Former Deputy Governor, Kaduna State.
12	Anonymous	20/03/2015	Rigachikun, Kaduna	Former State PDP Chairman.
13	Anonymous	25/03/2015	Tukur-Tukur Zaria	Delegate, Ang. Fatika Ward
14	Anonymous	02/05/2015	PDP LG Office, K/Doka Zaria	Delegate, Limancin Kona Ward
15	Anonymous	03/05/2015	Wushishi Road, Ang. Rimi, Kaduna	INEC-Resident Commissioner, Kaduna State
16	Anonymous	06/05/2015	PDP LG Office, K/Doka Zaria	PDP Chairman, Zaria LGA
17	Anonymous	07/05/2015	Department of Local Government and Development Studies, ABU Zaria	PDP Secretary, Zaria LGA
18	Anonymous	9/05/2015	Ang.Magaji, Yakawada, Giwa LG.	Gubernatorial Aspirant, 2007

19	Anonymous	15/05/2015	PDP State Secretariat, NDA Kaduna	Former PDP Chairman, Kaduna State.
20	Anonymous	23/05/2015	PDP LG Office, K/Doka Zaria	Delegate, Dambo Ward
21	Anonymous	23/05/2015	Ang. Bisa, T/Tukur Zaria	Delegate, Tukur-Tukur Ward
22	Anonymous	25/05/2015	Kajuru LG. PDP Office, Maraban-Kajuru along K/Magani	Delegate, Idon Ward
23	Anonymous	25/05/2015	Kajuru LG. PDP Office, Maraban-Kajuru along K/Magani	PDP Chairman, Kajuru LGA
24	Anonymous	25/05/2015	Kajuru LG. PDP Office, Maraban-Kajuru along K/Magani	PDP Secretary, Kajuru LGA
25	Anonymous	03/06/2015	Ohikere Road Malali, Kaduna	Gubernatorial Aspirant, 2007
26	Anonymous	10/06/2015	Sani Sambo Drive, Anguwan Rimi, Kaduna	Gubernatorial Aspirant, 2015
27	Anonymous	21/06/2015	Borno Fashion Palace, Isa Kaita Road, Kaduna	Gubernatorial Aspirant, 2007
28	Anonymous	27/06/2015	Kauru LG PDP Office No. 7 Gen. Hospital Road, Kauru	PDP Chairman, Kauru LGA
29	Anonymous	27/06/2015	Kauru LG PDP Office No. 7 Gen. Hospital Road, Kauru	PDP Secretary, Kauru LGA
30	Anonymous	13/07/2015	Kauru LG PDP Office No. 7 Gen. Hospital Road, Kauru	Delegate, Makami Ward
31	Anonymous	13/07/2015	Kauru LG PDP Office No. 7 Gen. Hospital Road, Kauru	Delegate, Dawaki Ward
32	Anonymous	14/07/2015	Kauru LG PDP Office No. 7 Gen. Hospital Road, Kauru	Delegate, Geshere Ward
33	Anonymous	16/07/2015	B/Gwari LG. PDP Office, No. 4 Lagos Road B/Gwari.	Delegate, Magajin Gari III Ward
34	Anonymous	16/07/2015	B/Gwari LG. PDP Office, No. 4 Lagos	Delegate, Kakangi Ward

			Road B/Gwari.	
35	Anonymous	16/07/2015	B/Gwari LG. PDP Office, No. 4 Lagos Road B/Gwari.	Delegate, Kutemeshi Ward
36	Anonymous	17/07/2015	B/Gwari LG. PDP Office, No. 4 Lagos Road B/Gwari.	PDP Secretary, B/Gwari LGA
37	Anonymous	19/07/2015	Sultan Bello Mosque, Kaduna	Former State Party Chairman.
38	Anonymous	21/07/2015	Kajuru LG. PDP Office, Maraban-Kajuru along K/Magani	Delegate, Kallah Ward
39	Anonymous	21/07/2015	Kajuru LG. PDP Office, Maraban-Kajuru along K/Magani	Delegate, Kajuru Ward
40	Anonymous	25/07/2015	Z/Kataf LG. PDP Office, Zonkwa	Delegate, Madakiya Ward
41	Anonymous	25/07/2015	Z/Kataf LG. PDP Office, Zonkwa	PDP Secretary, Zangon-Kataf LGA
42	Anonymous	26/07/2015	Z/Kataf LG. PDP Office, Zonkwa	Delegate, Gidan Jatau Ward
43	Anonymous	26/07/2015	Z/Kataf LG. PDP Office, Zonkwa	Delegate, Zaman Dabo Ward

Source: Survey Research (2015)

APPENDIX 6

SUMMARY OF KADUNA STATE GUBERNATORIAL PRIMARY ELECTIONS RESULT FROM 1999-2015

S/NO	YEAR	NAMES OF CONTESTANTS	LGA	VOTES SCORED	REMARK
1 **2** **3.** **4.** **5.**	**1999**	Sen. Ahmed Mohammed Makarfi Sen. Musa Bello Late Alh. Nuhu Babajo	Makarfi Kaduna South Zaria	193215 20053 8943	**Winner** **-** **-** **-**
1 2 3 4 5	**2003**	Sen. Ahmed Mohammed Makarfi	Makarfi	3464	Winner (Unoppossed) - - -
1 2 3 4 5	**2007**	Late Sen. Isaiah Balat Hon. Shu'aibu Idris Mikati Arc. Mohammed Namadi Sambo Hon. Lawal Sama'ila Yakawada Hon. Suleiman Usman Hunkuyi	Zangon-Kataf Birnin-Gwari Kaduna North Giwa Kudan	2106 18 4,095 67 613	- - Winner - -
1 2 3 4 5	**2011**	Hon. Suleiman Usman Hunkuyi Late Sir. Patrick Ibrahim Yakowa	Kudan Jema'a	24 1,098	- Winner
1 2 3	**2015**	Dr. Mukhtar Ramalan Yero Sen. Haruna Ziego Aziz	Zaria Jaba	902 01	Winner -

Source: INEC State Secretariat, Kaduna (2015), PDP State Secretariat, Kaduna (2015).

APPENDIX 7

KADUNA STATE UPDATE ON DISTRIBUTION OF PERMANENT VOTERS CARDS (PVCS) AS AT 3RD MARCH 2015

S/N	NAME OF LGA	CODE	NO OF REG. VOTERS	PVCS RECEIVED	PVCS ISSUED	NO OF CURRENT PVCS BALANCE	DISTRIBUTION %
1	BIRNIN GWARI	01	110,324	123,245	122.,384	861	93.30%
2	CHIKUN	02	217,337	208,065	189,105	18,960	90.89%s
3	GIWA	03	111,462	111,142	110,742	400	99.64%
4	IGABI	04	220,242	206,738	203,935	2,803	98.64%
5	IKARA	05	110,341	106,286	102,965	3,321	96.88%
6	JABA	06	57,813	56,691	54,960	1,731	96.95%
7	JEMA'A	07	142,762	140,462	131,126	9,336	93.35%
8	KACHIA	08	128,908	126,252	121,390	4,862	96.15%
9	KADUNA NORTH	09	313,567	299,940	247,836	52,104	82.63%
10	KADUNA SOUTH	10	361,303	350,584	325,152	25,432	92.75%
11	KAGARKO	11	91,748	91,147	86,888	4,259	95.33%
12	KAJURU	12	75,630	75,074	72,666	2,408	96.79%
13	KAURA	13	77,239	76,207	71,641	4,566	94.01%
14	KAURU	14	104,508	102,973	102,889	84	99.92%
15	KABAU	15	131,788	129,621	128,167	1,454	98.88%
16	KUDAN	16	79,904	80,193	77,906	2,287	97.15%
17	LERE	17	195,039	190,345	187,912	2,433	98.72%
18	MAKARFI	18	90,630	89,359	88,609	750	99.16%
19	SABON GARI	19	175,162	171,310	141,812	29,498	82.78%
20	SANGA	20	86,211	85,910	82,290	3,620	95.79%
21	SOBA	21	131,538	132,533	130,118	2,415	98.18%
22	ZANGON KATAF	22	147,138	141,161	139,820	1,341	99.05%
23	ZARIA	23	246,628	266,368	254,206	12,162	95.43%
	TOTAL		**3,407,222**	**3,361,606**	**3,174,519**	**187,087**	**94.43%**

Source: Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC), Kaduna State (2015)

APPENDIX 8

LIST OF DELEGATES TO STATE CONGRESS FOR KADUNA STATE PDP GOVERNORSHIP PRIMARIES ON 8TH DECEMBER, 2014

S/N	NAMES	POSITION
	APPENDIX 9: ZONE I AD-HOC DELEGATES	
	APPENDIX 10 AD-HOC DELEGATES FOR LERE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA (11 WARDS)	
1	Hon. Peter Bawa	Abadawa Ward
2	Mrs. Mato Jaja	Abadawa Ward
3	Rabi'u Federe	Abadawa Ward
4	Jonathan Shekarau	Garu Ward
5	Hon. Yohanna Dariya	Garu Ward
6	Mrs. Jummai Yadi (Rahaps)	Garu Ward
7	Mr. Dauda Silas	Gure/Kahugu Ward
8	Ajuji Gambo (Mrs)	Gure/Kahugu Ward
9.	Dan Asabe Kasambi	Gure/Kahugu Ward
10.	Hon. Hamisu Doka	Lazuru Ward
11	Mrs. Murna Mai Bindigaba	Lazuru Ward
12	Saidu Umar	Lazuru Ward
13	Maikasuwa Adamu	Lere Ward
14	Alh. Hamisu Dan Alhaji	Lere Ward
15	Jummai Ahmed	Lere Ward
16	Hon. Amadu Hamza	Kayarda Ward
17	Mrs. Gambo Matthew Bulus	Kayarda Ward
18	Israh Alhassan	Kayarda Ward
19	Aminu Sani Dan Alhaji	Dan Alhaji Ward
20	Monica Ishaya	Dan Alhaji Ward
21	Alh. Ubangida	Dan Alhaji Ward
22	Musa Sale	Ramin-Kura Ward
23	Deborah Joshua	Ramin-Kura Ward
24	Murtala Musa	Ramin-Kura Ward
25	Haruna Baruta	Saminaka Ward
26	Hajiya Ladi Musa	Saminaka Ward
27	Mohamed Shawilu Ujenge	Saminaka Ward
28	Alh. Abdulsalam Sabon Birni	Sabon Birni Ward
29	Madam Hadiza Zaria (Firdausi)	Sabon Birni Ward
30	Hon. Ja'afaru Ahmed	Sabon Birni Ward
31	Alh. Ussaini Ahmed Ukissa	Yarkasuwa Ward
32	Danbross Ayuba	Yarkasuwa Ward
33	Jakadiya (Ruth Solomon)	Yarkasuwa Ward

	APPENDIX 11 AD-HOC DELEGATES OF ZARIA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA (13 WARDS)	
34	Hon. Shehu Yahaya	Anguwan Juma Ward
35	Ibrahim Abdullahi Gwarana	Anguwan Juma Ward
36	Hajiya Jummai D. Abdullahi	Anguwan Juma Ward
37	Alhaji Umar 7up	Anguwan Fatika Ward
38	Sheik Ahmed Sanusi	Anguwan Fatika Ward
39	Habiba Samaila	Anguwan Fatika Ward
40	Bashir Ladan	Kaura Ward
41	Abdullahi Tafida	Kaura Ward
42	Hajia Goshi Isyaku	Kaura Ward
43	Alhaji Baban Yara	Kwarbai 'A' Ward.
44	Hon. Bashir Abdulkadir	Kwarbai 'A' Ward
45	Hajia Maryam Dogara	Kwarbai 'A' Ward
46	Alhaji Umar Aliyu Ghama	Kwarbai 'B' Ward
47	Hon. Maiwada Nuhu	Kwarbai 'B' Ward
48	Hajia Nana Ibrahim	Kwarbai 'B' Ward
49	Alhaji Kabir Sani Mai-mai	Limamcin Kona Ward
50	Alhaji Maiwada Wanzam	Limancin Kona Ward
51	Hajia Bilkisu Zailani	Limancin Kona Ward
52	Amadu Haruna	Dutsen Abba Ward
53	Alhaji Ado Shuaibu	Dutsen Abba Ward
54	Hajia Halima A. Shittu	Dutsen Abba Ward
55	Alhaji Ahmadu K/Juli	Kufena Ward
56	Alhaji Bala Haruna Gabari	Kufena Ward
57	Fatima Ibrahim	Kufena Ward
58	Alhaji Ja'afaru Dakache	Dambo Ward
59	Alhaji Aliyu Marafa	Dambo Ward
60	Hajia Gushi Isah	Dambo Ward
61	Hon. Abdullahi A. Matata	Gyellesu Ward
62	Alhaji Babangida Inuwa	Gyellesu Ward
63	Fatima Sani	Gyellesu Ward
64	Hon. Sadiq Gwadabe	Tudun Wada Ward
65	Alhaji Yusuf Kwaros	Tudun Wada Ward
66	Maryam Salisu	Tudun Wada Ward
67	Alhaji Badamisu Baba Ahmed	Tukur-Tukur Ward
68	Hon. Yusufu Namadi	Tukur-Tukur Ward
69	Hajia Falmata Abubakar	Tukur-Tukur Ward
70	Hon. Bako Haruna Wadata	Wucciciri Ward
71	Alhaji Garba Kawuri Rubuchi	Wucciciri Ward
72	Hajia Halima Yahaya Aba	Wucciciri Ward

	APPENDIX 12 **ZONE II AD-HOC DELEGATES**	
	APPENDIX 13 **AD-HOC DELEGATES OF BIRNIN GWARI LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA (11 WARDS)**	
73	Ahmed Abdu Sawane	Magajin Gari I Ward
74	Hajiya Awa Hamza	Magajin Gari I Ward
75	L. K. Tasiu Saidu	Magajin Gari I Ward
76	Mai Unguwa Halidu	Magajin Gari II Ward
77	Ankudi Chida	Magajin Gari II Ward
78	Alhaji Abdullahi Shawai	Magajin Gari II Ward
79	Mallam Sale Gurgu	Magajin Gari III Ward
80	Shuaibu Ibrahim Gwaska	Magajin Gari III Ward
81	Rabi Iliya	Magajin Gari III Ward
82	Abdulrahman Dangude	Gayan Ward
83	Shawai Tanimu Mai Unguwa	Gayan Ward
84	Sani Maishayi Labi	Gayan Ward
85	Shuaibu Hashimu	Randagi Kungi Ward
86	Garba Mai Uzuri Kimbi	Randagi Kungi Ward
87	Rashida Kungi	Randagi Kungi Ward
88	Gambo Adamu S/Layi	Kakangi Ward
89	Mallam Sirajo	Kakangi Ward
90	Hassan Aliyu Tashan Keji	Kakangi Ward
91	Zubairu Mai Bulawus	Dogon Dawa Ward
92	Gambo Shuaibu	Dogon Dawa Ward
93	Fatima Abubakar	Dogon Dawa Ward
94	Kabiru Yusuf Kazage	Kazage Ward
95	Bala Sadi Adamu	Kazage Ward
96	Luba Sahabi	Kazage Ward
97	Musa Ashura	Kutemeshi Ward
98	Inno Nuhu	Kutemeshi Ward
99	Muhammadu Iliyasu	Kutemeshi Ward
100	Abdulhamid Chiroma	Kuyello Ward
101	Aliyu Abdulhamid	Kuyello Ward
102	Amina Isah Jankuro	Kuyello Ward
103	Alfa Ibrahim	Tabanni Ward
104	Idris Aisha	Tabanni Ward
105	Halliru Sani	Tabanni Ward

	APPENDIX 14 **AD-HOC DELEGATES OF KAJURU LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA (10 WARDS)**	
106	Mr. James Simon Maro	Maro Ward
107	Mr. Yakubu Maigida	Maro Ward
108	Mrs. Barnabas Na Iri	Maro Ward
109	Hon. Patrick S. Maigari	Idon Ward
110	Hon. Iliya Bala	Idon Ward
111	Mrs. Tessy Inuwa	Idon Ward
112	Mr. Simon Shawuya	Afogo Ward
113	Mrs. Mary Elisha	Afogo Ward
114	Mr. Samson Babangida	Afogo Ward
115	Hon. Heros N. D. Maichibi	Kufana Ward
116	Mrs. Mary David Hussaini	Kufana Ward
117	Chief Stephen B. Manya	Kufana Ward
118	Mr. Do go Makeri	Kallah Ward
119	Mrs. Grace Ibrahim Lale	Kallah Ward
120	Mr. Ibrahim Libere	Kallah Ward
121	Eli B. Galadima	Rimau Ward
122	Mr. Zacharia Goma	Rimau Ward
123	Mrs. Victoria Amos	Rimau Ward
124	Garba Shuaibu	Kasuwan Magani Ward
125	Wasa Magaji	Kasuwan Magani Ward
126	Mrs. Jonah Bahago	Kasuwan Magani Ward
127	Hajiya Maimuna Fulani	Kajuru Ward
128	Alhaji Mohammed Jumare	Kajuru Ward
129	Alhaji Junaidu Idris Kajuru	Kajuru Ward
130	A-lh. Yalo Idris Buda	Buda Ward
131	Hon. Iliya Ibrahim	Buda Ward
132	Mrs. Mary Yakubu	Buda Ward
133	Hon. Isiyaku Garba	Tantatu Ward
134	Hon. Benjamin Ajiko	Tantatu Ward
135	Esther Danladi	Tantatu Ward
	APPENDIX 15 **ZONE III AD-HOC DELEGATES**	
	APPENDIX 16 **AD-HOC DELEGATES OF ZANGON-KATAF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA (11 WARDS}**	
136	Hon. Elias Dabo	Kamantan Ward
137	Mrs. Theresa Wushi	Kamantan Ward
138	Samaila Allahmagani	Kamantan Ward
139	Hon. Mrs. Grace Nju	Madakiya Ward
140	Mr. John Ambut	Madakiya Ward
141	Hon. Marshall	Madakiya Ward

142	Mr. Simon A. Achi	Unguwan Rimi Ward
143	Hon. Jonathan Asake	Unguwan Rimi Ward
144	Mrs. Na'omi Galadima	Unguwan Rimi Ward
145	Mr. Simon Iliya	Zonkwa Ward
146	Lydia Timothy	Zonkwa Ward
147	Mr. Gaiya Kazah	Zonkwa Ward
148	Luti Kure	Gidan Jatau Ward
149	Gideon Nuhu	Gidan Jatau Ward
150	Mrs. Esther Jacob	Gidan Jatau Ward
151	Ayuba Kwasu	Gora Ward
152	Mr. Akila Bungon	Gora Ward
153	Mary Bako	Gora Ward
154	Hon. Dominic Gambo	Zonzon Ward
155	Engr. Andy Yakubu	Zonzon Ward
156	Catherine Duniya	Zonzon Ward
157	Mrs. Angelina John	Zaman Dabo Ward
158	Hon. Marcus Zamani	Zaman Dabo Ward
159	Hon. Stephen Bawa	Zaman Dabo Ward
160	Hon. Mrs. Lawrencia L. Mallam	Unguwan Gaya Ward
161	Dr. John Ayuba	Unguwan Gaya Ward
162	Hon. Perry Kude	Unguwan Gaya Ward
163	Mr. Michael Andrew	Ikulu Ward
164	Hon. Barnabas Yerima	Ikulu Ward
165	Mrs. Asabaru Yaro	Ikulu Ward
166	Hassan Mohammed	Zango Urban Ward
167	Maimuna Kasim	Zango Urban Ward
168	Alhaji Garba Saleh	Zango Urban Ward
	APPENDIX 17 **AD-HOC DELEGATES OF KAURU LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA (11 WARDS)**	
169	Hon. Audu Musa	Makami Ward
170	Sa’adu Ibrahim	Makami Ward
171	Matan Sarkin Pawan Barwa	Makami Ward
172	Alhaji Magaji Kahuta	Kauru East Ward
173	Alhaji Ya'u Kachirga	Kauru East Ward
174	Asabe Dari Ganuwa	Kauru East Ward
175	Ibrahim Katuka	Kauru Westward
176	Alhaji Maiwada Musa	Kauru West Ward
177	Mrs. Keziah Kayikara	Kauru West Ward
178	Alhaji Mu'azu Yusuf Kadage	Dawaki Ward
179	Alhaji Audu Dawaki	Dawaki Ward
180	Hajia Sahanatu Dari Wugama	Dawaki Ward
181	Mallam Danbaba Chiroma	Kwassam Ward
182	Mr. Joshua Umaru	Kwassam Ward

183	Monica Gumbari	Kwassam Ward
184	Nura Tukura	Bital Ward
185	Ezekiel Magaji	Bital Ward
186	Mrs. Asabe Micah	Bital Ward
187	Hon. Zakariah Shamaki	Geshere Ward
188	Danladi Yakubu	Geshere Ward
189	Mrs. Maryam Waziri	Geshere Ward
190	Alhaji Ahmed Umar Chawai	Damakasuwa Ward
191	Mr. Machu Gwall	Damakasuwa Ward
192	Patience Patrick	Damakasuwa Ward
193	Audu Haruna	Badurum Ward
194	Mrs. Bilhatu John	Badurum Ward
195	Zakka Bawa	Badurum Ward
196	Audu Yani	Pari Ward
197	Hon. Julius Dogo	Pari Ward
198	Mrs. Asabe Nimrod	Pari Ward
199	Sunday Jacob	Kamaru Ward
200	Solomon Garba	Kamaru Ward
201	Mrs. Rose Abbas	Kamaru Ward

APPENDIX 18

INTERVIEW NOTIFICATION LETTER FOR RESPONDENTS

Department of Political Science and International Studies,
Faculty of Social Sciences,
Ahmadu Bello University,
Zaria.
02-01-2015.

The Chairman,
Peoples Democratic Party (PDP),
Kaduna State Chapter,
Kaduna.

Dear Sir,

REQUEST LETTER

I write to inform you that, you are one of my respondents in my Ph.D survey research currently carrying out under the supervision of the above department.

I'm therefore requesting to have a personal interview with you on the topic; " Intra-Party Politics and Primary Elections in Peoples Democratic Party (PDP); A Study of the Emergence of Gubernatorial Candidates in Kaduna State; (1999-2015) which forms part of the requirements for the award of Ph.D. in Political Science.

Sir, I do hope my application will be given due consideration.

Yours faithfully

……..
Muhammad Aminu Kwasau

APPENDIX 19

The Electoral Act on Political Parties Rules and Regulations

The Electoral Act 2010 as amended provides the ethos for the enthronement candidates in Nigeria. The Act is a product of the National Assembly and empowers Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) to regulate and conduct Federal State and Area Council elections; and for related matters. Part iv of this Act comprising sections 78-102 examines vividly the rules and regulations governing political parties in Nigaeria as follows;

Section 78: Powers of the INEC to Register Political Parties

(1) Any political association that complies with the provisions of the Constitution and this Act for the purposes of registration shall be registered as a political party. Provided however, that such application for registration as a political party shall be duly submitted to the Commission not later than 6 months before a general election (Electoral Act, 2010).

(2) The Commission shall on receipt of the documents in fulfillment of the conditions stipulated by the Constitution immediately issue the applicant with a letter of acknowledgement stating that all the necessary documents had been submitted to the Commission.

(3) If the Association has not fulfilled all the conditions under this section, the Commission shall within 30 days from the receipt of its application notify the Association in writing stating the reasons for non-registration.

(4) Any political association that meets the conditions stipulated in the Constitution and this Act shall be registered by the Commission as a political party within 30 days from the date of receipt of the application and if after the 30 days such Association is not registered by the Commission unless the Commission informs the Association **to the contrary** it shall be deemed to have been registered.

(5) Any Association which through the submission of false or misleading information pursuant to the provisions of this section procures a certificate of registration shall have such certificate cancelled.

(6) No application for registration as a political party shall be processed unless there is evidence of payment of administrative fee as may be fixed from time to time by the Commission.

(7) The Commission shall have power to de-register political parties on the following grounds:

(i) breach of any of the requirements for registration;

(ii) for failure to win a seat in the National or State Assembly election (Electoral Act, 2010).

Section 79: Decision of the Commission subject to judicial review

The decision of the Commission not to register any association as a political party may be challenged in a court of law, provided that any legal action challenging the decision of the Commission shall be commenced within 30 days from the date of receipt of the letter of notification of non registration from the Commission.

Section 80: Political Parties to be bodies corpeorate

Every Political Party registered under this Act shall be a body corporate with perpetual succession and a common seal and may sue and be sued in its corporate name.

Section 81: Contravention of Section 227 of the 1999 Constitution

(1) Any political party or association, which contravenes the provisions of section 227 of the Constitution is guilty of an offence and liable on conviction to a fine of-

(a) N 500,000.00 for the first offence;

(b) N 700,000.00 for any subsequent offence; and

(c) N 50,000 for every day that the offence continues.

(2) Any person or group of persons who aids or abets a political party in contravening the provisions of section 227 of the Constitution shall be guilty of an offence and be liable on conviction to a fine of N500,000 or 3 years imprisonment or both (Electoral Act, 2010).

Section 82: Symbols of Political Parties

(1) The Commission shall keep a register of symbols for use at elections.

(2) The Commission shall register the symbol of a political party if it is satisfied that,

(a) No other symbol of the same design is registered;

(b) The symbol is distinctive from any other symbol already registered; and

(c) Its use will not be offensive or otherwise objectionable.

(3) The Commission shall remove a symbol from the register of symbols if—

(a) The political party in whose name it is registered requests the removal; or

(b) The Commission is of the opinion that the political party or independent candidate in whose name the symbol is registered has ceased to exist or to use the symbol.

(4) Nothing in this section shall authorize the allotment or registration for use at any election of a symbol or material as symbol of a party, if it portrays:

(a) the Coat of Arms of the Federation;

(b) the Coat of Arms of any other country;

(c) any device or emblem which in the opinion of the Commission is normally associated with;

(i) The official acts of Government;

(ii) any of the Armed Forces of the Federation or the Nigeria Police Force or other uniformed service;

(iii) the regalia of a Chief;

(iv) any tribe or ethnic group;

(v) any religion or cult;

(vi) any portrait of a person living or dead;

(d) any symbol or part of a symbol which under the provision of this section continues to be registered by another political party.

(5) Subject to the provisions of this section, the symbol allotted to a political party and in use immediately before the coming into force of this Act shall continue to be available to, and be used by, that political party without payment of the fee (Electoral Act, 2010) .

Section 83: Allocation of Symbols

Where a symbol is registered by a political party in accordance with this Act, the Commission shall allot the symbol to any candidate sponsored by the political party at any election.

Section 84: Merger of Political Parties

(1) Any two or more registered political parties may merge on approval by the Commission following a formal request presented to the Commission by the political parties for that purpose.

(2) Political Parties intending to merge shall each give to the Commission **90 days** notice of their intention to do so before a general election.

Retained as in Bill

(3) The written request for merger shall be sent to the Chairman of the Commission and shall be signed jointly by the National Chairman, Secretary and Treasurer for the time being of the different Political Parties proposing the merger and shall be accompanied by:-

(a) a special resolution passed by the National Convention of each of the political parties proposing to merge, approving the merger;

(b) the proposed full name and acronym, Constitution, manifesto, symbol or logo of the party together with the addresses of the National office of the party resulting from the merger; and

(c) evidence of payment of administrative costs of N100,000 or as may be fixed from time to time by an Act of the National Assembly.

(4) On receipt of the request for merger of political parties the Commission shall consider the request; and if the parties have fulfilled the requirements of the Constitution and this Act, approve the proposed merger and communicate its decision to the Parties concerned before the expiration of thirty (30) days from the date of the receipt of the formal request. Provided that if the Commission fails to communicate its decision within 30 days the merger shall be deemed to be effective.

(5) Where the request for the proposed merger is approved, the Commission shall forthwith withdraw and cancel the certificates of registration of all the Political Parties opting for the merger and substitute therefore, a single certificate of registration in the name of the party resulting from the merger.

(6) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (2) of this section no merger of Political Parties received by the Commission less than **90 days** before any general election in the country shall be considered by the Commission.

Section 85: Conditions for the Merger of Political Parties

(1) Every registered political party shall give the Commission at least 21 days notice of any convention, congress, conference or meeting convened for the purpose of electing members of its executive committees, other governing bodies or nominating candidates for any of the elective offices specified under this Act.

(2) The Commission may with or without prior notice to the political party monitor and attend any convention, congress, conference or meeting which is convened by a political party for the purpose of:-

(a) electing members of its executive committees or other governing bodies;
(b) nominating candidates for an election at any level;
(c) approving a merger with any other registered political party.

(3) The election of members of the executive committee or other governing body of a political party, including the election to fill a vacant position in any of the aforesaid bodies, shall be conducted in a democratic manner and allowing for all members of the party or duly elected delegates to vote in support of a candidate of their choice.

(4) Notice of any congress, conference or meeting for the purpose of nominating candidates for Area Council elections shall be given to the Commission at least 21 days before such congress, conference or meeting.

Section 86: Monitoring of Political Parties

(1) The Commission shall monitor and keep records of the activities of all the registered political parties.

(2) The Commission may seek information or clarification from any registered political party in connection with any activities of the political party which may be contrary to the provisions of the Constitution or any other law, guidelines, rules or regulations made pursuant to an Act of the National Assembly.

(3) The Commission may direct its enquiry under subsection (2) of this section to the Chairman or Secretary of the Political Party at the National, State, Local Government or Area Council or Ward level, as the case may be.

(4) A Political Party which fails to provide the required information or clarification under subsection (2) of this section or carry out any lawful directive given by the Commission in conformity with the provisions of this section is guilty of an offence and liable on conviction to a fine of not less than N500,000:00.

Section 87: Nomination of Candidates by Parties

(1) A political party seeking to nominate candidates for elections under this Act shall hold primaries for aspirants to all elective positions.

(2) The procedure for the nomination of candidates by political parties for the various elective positions shall be by direct or indirect primaries.

(3) A political party that adopts the direct primaries procedure shall ensure that all aspirants are given equal opportunity of being voted for by members of the party.

(4) A political party that adopts the system of indirect primaries for the choice of its candidate shall adopt the procedure outlined below:

(a) In the case of nominations to the position of Presidential candidate, a political party shall,
  (i) Hold special conventions in each of the 36 States of the Federation and FCT, where delegates shall vote for each of the aspirants at designated centres in each State Capital on specified dates.
  (ii) A National Convention shall be held for the ratification of the candidate with the highest number of votes.
  (iii) the aspirant with the highest number of votes at the end of voting in the 36 States of the Federation and FCT, shall be declared the winner of the Presidential primaries of the political party and the aspirants name shall be forwarded to the Independent National Electoral Commission as the candidate of the party after ratification by the national convention (Electoral Act, 2010).

(b) In the case of nominations to the position of Governorship candidate, a political party shall:
  (i) Hold special congress in each of the local government areas of the States with delegates voting for each of the aspirants at the congress to be held in designated centres on specified dates.
  (ii) The aspirant with the highest number of votes at the end of voting shall be declared the winner of the primaries of the party and aspirant's name shall be forwarded to the Independent National Electoral Commission.

(c) In the case of nominations to the position of Senatorial candidate, House of Representatives and State House of Assembly a political party shall, where they intend to sponsor candidates:
  (i) Hold special congresses in the Senatorial District, Federal Constituency and the State assembly constituency respectively, with delegates voting for each of the aspirants in designated centres on specified dates.
  (ii) The aspirant with the highest number of votes at the end of voting shall be declared the winner of the primaries of the party and the aspirant's name shall be forwarded to the Independent National Electoral Commission as the candidate of the party.

(d) In the case of the position of a Chairmanship candidate of an Area council a political party shall, where they intend to sponsor candidates:

(i) Hold special congresses in the Area Councils, with delegates voting for each of the aspirants at designated centres on a specified date.

(ii) The aspirant with the highest number of votes at the end of voting shall be declared the winner of the primaries of the party and the aspirant's name shall be forwarded to the Independent National Electoral Commission as the candidate of the party.

(5) In the case of a councillorship candidate, the procedure for the nomination of the candidate shall be by direct primaries in the ward and the name of the candidate with the highest number of votes shall be submitted to the Independent National electoral commission as the candidate of the party.

(6) Where there is only one aspirant in a political party for any of the elective positions mentioned in sub section (4)(a), (b), (c) and (d), the party shall convene a special convention or congress at a designated centre on a specified date for the confirmation of such aspirant and the name of the aspirant shall be forwarded to the Independent National Electoral commission as the candidate of the party.

(7) A political party that adopts the system of indirect primaries for the choice of its candidate shall clearly outline in its constitution and rules the procedure for the democratic election of delegates to vote at the convention, congress or meeting.

(8) No political appointee at any level shall be a voting delegate at the Convention or Congress of any political party for the purpose of nomination of candidates for any election.

(9) Where a political party fails to comply with the provisions of this Act in the conduct of its primaries, its candidate for election shall not be included in the election for the particular position in issue.

(10) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Act or rules of a political party, an aspirant who complains that any of the provisions of this Act and the guidelines of a political party has not been complied with in the selection or nomination of a candidate of a political party for election, may apply to the Federal High Court or the High Court of a State, for redress.

(11) Nothing in this section shall empower the Courts to stop the holding of primaries or general election under this Act pending the determination of the suit.

Section 88: Offences in relation to finances of a political party

(1) Any Political Party that-

(a) holds or possesses any fund outside Nigeria in contravention of section 91(3)(a) of this Act commits an offence and shall forfeit the funds or assets purchased with such funds to the Commission and on conviction shall be liable to a fine of not less than N500,000.00;

(b) retains any fund or other asset remitted to it from outside Nigeria in contravention of section 91(3)(b) of this Act is guilty of an offence and shall forfeit the funds or assets to the Commission and on conviction shall be liable to a fine of not less than N 500,000.00 (Electoral Act, 2010) .

Section 89: Period to be covered by Annual Statement

(1) Every political party shall submit to the Commission a detailed annual statement of Assets and Liabilities and analysis of its sources of funds and other assets, together with statement of its expenditure in such a form as the Commission may from time to time require.

(2) The Statement of Assets and Liabilities referred to in subsection (1) of this section shall be in respect of the period 1st January to 31st December in each year, and that in the year which this Act comes into operation, it shall be for the period beginning with the registration of such party and ending on the following 31st December.

(3) Every political party shall grant to any officer authorized in writing by the Commission, access to examine the records and audited accounts kept by the political party in accordance with the provisions of this Act and the political party shall give to the officer all such information as may be requested in relation to all contributions received by or on behalf of the party.

(4) The Commission shall publish the report on such examinations and audit in three National Newspapers.

Section 90: Power to Limit Contribution to a Political Party

(1). The Commission shall have power to place limitation on the amount of money or other assets, which an individual or group of persons can contribute to a political party.

Section 91: Election Expenses of political parties

(1) Election expenses shall not exceed the sum stipulated in subsection (2) - (7) of this section.

(2) The maximum election expenses to be incurred by a candidate at a Presidential election shall be one billion naira (₦1,000,000,000).

(3) The maximum election expenses to be incurred by a candidate at a Governorship election shall be two hundred million naira (₦200,000,000).

(4) The maximum amount of election expenses to be incurred in respect of Senatorial seat by a candidate at an election to the National Assembly shall be forty million naira (N40,000,000) while the seat for House of Representatives shall be twenty million naira (N20,000,000)

(5) In the case of State Assembly election, the maximum amount of election expenses to be incurred shall be ten million naira (N10, 000,000).

(6) In the case of a chairmanship election to an Area Council, the maximum amount of election expresses to be incurred shall be ten million naira (N10,000,000).

(7) In the case of councillorship election to an Area Council, the maximum amount of election expenses to be incurred shall be one million naira (N1,000, 000).

(8) In determining the total expenditure incurred in relation to the candidature of any person at any election no account shall be taken of:-

(a) any deposit made by the candidate on his/her nomination in compliance with the law ;

(b) any expenditure incurred before the notification of the date fixed for the election with respect to services rendered or material supplied before such notification.

(c) Political party expenses in respect of the candidate standing for a particular election.

(9) No individual or other entity shall donate more than one million naira (N1,000,000) to any candidate.

(10) A candidate who knowingly acts in contravention of this section commits an offence and on conviction shall be liable -

(a) in case of presidential election to a maximum fine of N1,000,000.00 or imprisonment of 12 months or both;

(b) in the case of a governorship election to a fine of N800,000.00 or imprisonment for 9 months or both;

(c) in case of senatorial seat **election** in the National Assembly election to a fine of N600,000.00 or imprisonment for 6 months or both;

(d) In the case of House of Representatives seat **election** in the National Assembly election to a fine of N500,000.00 or imprisonment for 5 months or both;

(e) In the case of a State House of Assembly election to a fine of N300,000.00 or 3 months imprisonment or both;

(f) In the case of Chairmanship election to a fine of N300,000.00 or 3 months imprisonment or both; and

(g) In the case of Councillorship election to a fine of N100,000.00 or 1 month imprisonment or both.

(11) Any individual who knowingly acts in contravention of subsection (9) shall on conviction be liable to a maximum fine of N500,000.00 or 9 months imprisonment or both.

(12) Any Accountant who falsifies or conspires or aids a candidate to forge or falsify a document relating to his expenditure at an election or receipt or donation for the election or in any way aids and abets the breach of the provision of this section of this Act commits an offence and on conviction is liable to 10 years imprisonment (Electoral Act, 2010).

(13) For the purposes of an election, "election expenses" means expenses incurred by a political party within the period from the date notice is given by the Commission to conduct an election up to and including, the polling day in respect of the particular election.

(14) Election expenses incurred by a political party for the management or the conduct of an election shall be determined by the Commission in consultation with the political parties.

(15) (a) Election expenses of a political party shall be submitted to the Commission in a separate audited return within six months after an election and such return shall be signed by the political party's auditors and countersigned by the Chairman of the party and be supported by a sworn affidavit b**y** the signatories as to the correctness of its contents.

(b) Any political party which commits a breach of this section is guilty of an offence and shall be liable on conviction to a maximum fine of N1,000,000 and in the case of failure to submit an accurate audited return within the stipulated period, the court may impose a maximum penalty of N200,000 per day on any party for the period after the return was due until it is submitted to the Commission.

(16) The return referred to in subsection (3) of this section shall show the amount of money expended by or on behalf of the party on election expenses, the items of expenditure and commercial value of goods and services received for election purposes.

(17) The political party shall cause the return submitted to the Commission pursuant to subsection (4) of this section to be published in at least two National Newspapers.

(18) Any political party that incurs election expenses beyond the limit stipulated in this Act is guilty of an offence and shall be liable on conviction to a maximum fine of N1,000,000.00. and forfeiture to the Commission, of the amount by which the expenses exceed the limit set by the Commission.

(19) The Commission shall make available for public inspection during regular business hours at its Headquarters and state offices the audit returns of the political parties required by subsection (3) of this section which shall include the names, addresses, occupation, and amount contributed by each contributor to a party.

Section 93: Disclosure by political parties

(1) No political party shall accept or keep in its possession any anonymous monetary or other contributions, gifts, properties, etc from any source whatsoever.

(2) Every political party shall keep an account and asset book into which shall be recorded:-

(a) all monetary and other forms of contribution received by the party; and

(b) the name and address of any person or entity that contributes any money or assets which exceeds N1,000,000.00

(3) No political party shall accept any monetary or other contribution exceeding N100,000 unless it can identify the source of the money or other contribution to the Commission.

(4) Every political party sponsoring the election of a candidate shall, within three months after the announcement of the results of the election, file a report of the contributions made by individuals and entities to the Commission.

Section 94: Conduct at political rallies, and processions, etc.

(1) For the purpose of the proper and peaceful conduct of political rallies and processions, the Commissioner of Police in each state of the Federation and the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja, shall provide adequate security for processions at political rallies in the states and the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja.

(2) A person who, while present at a political rally or procession or voting centre, has with him any offensive weapon or missile otherwise than in pursuance of a lawful duty is guilty of an offence and liable on conviction to a maximum fine of N2,000,000 or imprisonment for a term of 2 years or both.

(3) For the purpose of subsection (2) of this Section, a person shall be deemed to be acting in pursuance of a lawful duty if he is acting in his capacity as a police officer or as a member of a security agency authorized to carry arms and is specifically posted to be present at that political rally or procession (Electoral Act, 2010) .

Section 95: Prohibition of certain conduct etc. at Political Campaigns

(1) No political campaign or slogan shall be tainted with abusive language directly or indirectly likely to injure religious, ethnic, tribal or sectional feelings.

(2) Abusive, intemperate, slanderous or base language or insinuations or innuendoes designed or likely to provoke violent reaction or emotions shall not be employed or used in political campaigns.

(3) Places designated for religious worship, police station, and public offices shall not be used-

(a) for political campaigns, rallies and processions; or

(b) to promote, propagate or attack political parties, candidates or their programmes or ideologies.

(4) Masquerades shall not be employed or used by any political party, candidate or person during political campaigns or for any other political purpose.

(5) No political party or member of a political party shall retain, organize, train or equip any person or group of persons for the purpose of enabling them to be employed for the use or display of physical force or coercion in promoting any political objective or interests, or in such manner as to arouse reasonable apprehension that they are organized, trained or equipped for that purpose.

(6) No political party, person or candidate shall keep or use private security organization, vanguard or any other group or individual by whatever name called for the purpose of providing security, assisting or aiding the political party or candidate in whatever manner during campaigns, rallies, processions or elections.

(7) A political party or person**s** who contravenes any of the provision of this section is guilty of an offence and shall be liable on conviction-

(a) in the case of an individual, to a maximum fine of N1,000,000 or imprisonment for the term of 12 months; and

(b) in the case of a political party, to a fine of N2,000,000 in the first instance, and N1,000,000 for any subsequent offence.

(8) Any person or group of persons who aids or abets a political party in contravening the provisions of subsection (5) of this section guilty of an offence and is liable on conviction to a fine of N500,000 or 3 years imprisonment or both.

Section 96: Prohibition of use of force or violence during political campaign

(1) No candidate, person or group of persons shall directly or indirectly threaten any person with the use of force or violence during any political campaign in order to compel that person or any other person to support or refrain from supporting a political party or candidate.

(2) Any person or political party that contravenes the provisions of this section is guilty of an offence and liable on conviction-

(a) in the case of an individual, to a maximum fine of N1,000,000 or imprisonment for a term of 12 months; and

(b) in the case of a political party, to a fine of N2,000,000 in the first instance, and N500,000 for any subsequent offence.

Section 97: Effects on elected officer where political party ceases to exist

Where a political party ceases to exist in accordance with the Constitution and this Act, a person elected on the platform of the Political Party in an election under this Act shall remain validly elected, complete his tenure, and, for purposes of identification, be regarded as a member of the political party under which he was elected.

Section 98: Existing political parties

Any political party registered by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of any law in force immediately before the coming into force of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria and this Act shall be deemed to have been duly registered under this Act

Section 99: Limitation on political broadcast and campaign by political parties (1) For the purpose of this Act, the period of campaigning in public by every political party shall commence 90 days before polling day and end 24 hours prior to that day.

(2) A registered Political Party which through any person acting on its behalf during the 24 hours before polling day-

(a) Advertises on the facilities of any broadcasting undertaking; or

(b) Procures for publication or acquiesces in the publication of an advertisement in a Newspaper, for the purpose of promoting or opposing a particular candidate, is guilty of an offence under this Act and upon conviction shall be liable to a maximum fine of N500,000.

Section 100: Campaign for election

(1) A candidate and his party shall campaign for the elections in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be determined by the Commission.

(2) State apparatus including the media shall not be employed to the advantage or disadvantage of any political party or candidate at any election.

(3) Media time shall be allocated equally among the political parties **or candidates** at similar hours of the day.

(4) At any public electronic media, equal airtime shall be allotted to all political parties **or candidates** during prime times at similar hours each day, subject to the payment of appropriate fees.

(5) At any public print media, equal coverage and conspicuity shall be allotted to all political parties.

(6) Any public media that contravenes subsections 3 and 4 of this section shall be guilty of offence and on conviction be liable to a maximum fine of N500,000 in the first instance and to a maximum fine of N1,000,000 for subsequent conviction.

Section 101: Prohibition of Broadcast, etc. 24 hours preceding or on polling day

(1) A person, print or electronic medium that broadcasts, publishes, advertises or circulates any material for the purpose of promoting or opposing a particular political party or the election of a particular candidate over the radio, television, newspaper, magazine, handbills, or any print or electronic media whatsoever called during twenty four hours immediately preceding or on polling day is guilty of an offence under this Act.

(2) Where an offence under subsection (1) of this section is committed by a body corporate, every principal officer of that body is equally guilty of an offence under this Act.

(3) Where any person is convicted of an offence under this section he shall be liable:

(a) in the case of a body corporate to a maximum fine of N1,000,000 and

(b) in the case of an individual to a maximum fine of N500,000 or to imprisonment for 12 months.

Section 102: Campaign based on religion, tribe etc.

Any candidate, person or association who engages in campaigning or broadcasting based on religious, tribal, or sectional reason for the purpose of promoting or opposing a particular political party or the election of a particular candidate, is guilty of an offence under this Act and on conviction shall be liable to a maximum fine of N1,000,000 or imprisonment for twelve months or to both.

APPENDIX 20
PDP CONSTITUTION

Article 1: Name of the party;
The name of the Party shall be PEOPLES DEMOCRATIC PARTY ("hereinafter called the party") and its acronym shall be (PDP).

Article 2: Supremacy of the party constitution;
Subject to the provision of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, this institution shall be supreme and if any other Law, Rules or Regulations of the Party is Consistent with the provision of this constitution, the constitution shall prevail and that other Law, Rule or Regulation shall, to the extent of its inconsistency, be null and void and of no effect.

Article 3: Motto and Slogan;
The motto of the Party shall be "JUSTICE, UNITY AND PROGRESS". The slogan of the party shall be "PDP - POWER TO THE PEOPLE", demonstrated by a raised clenched right list,

Article 4: Flag and Emblem;
The flag of the Party shall be in the colours of GREEN, WHITE and RED in equal horizontal stripes. The EMBLEM of the party shall be an UMBRELLA in the Party's colours.

Article 5: Registered Office;
The registered office of the Party shall be in the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja.

Article 6: The Character and Ethics of the Party:

a The Character of the Party;

i. The Party shall be a non-tribal, non-religious and non-sexist democratic organisation
ii. The Party policies and programs shall be determined by its membership to which its leadership shall be accountable.
iii. The Party shall contest all elections drawing its support from all sections of the society.
iv. The Party shall, while striving for maximum unity of purpose, respect the linguistics, cultural and religious and diversity of its members.
v. The Party shall support the emancipation of women by encouraging their representation-at all levels and combat sexism.
vi. The Party shall observe the principle of freedom of speech and free circulation of ideas and information (PDP Constitution, 2006).

b. Ethics:

The Party Ethic shall consist of the following set of moral codes: Truth, Integrity, Honour, work, Leadership, Accountability, Prudence, Service, Sharing, Sacrifice, Self-discipline, Self-reliance, Grace, Compassion, Patriotism, Health, Knowledge, Courage, Enquiry, Endurance and Comradeship.

Article 7: Aims of the party;
The Party shall promote: -

(i) The Unity of Nigeria
(ii) The rule of law, equity and justice
(iii) Good governance and equality of opportunity for ALL Nigerians
(iv) Respect for fundamental human rights
(v) Integrity and transparency in the conduct of public affairs
(vi) Sustainable development through sound education, basic health care, abundant food production, rapid industrial growth, housing, full employment, provision and improvement of infrastructure and basic services.
(vii) True federalism and equitable revenue sharing formula
(viii) Full and productive employment with security of life, family and property.
(ix) Self-respect, self-reliance and human dignity.

Article 8: Objectives of the party;
To achieve these aims, the Party shall endeavour to:

(i) Maintain and preserve the integrity, unity and sovereignty of the Federal Republic of Nigeria as one indivisible political entity;
(ii) Ensure genuine restoration, permanent entrenchment and practice of democracy, the rule of law, equity and social justice;

(iii) Promote national integration and harmonious co-existence of the diverse communities or our society (PDP Constitution, 2006);
(iv) Build an egalitarian society founded on the principle of freedom, equality and justice;
(v) Uphold the independence of the judiciary, free press, as well as the freedom of speech and association;
(vi) Ensure that the program of the Party at all levels conform at all times with the fundamental objectives, and directive principle of state policy, as contained in the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, as well as the Ethics, Aims and Objectives of the constitution of the Party;
(vii) Promote mutual respect for and understanding of the religious, traditional and cultural heritage of the various communities of Nigeria;
(viii) Eradicate illiteracy in our society and promote learning and research in science and technology;
(ix) Co-operate with African and other Nationalist movements and organisations working for the eradication of imperialism, neo-colonialism, racism and to strive relentlessly towards African Unity, as well as greater understanding and cohesion among all peoples of African descent;
(x) Co-operate with member nations in promoting the aims of the Economic Community of West African Countries (ECOWAS), the organisation of African Unity (OAU), the Commonwealth of Nations, the United Nations organisation (UNO) and other international and regional groupings that shall be in the best interest of Nigeria and Africa, and help to find just and peaceful solution for international disputes (PDP Constitution, 2006);
(xi) To support and promote the struggle for the rights of children and the disabled;
(xii) Undertake other activities, which in the opinion of the party are conducive to the attainment of the aims and objectives of the Party.

Article 9: Membership;

A. Eligibility;

The Party membership shall be open to:

a. All Nigerians who are of 18 years and above irrespective of religion, ethnicity, sex, social or economic status who accept its principles, policies and programs and who undertake to abide by its constitution.

B. Membership Admission

A prospective member shall:

i. Register at his Ward of origin or where he ordinarily resides;
ii. Pay the prescribed registration fee and other dues.

As amatter of fact, there are a lot of dissatisfaction about PDP membership because ther is no strict rules for the possession of membership card that is why every body can work into party office and posses his/her membership card since no clearly defined process was put in place to make membership of the party a serius affair.

Article 10: Rights and duties of members;

A Rights:-

A party member shall be entitled to:

a) Take a full, active and constructive part in the discussion, formulation and implementation of the policies and programs of the Party;
b) Receive and impart information on all aspect of the Party policies, programs or activities;
c) Offer constructive criticism of any member, policy, programs or activity of the Party;
d) Take part in election and be elected or appointed to any committee, structure, commission or delegate of the Party subject to such conditions as may be imposed by the Party; and
e) Submit proposals or statements to the Ward, Local Government, State, Zonal or National Executive Committee, provided such proposals or statements are submitted in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Party.

B Duties

A Party member shall:

a) Belong to and take an active part in the life of his or her branch;
b) Take all necessary steps to understand, propagate and execute the aims and objectives of the Party;
c) Endeavour to acquaint himself with the social, cultural, political and economic problems of the country;
d) Combat propaganda detrimental to the Party and defend the policies and programs of the Party;
e) Oppose tribalism, sexism, religious and political intolerance or any other form of discrimination;
f) Observe discipline, behave honestly and carry out loyally all decisions of the majority and decisions of higher organs of the Party;

g) Refrain from publishing or distributing to the media any articles which purport to be the view of any faction or tendency within the Party without due authorization (PDP Constitution, 2006) ;
h) Ensure that he is registered as a voter in the constituency where he resides;
i) Pay such fees, levies and dues as may be prescribed from time to time by the National Convention or by any other organ of the Party authorised to do so;
j) Subject to the provision of this constitution, be eligible to vote and be voted for at Party meetings or elections; and
k) Be loyal to the Party and not do anything that is inconsistent with this constitution.

Article 11: Loss of membership;

1. Without prejudice to the provision of Article 9 of this Constitution, any member who fails to renew his membership by payment of the annual subscription fees within 6 months after the due date shall cease to enjoy the rights and privileges of membership and if in default for upwards of 12 months, shall cease to be a member.
2. Any member who loses his membership on account of his failure to pay his dues or meet his financial obligation shall resume membership on the payment of all outstanding dues.

Article 12: Party Organization;

1. The Party shall be organised and administered at the following levels, namely:
i. Ward
ii. Local Government Area (LGA)
iii. State
iv. Zonal
v. National

There shall be informal units for mobilisation to wit:-
i. The State Constituency
ii. The Federal Constituency
iii. The Senatorial Constituency
3. There shall be a Party Secretariat at all levels of the Party;
4. For all purposes of Party organisation the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja shall be treated as a state.

Article 13: The Organs of the Party:

1. The organs of the Party shall consist of the following;
- i. The Ward Executive Committee
- ii. The Ward Congress
- iii. The Local Government Executive Committee
- iv. The Local Government Area Congress
- v. The Senatorial District Working Committee
- vi. The State Working Committee
- vii. The State Caucus
- viii. The State Executive Committee
- ix. The State Congress
- x. The Zonal Working Committee
- xi. The Zonal Executive Committee
- xii. The Zonal Congress
- xii. The National Working Committee
- xiv. The National Caucus
- xv. The National Board of Trustees
- xvi.. The National Executive Committee
- xvii. National Convention

The Local Government Executive Committee

A. There shall be a Ward Executive Committee which shall comprise of the following:
i. The Chairman
ii. The Chairman of the Local Government Council or the Deputy Chairman who are members of the Party
iii. The Deputy Chairman
iv. All Ward Chairmen in the Local Government Area
v. The Secretary
vi. The Assistant Secretary
vii. The Treasurer

viii. The Financial Secretary
ix. The Publicity Secretary
x. The Assistant Publicity Secretary
xi. The Organising Secretary
xii. The Auditor
xiii. The Legal Adviser
xiv. The Assistant Legal Adviser
xv. Four (4) other ex-officio members at least two of whom shall be women
xvi. The Women Leader
xvii. The Youth Leader
xviii. Members of the National, Zonal and State Executive Committees from the Local Government Area
xix. Members of the National Board of Trustees from the Local Government Area
xx. Member of the National and State Assemblies from the Local Government Area who are members of the Party
xxi. All political office holders that is to say, the President, the Vice President, Federal Ministers, Special Advisers and Assistants to the President, Special Advisers and Assistants to the Vice President, Governors, Deputy Governors and State Commissioners, Special Advisers and Assistants to the Governors and Deputy Governors, Secretary to the Federal Government and Secretary to the State Government, Chairman and members of the Board. Of Federal and State Parastatals from the Ward who are members of the Party (PDP Constitution, 2006).

B. The Local Government Area Executive Committee shall meet at least twice a month
C. The Local Government Area Executive Committee shall be summoned by the Local Government Chairman or upon application by two-third (2/3) of the members of Local Government Area Executive Committee
D. The quorum at meetings of the Local Government Area Executive Committee shall be one-fifth of its membership

The Local Government Area Congress

A. There shall be a Local Government Area Congress which shall consist of:
   i. The Local Government Party Chairman and other members of the Local Government Area Executive Committee
   ii. All National, Zonal and State Executive Committee members of the Party from the Local Government Area
   iii. The Local Government Council Chairman, the Deputy Chairman, Supervisors and Councillors who are members of the Party
iv. All members of the National and State Assemblies from the Local Government Area, who are members of the Party
v. Members of National Board of Trustees from the Local Government Area
vi. All members of the Ward Executive Committee in the Local Government Area
vii. Eight (8) delegates from each Ward of the Local Government Area elected at the Ward Congress who shall cease to function after the Local Government Area Congress for which they were elected
viii. Two (2) delegates from each Ward who shall be women elected at the Ward Congress and who shall cease to function after the Local Government Area Congress for which they were elected
ix. All political office holders produced by the Party for the Local Government Area. (PDP Constitution, 2006)

B.

i. The Local Government Area Congress shall be held at least once every two years. It will alternate with a Local Government Area Party Conference which will hold bi-annually
ii. The quorum of the Local Government Area Congress shall be one-fifth of delegates provided that no less than two-third of all Wards are represented
iii. The Local Government Area Executive Committee shall be responsible for summoning the Local Government Area Congress

Senatorial District Working Committee

A. There shall be a Senatorial District Working Committee which shall comprise of:-
i. The State Vice-Chairman from the Senatorial District who shall be the Chairman of the District Working Committee
ii. State Governors and their Deputies who are members of the Party from the Senatorial District
iii. Members of the National Board of Trustees from the Senatorial District
iv. Members of National, Zonal and State Executive Committees of the Party from Senatorial District

v. Local Government Area Party Chairmen and Secretaries from the Senatorial District
vi. Local Government Council Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen from the Senatorial District who are members of the Party
vii. Senatorial Women Leader who shall be elected by the Senatorial District Working Committee
viii. Senatorial Youth Leader who shall be elected by the Senatorial District Working Committee
ix. Assistant State Secretary from the Senatorial District
x. State Assistant Organising Secretary from the Senatorial District
B. The State Caucus shall meet at least once a month and shall have the power of co-option.

The State Executive Committee

A. There shall be a State Executive Committee which shall comprise of:
i. The State Chairman
ii. All National and Zonal Executive Committee members of the Party from the State.
iii. The Governor and Deputy Governor of the State if produced by the Party
iv. The Speaker, Deputy Speaker, Party Leader and Party Whip of the Party Whip of the Party, in the State House of Assembly
v. The State Deputy Chairman
vi. The State Vice-Chairman
vii. All Party Chairmen from Local Government Areas of the State
viii. The State Secretary
ix. Three (3) State Assistant Secretaries
x. The State Treasurer
xi. All elected Council Chairmen and their Deputies, produced by the Party
xii. The State Financial Secretary
xiii. The State Assistant Financial Secretary
xiv. The State Publicity Secretary
xv. The State Assistant Publicity Secretary
xvi. The State Organising Secretary
xvii. There (3) State Assistant Organising Secretaries from each of the Senatorial Districts
xviii. The State Legal Adviser
xix. The State Assistant Legal Adviser
xx. The State Auditor
xxi. Two (2) other members elected by the State Congress from each of the three senatorial districts, three of whom shall be women
xxii. The State Women Leader
xxiii. The State Youth Leader
xxiv. Members of the National Board of Trustees from the State
B. The State Executive Committee shall meet at least once in every quarter. The Chairman or 2/3 of the members of the Executive Committee shall have power to summon an extra-ordinary meeting
C. The quorum of the State Executive Committee meeting shall be one-quarter (1/4) of the membership

The State Congress

A. There shall be a State Congress which shall comprise of:-
i. The State Chairman and members of the State Executive Committee.
ii. All members of the National and Zonal Executive Committee from the State.
iii. All members of the National Assembly and the State House of Assembly who are members of the Party.
iv. All Commissioners, Special Advisers and Special Assistants to the Governor and Deputy Governor who are members of the Party.
v. All Local Government Council Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen who are members of the Party.
vi. All Local Government Party Secretaries.
vii. All Local Government Women and Youth Leaders.
viii. Three (3) delegates from each Local Government elected at the Local Government Congresses who shall cease to function after the conclusion of the State Congress for which they were elected.
ix. Ministers, Ambassadors, Advisers and Special Assistants to the President and the Vice President produced by the Party from the State.
x. Members of the National Board of Trustees from the State.

Zonal Working Committee

There shall be Zonal Working Committee which shall comprise of:-

i. The Zonal Chairman
ii. The Zonal Secretary
iii. the Zonal Treasurer
iv. The Zonal Financial Secretary
v. The Zonal Organizing Secretary
vi. The Zonal Legal Adviser
vii. The Zonal Publicity Secretary
viii. The Zonal Auditor
ix. The Zonal Woman Leader
x. The Zonal Youth Leader

B. The Zonal Working Committee shall meet at least once every forth night and its Quorum shall be one half of its membership.

The Zonal Executive Committee

The Zonal Executive Committee

i. The National Vice Chairman who shall be the Chairman of the committee.
ii. State Governors and their Deputies who are members of the Party.
iii. Members of the National Assembly from the Zone who are members of the Party.
iv. Members of the National Executive Committee from the Zone.
v. Members of the National Executive Committee from the Zone.
vi. Ministers, Special Advisers and Special Assistants to the President and Vice President from the Zone who are members of the Party.
vii. Speaker, Deputy Speaker, Party Leader and Party Whip of the State House of Assemblies from the Zone who are members of the Party.
viii. The Zonal Secretary who shall be the Secretary of the Committee.
ix. State Chairman and State Secretaries of the Party from the Zone.
x. The Zonal Treasurer
xi. The Zonal Financial Secretary
xi. The Zonal Publicity Secretary
xii. The Zonal Legal Adviser (who shall be a Legal practitioner of at least five years standing)
xiii. The Zonal Woman Leader
xii. The Zonal Youth Leader
xiii. One Ex-officio member from each of the States in the Zone.

B. The Zonal Executive Committee shall meet at least once every quarter provided that the Chairman or two third of the members of the Committee shall have power to summon an extra ordinary meeting.
C. The Quorum of the Zonal Executive Committee shall be one-third of the membership of the Committee.
D. The Zonal Executive Committee shall have the power of co-option.

The Zonal Congress

A. There shall be a zonal congress of the Party which shall consist of all delegates to the National Convention from the Zone.
B. The Zonal Congress will meet every 2 years. It will alternate with the zonal Party Conference, which will be convened bi-annually.

The National Working Committee

A. There shall be a National Working Committee of the Party, which shall comprise of:-

i. National Chairman
ii. Two Deputy National Chairmen
iii. The National Secretary
iv. The Deputy National Secretary
v. The National Treasurer
vi. The National Financial Secretary
vii. The National Organising Secretary
viii. The National Publicity Secretary
ix. The National Auditor

x. National Legal Adviser
xi. The National Woman Leader
xii. The National Youth Leader
B. The Quorum of the National Working Committee shall be one-half (1/2) of its members.
C. The National Working Committee shall meet at least once every forth night.

National Caucus

A. There shall be a National Caucus of the Party which shall consist of the following:-
i. The National Chairman of the Party as chairman.
ii. The President and Vice President, if produced by the Party.
iii. The Senate President and Deputy Senate President, the Leader and Deputy Leader, the Chief Whip and Deputy Chief Whip of the Party in the Senate, who are members of the Party.
iv. The Speaker and the Deputy Speaker, the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Party, the Chief Whip and Deputy Chief Whip of the Party in the House of Representatives, who are members of the Party.
v. The two Deputy National Chairmen and the National Treasurer.
vi. The Chairman and Secretary of the Board of Trustees and six other Trustees, one from each of the six geo-political zones.
vii. The National Secretary, who shall be the Secretary of the Caucus.
viii. The Attorney General of the Federation, if produced by the Party.
ix. The Secretary to the Government of the Federation, if produced by the Party.
x. Three (3) members of the Party who are Federal Ministers to be nominated by the President of the Federal Republic.
xi. The Political Adviser and the Adviser on National Assembly matters to the President if produced by the Party.
B. The National Caucus shall have the power of co-option.
C. The Quorum of the Caucus shall be one-half of its members.
D. The National Chairman shall, in consultation with the President summon the meeting of the Caucus from time to time to consider important issues affecting the Party and the Nation.

National Executive Committee

A. There shall be a National Executive Committee of the Party which shall comprise of the following:-
i. National Chairman
ii. The President and Vice President, if produced by the Party.
iii. The President of the Senate and Deputy Senate President of the Senate who are produced by the Party. The Leader and Deputy Leader, the Chief Whip and Deputy Chief Whip of the Party in the Senate.
iv. The Speaker and the Deputy Speaker in the House of Representatives, who are produced by the Party, the Leader and Deputy Leader, the Chief Whip and Deputy Chief Whip of the Party in the House of Representatives.
v. All State Governors who are members of the Party.
vi. The two Deputy Chairmen (North and South)
vii. The six Zonal Chairmen.
viii. The Chairman and Secretary of the National Board of Trustees.
ix. Other members of the National Board of Trustees who shall, however, not have any voting rights.
x. All State Chairmen including those of the Federal Capital Territory.
xi. The National Secretary.
xii. The Deputy National Secretary
xiii. The National Treasurer
xiv. The Deputy National Treasurer
xv. The National Financial Secretary
xvi. The Deputy National Financial Secretary
xvii. The National Organising Secretary
xviii. The Deputy National Organising Secretary
xix. The National Publicity Secretary
xx. The Deputy National Publicity Secretary
xxi. The National Legal Adviser
xxii. The Deputy National Legal Adviser
xxiii. The National Auditor
xxiv. The Deputy National Auditor

xxv. The National Woman Leader
xxvi. The Deputy National Woman Leader
xxvii. The National Youth Leader
xxviii. The Deputy National Youth Leader
xxix. Three (3) elected members at least one of whom shall be a woman from each of the six geo-political zones.
B. The National Executive Committee shall meet at least once in a quarter.
C. The National Executive Committee shall meet at the request of two-third (2/3) of its membership who shall notify the Chairman at least fourteen (14) days prior to the meeting.
D. The Quorum for the meeting of the National Executive Meeting shall be one quarter (1/4) of the members of the Committee.

The National Board of Trustees

A. There shall be a Board of Trustees of the Party, which shall comprise the following:
i. Three (3) elected members from each of the six (6) geo-political zones. Persons so elected shall not seek further elective office in the Party.
ii. One woman from each of the six geo-political zones.
iii. All serving and past National Chairmen and National Secretaries of the Party.
iv. All serving and past Presidents and Vice Presidents of the Federal Republic of Nigeria provided that they held the respective posts as members of the Party.
v. All serving and past Presidents of the Senate and Speakers of the Flouse of Representatives, provided that they held the respective posts as members of the Party.
vi. Any members of the Party that the Board of Trustees deems it fit to appoint as members of the Board of Trustees. Such appointment shall be subject to ratification at the Party's convention.
vii. The National Board of Trustees shall be registered under the (Land Perpetual Act).
viii. The Trustees from each zone shall elect one person from amongst them who shall be registered along with the Board of Trustees to be known as Registered Board of Trustees.
ix. The Board of Trustees shall comprise persons of integrity who have contributed substantially to the growth of the Party.
x. The Board of Trustees shall have and elect a Chairman and a Secretary from its members.
xi. The Secretary of the Board of Trustees shall be the custodian of the common seal of the Party.
xii. Each member of the Board of Trustees shall hold office for a term of five years and at the expiration shall be eligible for re-election for another term of five (5) years only.
xiii. The Board of Trustee shall regulate its own proceeding.
xiv. The Board of Trustee shall meet at the instance of the Chairman or at the request of half of the members of the Board or following resolution of the National Executive Committee requesting for such a meeting.

National Convention

A. There shall be a National Convention of the Party which shall consist of:-
i. The National Chairman and other members of the National Executive Committee.
ii. Members of the Board of Trustees.
iii. The Secretary to the Government of the Federation (if a member of the Party)
iv. All Governors and Deputy Governors who are members of the Party.
vi. All members of the National and State Assemblies who are members of the Party.
vii. All Ministers, Ambassador, Special Advisers and Special Assistants to the President and Vice President and all Chairmen of Board of Federal parastatals who are members of the Party.
viii. All Zonal and State Party Secretaries (including those of the Federal Capital Territory).
viii. All State Youth and Women Leaders (including those of the Federal Capital Territory).
ix. All Party Chairmen of the Local Government Areas.
x. One delegate from each Local Government Area elected at the Local Government Area congress.
xi. All Local Government Council Chairmen produced by the Party.
B. The Quorum of the National convention shall be one-third (1/3) of the members.
C. The National Convention shall meet every two years. It shall alternate with the National Party Conference which shall hold bi-annually.
D. A Special National Convention may be convened at any time at the instance of the national Executive Committee or two-third of all State Executive Committees. The Special National Convention shall meet to discuss special matters only which shall be specified in the notice summoning the convention.

Article 14: Powers and functions of party organs;

Ward Executive Committee

A. The function of the Ward Executive Committee shall be as follows.

i. Day to day running of the Party.

ii. Raise funds for the day-to-day running of the Party and other functions.

iii. Membership drive.

iv. Draw up strategies for political campaigns.

v. Mobilization of voters.

vi. Putting into effect decision of ward congresses and other organs of the Party

vii. Perform such other functions as will be in the interest of the Party.

The Ward Congress

A. The functions of the Ward Congress shall be as follows:-

i. To improve the budget for the Ward.

ii. To conduct primaries for Ward elections.

iii. To elect members of the Ward Executive Committee.

iv. To receive Ward delegates to Party Congress.

v. To receive report of officers of the Ward.

vi. To receive Auditors Reports; and

vii. Such other business as shall be in the interest of the Party.

3. Local Government Executive Committee

A. The function of the Local Government Executive Committee shall be as follows:-

i. To identify political, social and economic issues of concern to the Local Government;

ii. To receive reports from the constituent Wards on

   a. Membership drive
   b. Fund raising activities
   c. Strategies for political campaigns and electoral successes
   d. Mobilisation of voters.

iii. To harmonise report and distribute same to all wards and ensure their implementation.

iv. To provide strategies for effective communication between the Wards and the Local Government.

v. To undertake general administration of the Party in the Local Government.

vi. To implement decision of the Local Government Congress and other organs of the Party.

vii. To employ and prescribe the conditions of service including discipline of all secretariat staff of the Party in the Local Government Area.

Local Government Area Congress

The function of the Local Government Area Congress of the Party shall be as follows:-

i. To elect members to the Local Government Executive Committee of the Party.

ii. To organise primaries for election into the State and the National Assemblies.

iii. To elect Local Government Party delegates to the State Congress and National Convention.

iv. To approve budget for administration of the Party at the Local Government level.

v. To receive the Audit's Report.

Senatorial District Working Committee

The function of the Senatorial District Working Committee shall be as follows:-

i. To co-ordinate the policies, programs and operations of the Party within the Senatorial District;

ii. To liaise with the Local Government Areas within the District and State Headquarters.

State Working Committee

i. The State Working Committee shall be responsible for the day-to-day administration of the Party at the State level and shall be responsible to the State Executive Committee.

ii. Perform such other functions as may be assigned to its by the State Executive Committee.

iii. Meet once in a forth night at the instance of the Chairman.

State Caucus

i. The State Caucus shall meet from time to time to consider urgent and important issues affecting the Party and the State.

State Executive Committee

A. The functions of the State Executive Committee shall be as follows:

i. Identify political, social and economic issues of concern to the State.

ii. Undertake the general administration of the Party in the State, and implement the decisions of the State Congress or directives of the National Executive Committee or National Convention.
iii. Prepare the annual budget of the Party in the State.
iv. Prepare the Agenda for the State Congress.

State Congress

The function of the State Congress shall be as follows:

i. Approve the budget of the Party in the State.
ii. Elect Officers of the State Executive Committee.
iii. Organise primaries for Governorship Elections.
iv. Receive report of officers of the Party.
v. Receive Auditor's report.
vi. The State Congress shall meet once every two years on a date and at a venue to be determined by the State Executive Committee, provided that the State Congress shall be held before the National Convention.

Zonal Working Committee

There shall be a Zonal working Committee, which shall be responsible for day-to-day administration of the Party at the Zonal level and shall be responsible to the Zonal Executive Committee..

ii. Act as liaison between the National Secretariat and the State Chapters in the zone and vice versa.
iii. Prepare and submit reports for the consideration of the Zonal Executive Committee.
iv. It shall perform such other functions as may be assigned to it by the Zonal Executive Committee.

Zonal Executive Committee

A. There shall be a Zonal Executive Committee which shall meet at least once every two months and whose functions shall be as follows:

i. Harmonise, co-ordinate and review all activities of the Party within the Zone
ii. Establish ad-hoc or standing committees of the party within the zone and appoint members to such committees
iii. Summon and prepare agenda for the zonal congress
iv. Prepare and submit reports and budgets for the consideration of the zonal congress
v. Carry out any other function assigned to it by the National Executive Committee.

B. The meeting of the Zonal Executive Committee shall be summoned by the Zonal Chairman or at the request of two-third of its members.

Zonal Congress

There shall be a Zonal Congress whose function shall be as follows:

i. To approve the budget of the Party in the Zone
ii. To elect officers of the Zonal Working Committee
iii. To receive the report of officers of the Party in the Zone
iv. To receive the Auditor's report

National Working Committee

There shall be a National Working Committee, which shall perform the following functions:

i. Be responsible for the day-to-day administration of the Partyand shall be responsible to the National Executive Committee.
ii. In case of emergency, the National Working Committee shall act on behalf of the National Executive Committee subject to ratification by the National Executive Committee.
iii. The National Working Committee shall perform such other functions as may be assigned to it by National Executive Committee.

National Caucus

There shall be National Caucus, which shall meet from time to time to consider urgent and important issues affecting the Party and shall co-ordinate and harmonise the relations between, and the activities of, the executive and legislative arms of the government and the Party.

National Board of Trustees

A. There shall be a National Board of Trustees, which shall:

i. Ensure highest standards of morality in all the activities of the Party, with power to call to order any officers of the Party whose conduct falls below the norms
ii. Ensure high morale if members of the Party, and ensure that the Party enjoys a good image before the Nigerian populace and that the Party is in good political health.

iii. Harmonise, co-ordinate, review and advise on politics, programs and activities of the Party on National level.
iv. Be vested with the assets of the Party and shall serve as custodians of such assets
v. Co-ordinate the sourcing of Party funds
vi. Mediate in dispute between the executive and legislative arms of government.
vii. Carry out all such other functions and activities as may be referred to it by the National Executive Committee or the National Convention
viii. Give advice on any Party matter to the National Executive Committee of the Party

B. Member of the Board of Trustees may attend any meetings of any organ of the Party except the National Caucus
C. The Chairman and Secretary of the Board of Trustees shall be members of the National Executive Committee
D. A Trustee may be removed from office by a resolution of the National Convention on the recommendation of the Board of Trustees, on the ground of infirmity or misconduct
E. A Trustee may resign his membership of the Board of Trustees by tendering a letter to that effect to the Chairman
F. Any vacancy on the Board of Trustees shall be filled by the Board subject to ratification by the National Convention
G. The Board of Trustees shall regulate its own proceeding and shall draw up a code of conduct which shall be binding on the members.

The National Executive Committee

There shall be a National Executive Committee, which shall:

a. Summon the National Convention and prepare its agenda
b. Prepare and submit reports and budget for the approval of the National Convention
c. Prepare financial guidelines for the approval of the National Convention
d. Initiate policies and programs for the approval of the National Convention
e. Deal with appeals and other matters referred to it by the Zones or States of the Federation
f. Make rules for Party discipline which shall be binding on all organs and member of the Party
g. Make Party electoral regulations to govern the conduct of elections to all Party offices at every level and regulate procedure of selecting Party candidates for elective offices.
h. Ratify conditions of service of the Secretariat staff of the Party
i. Co-opt such persons as it shall deem necessary or expedient to attend its meeting and participate in its deliberation provided that such persons shall have no voting right.
j. Make standing orders for the approval of the National Convention.
k. Deal with any other matter referred to it by the National Convention or the Board of Trustees.
L. Establish ad-hoc or standing committees of the Party and appoint members to such committee.
m. Exercise such other powers and functions as are vested in it by this Constitution.
n. Shall in consultation with the Board of Trustees appoint eminent and outstanding Party leaders to the position of patriarch or member emeritus who shall have the right of attendance at all meetings of all Party organs.
o. The National Executive Committee shall from time to time examine the actions, policies, programs pursued and legislation made or proposed by Governments in the Federation (produced by the Party) in order to ascertain that they are in accord with the principles, policies, programs, aims and objectives and the manifesto of the Party and make the necessary recommendation or take any appropriate action.
p. Raise adequate funds for the management and sustenance of the Party.
q. Recommend the minimum rates of annual subscription payable by members
r. Recommend the proportion of income each Ward, Local Government and State shall remit to the National Secretariat from its subscription.
s. Decision of the National Executive Committee shall be binding on all organs and members of the Party.

The National Convention

The Party National Convention shall be the final authority of the Party and shall be vested with the following powers:

a. Formulate policies and programs for the Party
b. Elect or remove the National Officers of the Party
c. Elect the Presidential Candidates of the Party

d. Demand and receive report from the National Executive Committee and fro any other committee or organ of the party ad take appropriate action.
e. Appoint any committee it may deem necessary, desirable or expedient and assign to them such powers and functions, as it may deem fit and proper.
f. Examine the actions taken or legislation proposed or passed by any government, legislative house or local government council and determines what further action the Party should take.
g. Secure at all elections the return of as many Party candidates as possible, in order, generally to have control of the legislative and executive arms of government in the federation.
h. Consider reports from the State and Local Government branches of the Party and take such decisions and actions as are necessary to protect, advance and consolidate the gains and interests of the Party.
i. Raise adequate fund for the management and substance of the Party.
j. Exercise control and take disciplinary actions on all organs, officers and members of the Party.
k. Determine or approve the type and membership to standing committees to be set up by the National Executive Committee.
L. Review, or amend the Party Constitution from time to time as the need arises.
m. Delegate any of its powers to the National Executive Committee or to any other organ or member of the Party.
n. Take any action as may be conducive to the promotion of the aims and objectives of the Party.
o. Appoint External Auditors to audit the Party's Accounts.
p. Exercise such other power and authority as are vested in it by this Constitution.
q. Ratify the minimum rate of annual subscription to be paid by members and the proportion of income from such subscription to be remitted to the party National Secretariat.
r. Without prejudice to the above provision of Article 12, Section 1 7, there will be bi-annual Party Conferences at the Ward Local Government, State, Zonal and National levels to discuss National and Party issues (PDP Constitution, 2006).

Article 15: Powers and functions of officcers

The National Chairman

The National Chairman shall be the Chief Executive of the Party and is vested with the following powers:

i. Summon and preside over the meetings of the National Convention, the National Executive Committee, the National Caucus and the National Working Committee of the Party.
ii. Provide good and effective leadership and direct the activities of the Party under the overall supervision of the National Executive Committee.
iii. Promote and defend the integrity, po/icies and programs of the Party and make pronouncements for and on behalf of the National Executive outlining the policies, programs and activities of the Party;
iv. Exercise all powers vested in him by this Constitution as well as ensuring, strict compliance with the provisions of this Constitution;
v. Assign specific functions to any member or officer of the Party;
vi. Delegate his powers to the Deputy National Chairmen and Zonal Chairmen;
vii. Casting votes if and when necessary;
viii. Present to the National Convention a comprehensive statement of the state of the Party and the political situation generally.

The Deputy National Chairman

i. In the absence of the National Chairman, the Deputy National Chairman from the Chairman's zone shall preside at meetings and act on his behalf. In his absence the other Deputy National Chairman shall preside as well as act on behalf of the National Chairman.
ii. Each Deputy National Chairman shall be assigned specific functions and shall also perform such other Party functions as may be assigned to him by the National Convention, the National Executive Committee and the National Chairman.

National Secretary

The national Secretary shall be the Chief Administrative and Accounting Officer of the Party and is vested with the following powers:

i. Supervise the day-to-day activities of the Party.
ii. Conduct or direct the conduct of the correspondences of the Party and cause to be issued notices of meetings of the National Convention, the National Executive Committee, the National Caucus and the national Working Committee.

iii. Cause to be kept all records and records of proceeding of the National Convention, the National Executive Committee, the National Caucus and the National Working Committee as well as other records of the Party.
iv. Render a written annual report of the activities of the Party.
v. Ensure the implantation of the decisions and directives of the National Convention, the National Executive Committee, the National Caucus and the National Working Committee and ensure that all units of the party carry out their duties promptly and properly.
vi. Carry out any other duties as may be assigned to him from time-to-time by the National Convention, the National Caucus, the National Executive Committee and the National Chairman.
vii. Consult the National Chairman in the discharge of the duties of his office (PDP Constitution, 2006).

The Deputy National Secretary

The Deputy National Secretary shall assist the National Secretary in the discharge of this duties and shall deputize for him in his absence or whenever so directed.

The National Treasurer

The National Treasurer shall be the Chief custodian of the funs of the Party and is vested with the following powers:

i. Receive and promptly pay into the Party's accounts all monies received for and on behalf of the Party and keep all cheque books and other banking documents of the Party.
ii. Ensure prudent management of the Party's funds.
iii. Ensure that all funds received by the Party are duly received for and paid into the Party's accounts immediately and if for any reason that is not possible, within 48 hours of collection.
iv. Prepare and submit a yearly statement of account and periodic reports to the National Executive Committee.

The Deputy National Treasurer

i. The Deputy National Treasurer shall assist the National Treasurer in the discharge of his duties and shall deputize for him in his absence or whenever so directed.

The National Financial Secretary

The national Financial Secretary is vested with the following powers:

i. Collect and keep records of all dues, levies, subscriptions and donations paid or made to the Party.
ii. Prepare and submit proposals for raising funds for the Party for the consideration of the National Executive Committee.
iii. Undertake strict supervision of budgeting, budgetary control and financial reporting.
iv. Protect assets of the party and institute operating procedures through internal control (PDP Constitution, 2006).
v. Establish and co-ordinate policies for the investment of funds to generate income for the Party.

Deputy National Financial Secretary

i. The Deputy National Financial Secretary shall assist the National Financial Secretary in the discharge of his duties and shall deputize for him in his absence or whenever so directed.

The National Organizing Secretary

The National Organizing Secretary is vested with the following powers:

i. Initiate programs for the general mobilization of Party members and recruitment of new members.
ii. Appraise the problems of the Party and propose solutions to such problems.
iii. Harmonize all information and device appropriate STRATEGY for winning election.
iv. Implement and co-ordinate all field activities of the Party.
v. Organize seminars, workshops, rallies and campaign programs for the attainment of the Party's objectives.
vi. Liaise with the National Woman and Youth leaders for harmonization of programs for the attainment of the Party's victory at all elections.

The Deputy National Organizing Secretary

i. The Deputy National Organizing Secretary shall assist the national Organizing Secretary in the discharge of his duties and shall deputize for him in his absence or whenever so directed.

The National Publicity Secretary

The National Publicity Secretary is vested with the following power:

i. Co-ordinate Party information and public relations.
ii. Be the Chief image-maker of the Party.

iii. Cause to be publicized the policies and programs of the Party in line with the aims and objectives of the Party.

The Deputy National publicity Secretary

i. The Deputy National Publicity Secretary shall assist the National Publicity Secretary in the discharge of his duties and shall deputize for him in his absence or whenever so directed.

The National Auditor

There shall be a National Auditor of the Party who shall:

i. Audit the book of account of the Party annually and shall report to the National Executive Committee.
ii. Present the audited account of the Party to the National Convention annually.
iii. Carry out any other function as may be required by the National Executive Committee.

The Deputy National Auditor

The Deputy National Auditor shall assist the National Auditor in the discharge of his duties and shall deputize for him in his absence or whenever so directed.

The National Legal Adviser

There shall be a National Legal Adviser of the Party who shall:

i. Advise the Party on Legal Matters.
ii. Arrange for the conduct of litigation and defense of actions on behalf of the Party, including its organs and officials as far as the subject of litigation affects the Party's interest (PDP Constitution, 2006).
iii. Interpret the laws, regulations and Constitution of the Party in the event of any ambiguities.

Deputy National Legal Advise

There shall be a Deputy National Legal Adviser who shall perform such functions as may be assigned to him by the National Legal Adviser and deputize for him in his absence.

The National Woman Leader

There shall be a National Woman Leader who shall

i. Be responsible for women mobilization and organization.
ii. Initiate and implement strategic programs and policies aimed at endearing the Party to Nigeria Women.
iii. Co-ordinate activities of the Zonal and State Women Leaders.

The Deputy National Woman Leader

There shall be a Deputy National Woman Leader who shall perform such duties and functions as may be assigned to her by the National Woman Leader and shall deputize for her in her absence or whenever so directed.

The National Youth Leader

There shall be a National Youth Leader who shall:

i. Be responsible for mobilization of Youth for the attainment of Party objectives.
ii. Initiate and implement strategic programs and policies aimed at endearing the Party to Nigerian Youths.
i. Co-ordinate the activities of the Zonal and State Youth Leaders.

The Deputy National Youth Leader

There shall be a Deputy National Youth Leader who shall perform such functions as may be assigned to him by the National Youth Leader and deputize for him in his absence or whenever so directed.

i. Subject to the provisions of this Constitution all other offices at the Zonal, State, Local Government and Ward levels shall have the same powers and functions at their corresponding National Officers.
ii. The Executive Committee at all levels shall have power to set up Committees where necessary, desirable or expedient and shall assign to them such powers and functions as may be deemed fit and proper.

Article 16: Discipline of Members;

Subject to the provisions of this Constitution the Party shall have power to discipline its members as hereafter provided.

Offences

i. Any breach of the Party Constitution.
ii. Acts, Conduct or utterances likely to bring the Party into disrepute, hatred or contempt.
iii. Disobedience or neglect to carry out lawful directives of the Party or any organ or officer of the Party.
iv. Engaging in dishonest practices, defrauding the Party, its members or officials.
v. Persistent absenteeism from meetings and in the case of an elected Party official, absenteeism also from duty.
vi. Engaging in anti-party activities.
vii. Disorderly conduct at meetings, rallies etc.

viii. Engaging in any other activities likely to cause disaffection among Party members or likely to disrupt the peaceful, lawful and efficient conduct of Party business.

ix. Unauthorised publicity of Party dispute or creating parallel Party organ(s) at any level.

x. Factionalization or belonging to any group(s) within the Party under whatever name(s) other than as provided for in the constitution.

xi. It shall not be lawful for the Party or any member thereof to organize, retain, train, equip or encourage the organizing, retention, training, equipping of any member or group of members for the purpose of employing the use of display of physical force or coercion or any form of intimidation whatsoever (PDP Constitution, 2006).

xii. A member of the Party shall not resort to Court action or litigation on any disputes or on any matter whatsoever concerning rights, obligations and duties of any member(s) without first availing himself of the provision of Article 16 (B, C and D) of this Constitution.

Disciplinary Procedure

i. (a) Subject to the provisions of this Article and principle of natural justice. There shall be a Disciplinary Committee of seven members at every level of the Party appointed by the appropriate Executive Committee.

(b) The Working Committee at any level may after preliminary hearing, suspend a member from the Party for a period not exceeding one month within which he shall not lose his right to contest any election. He shall be referred to the appropriate Disciplinary Committee within this period.

ii. The Disciplinary Committee shall inform the member(s) in writing concerning the allegations and the place and time of hearing the case against him/them (PDP Constitution, 2006).

iii. Parties before a Disciplinary Committee shall be given opportunity to present their case orally or in writing either in person or through a counsel of his choice and call witnesses.

ii. The Executive Committee of the Party at the appropriate level shall stipulate a time limit, within which the Disciplinary Committee shall complete its work which shall in any case not be more than 14 days.

Punishment

1. Any member of the Party found guilty of any of the offences disclosed under Article 14 (A) shall be liable to any of or combination of the following punishments:

i. Reprimand
ii. Censure
iii. Fine
iv. Debarment from holding any Party Office
v. Removal from office
vi. Suspension from the Party
vii. Expulsion from the Party

2. Subject to the provision of this article, the Executive Committee at any level of the Party shall have power to decide on any of the disciplinary measures against any member at that level.

3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution relating to discipline where it proposed to expel or remove a member of the National Executive Committee, Public Office holder, Ministers, Ambassadors, Special Advisers, Deputy Governors, or member of any of the legislative houses, such a proposal shall be submitted to the National Executive Committee which shall refer the same to its Disciplinary Committee.
For other categories of Executive Committee members, Public office holders, and other Party members the appropriate Executive Committee shall initiate and take necessary disciplinary action (PDP Constitution, 2006).

4. The National Executive Committee shall, on receipt of the report of the Disciplinary Committee, make a decision on the matter within fourteen days.

5. A decision to expel a member of the Party whether an office holder or not, taken or confirmed by the National Executive Committee shall become effective upon ratification by the National Convention, save that a member so expelled shall cease to enjoy all privileges of membership yntil such ratification.

Appeal

a. Any member of the Party who is aggrieved by the decision of any of the organs of the Party shall have the right of appeal within 14 days of the decision to the immediate higher organ of the Party.

b. An appeal shall be determined by the appropriate appeal body with 21 days from the date of receipt of the notice of appeal by the appropriate Executive Committee.

Article 17: Registration;
Register of Members

i. A register of members shall be kept and maintained at the Ward Secretariat of the Party.

Foreign Chapters

i. Subject to the approval of the National Executive Committee, members of the Party who reside in countries having diplomatic relations with Nigeria, not being less than fifty (50) in number, may establish chapters of the Party in their places of residence.
ii. There shall be established in the National Secretariat the office of Co-ordinator of Foreign Chapters who shall be responsible for co-ordinating the activities of the Foreign Chapters and who shall be accountable to the National Secretary.

Article 18: Tenure of office;

1. All National, Zonal, State, Local Government Area, and Ward Officers of the Party shall hold office for a period of four (4) years and shall be eligible for re- election at the appropriate Convention or Congress for a second term only.
2. At the appropriate convention or congress at mid term i.e. (two (2) years), a vote of confidence may be moved on any member of the Executive Committee at any level. Where such a vote fails such an Executive Committee member will be replaced at that convention or congress. A notice of two months must be given to the Secretary at the appropriate level who will circulate it to the relevant Chapters one month before the convention or congress. The vote of confidence will be defeated by 2/3rd of the members of convention or congress seating and voting.
3. Any officer elected into the Executive Committee at any level may resign his office by giving 30-days notice in writing to the appropriate Executive Committee, except in the case of resignations for the purpose of running for an elective office which shall be effective within the period stipulated in the guideline issued for such elective office by the National Executive Committee of the Party (PDP Constitution, 2006).
4. Should a vacancy occur in any of the Party offices, the appropriate Executive Committee shall appoint a substitute from the zone where the former office holder originated pending the conduct of election at the next Congress or Convention.
5. Any officer may be removed during his tenure of office through a vote of no confidence against him passed by two-thirds of the members present and voting at the appropriate Congress or Convention.

Article 19: Prohibition from Holding Dual Offices

Subject to the provisions of the Party Constitution, any member holding a Party office at any level shall be deemed to have resigned that positive if he assumes any of the following offices:

1. President of the Federal Republic
2. The Vice President of the Federal Republic
3. Governor and Deputy Governor
4. Minister of the Federal Republic
5. Ambassador and Special Adviser/Special Assistant to the President or Vice President.
6. Member of the National and State Assemblies
7. Commissioner in a State, Special Adviser or Special Assistant to the Governor or Deputy Governor.
8. Chairman, Deputy Chairman Councillors of the Local Government Council.
9. Any full time employment or appointment in the public service.

Article 20: Mode of Elections into Party Offices

The National Convention, Zonal, State, Local Government and Ward Congresses shall meet to elect the officers of the Party as specified under the Party Constitution at the various levels of the Party structure.

Every registered member who has satisfied the requirements for nomination and election under the Party Constitution, the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria or any other law, rules or regulations shall be eligible to contest for a Party office provided that officials of the Party shall also be eligible to re-contest for any office so long as they conform with the stipulations of the Party guidelines.

Guidelines for elections to Party offices shall be approved by the National Executive Committee of the Party in accordance with the provisions of the Party Constitution.

No member of the Party shall be qualified for nomination or election or appointment into any Party office unless he has been a registered member for at least twelve (12) calendar months.

Article 21: Nomination of Candidates for Election to Public Offices;

The National Executive Committee shall, subject to the provisions of the Party Constitution, formulate guidelines/regulations for the nomination of candidates for election into public offices at all levels. The National Executive Committee shall be the final authority for resolving all disputes relating to the choice of Party candidates for any elections and for confirming the name(s) or list of names of Party candidates for any elective public offices in the Federation (PDP Constitution, 2006).

Article 22: Party Finance;

The Party shall derive its funds from:

i. Subscriptions Fees, and Levies on members
ii. Proceeds from investments.
iii. Subventions and Donations
iv. Gifts and Grants by individual or groups of individuals as authorised by the law
v. Borrowing as approved by the National Executive Committee.
vi. Any other lawful means

Article 23: Bank Accounts;

i. The Party shall maintain Bank Accounts at the headquarters, city or town it is situated provided that where bank facilities are not available, the services of the bank nearest to the city or town shall be utilized.
ii. The Bank for such accounts shall be decided by the Executive Committee at that level of the Party.
iii. The following Officers of the Party, as the case may be shall be authorized signatories to the Bank Accounts and other financial transactions:
    a. The National Chairman and his counterparts at Zonal, State, Local Government and Ward levels;
    b. The National Secretary and his counterparts at Zonal, State, Local Government and Ward levels;
    c. The National Treasurer and his counterparts at Zonal, State, Local Government and Ward levels;

Provided that the withdrawals from or debit instructions on the accounts shall be valid if authorised by the Chairman and any other two signatories (i.e. Secretary or treasurer).

Article 24: Audit of Accounts;

The National Executive Committee shall appoint a competent firm of accountants to audit the accounts of the Party annually and present the report of the audited accounts at the National Convention.

The Zonal, State and the Local Government Executive Committees shall similarly appoint a] competent firm of Accountants to audit the Accounts of the Party annually and present the reports of the audited accounts at their respective Congress (PDP Constitution, 2006).

Article 25: Amendments;

(A) No amendment to the Party Constitution shall be valid except made at the National Convention.
(B) i. The Party shall have the power to amend the Party Constitution provided that no amendment of the Constitution shall be made except at the National Convention of the Party, and only by two-third (2/3rd) majority of members present and voting at the National Convention.
    ii. Notice of the proposed amendment shall be given to the National Secretary at least to months before the date of the National Convention. The notice which shall be in writing shall contain a clear statement of the amendment sought and the reasons for same.
    iii. Notice of the amendment shall be given to the National Secretary who shall cause same to be circulated to the State branches of the Party for publication at least one month before the date of the Convention.

Article 26: Common Seal;

There shall be a common seal of the Party, which shall be in the custody of the Secretary of the National Board of Trustees.

Article 27: Contractual Liability;

Only National officers shall have the authority to bind the Party or to create any legal relationship. Any other person purporting to bind the Party shall produce a written authorization from one of the National Officers which shall indicate the events of that National Officer's authority.

The Party shall have perpetual succession and power, apart from its individual members, to acquire, hold and alienated property, enter into agreements and do all things necessary to carry out its aims and objectives and defend its members, its property and its reputation (PDP Constitution, 2006) .

Article 28: Oath of Office;

Every person elected or appointed, as an officer of the Party shall subscribe to the Oath of Office as provided in Schedule 1 & 2 to this Constitution, in the language that he understands before a Commissioner for Oaths or Notary Public.

Article 29: Interpretation;

In this Constitution:

(a) Any question as to the meaning of any section of this Constitution or the schedule hereto shall be referred to the national Executive Committee whose interpretation of the same shall be final.
(b) Funds include valuable properties.
(c) Any reference to the masculine gender shall be deemed to include the feminine gender.
(d) Party means, PEOPLES DEMOCRATIC PARTY.
(e) "Month" means, "Calendar Month"
(f) Where computation of any figure in this Constitution results in a fraction, the figure obtained shall be rounded up to the nearest whole number.
(g) "Youth" meant a member between the ages of 18 and 40 years.
(h) The Party shall be a body corporate with perpetual succession and a common seal and may sue or be sued in its corporate name.

Schedule 1. Oath of allegiance;

I, _____ do solemnly swear/affirm that I shall be faithful and bear true allegiance to the PEOPLES DEMOCRATIC PARTY. I shall discharge my duties to the best of my ability, faithfully and in accordance with the Constitution of the Party and always "in the interest of the integrity, solidarity, advancement, well-being and prosperity of the Party and the Federal Republic of Nigeria; that I will strive to pursue, enhance and achieve the aims and objectives of the party as contained in its Constitution and Manifesto; that I shall not allow my personal interest to influence my Official decision; that in all circumstances I shall do right to all the members and organs of the Party and to all manner of people, (according to law without fear or favour, affection or ill-will; that I shall not directly or indirectly communicate or reveal to any person any matter which shall be brought to my attention or which shall become known to me as an officer of the Party, except as may be required for the due discharge of my duties, and that I shall devote myself to the service and well-being of the people of Nigeria. So help me God (PDP Constitution, 2006).

Schedule 2. Staff Rules;

i. Employees of the Party shall be subject to the direct control and discipline of the National, Zonal, State, Local Government Area and Ward Secretariat of the Party. Appeal on matters of discipline and routine administrative matters shall lie with the Chairman at the various levels.
ii. All employees of the Party shall be bound by the Constitution, Rules and regulations of the Party and decisions of the National Executive Committee and other authorized organs of the Party. A person who seeks and obtains employment in the Party shall be deemed to be a member of the Party.
iii. Any employee of the Party who acts in a manner likely to bring contempt or ridicule to the Party or its officers or takes part in subversive activity against the Party or its officers shall, if found guilty, be immediately relieved of his post. Erring employees shall be afforded ample opportunity to defend themselves before disciplinary action is taken against them.
iv. The remuneration and other conditions of service of employees shall be determined as follows:
    a. For National Officers (employees) by the National Convention on the recommendation of the National Executive Committee.
    b. For the State Officers (employees) by the State Congress on the recommendation of the State Executive Committees.
    c. For the Local Government Area and Ward Officers (employees) by the Local Government Area Congress on the recommendation of the Local Government Executive Committees.
    d. No employee of the Party shall seek nomination to enable him contest any election unless he resigns his appointment one month to the date of elections.

Schedule 3. Language to be used in Meetings;

The Proceedings of a Party meeting at all levels of the Party shall be in English Language or any Nigerian Language understood by a majority of members at the respective level. All meetings shall be chaired by the Chairman or his Deputy at the relevant level. In the event of the absence of the Chairman and his deputy, members present shall elect a member from themselves to preside over the meeting. Rules and Regulations governing the conduct of any meeting shall be approved from time to time by the National Executive Committee (PDP Constitution, 2006 as ammended).

Schdule 4. Change of Leadership of the Party

a. Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) has provided in its constitution how change in Leadership can be effected peacefully. National convention being the supreme organ of the party has powers to change National Leadership either through normal election or through a vote of no confidence.

b. The power to convene a National convention is vested in the National Executive committee whose National Chairman and National Secretary are given the responsibilities of summoning and issuing of notices for meeting of the National Convention.

c. Membership of the NEC which is the Executive organ of the party is made up of National Officers of the party, State Chairman, President and Vice- President, President of the Senate the Speaker of the House of Representatives and State Governors. While National Officers of the party are expected to renew their mandate at the convention if they so desire, the elected political office holders will continue to be members of the NEC throughout their tenure of office (PDP Constitution; 2006).

APPENDIX 21
The Manifesto of the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP)

The original edition of the manifesto is a twenty eight (28) pages booklet with thirty one (31) provisions covering the following issues:

32. Resolution on party formation
33. Political objectives of the party
34. Indivisibility of the Nigeria polity
35. The judiciary and the administration of justice
36. Economy
37. Agriculture
38. Rural development
39. Industrialisation
40. Health
41. Education
42. Science and Technology
43. Defence
44. Transport
45. Communication
46. Internal Security
47. Energy
48. Water Supply
49. Labour Employment and Wages
50. Natural Resources
51. Iron and Steel
52. Youth and Sports
53. Nigerian Culture
54. Women
55. Human Rights
56. Environmental Obligations
57. Civil Service
58. Traditional Rulers
59. Housing
60. Tourism
61. Land and,
62. Foreing Policy

Rural Development:

The Party shall be committed to the following objectives:

a. Integrated Rural Development;
b. Reduction in the level of rural poverty;
c. Reversal of rural-urban migration;
d. Re-introduction and expansion of extension services in the rural areas; and
e. Expansion of mass literacy programs, development of rural roads, water supply, community healthcare, electrification and communications.

To achieve these, the party shall:

a. Encourage the establishment of small-scale and cottage industries;
b. Increase funding for integrated rural development programs;
c. Improve in the co-operative society micro-credit system in the rural areas; and
d. Co-operate with NGOs and multi-lateral agencies in the empowerment of rural communities.

Health Objectives

The party shall present a comprehensive healthcare policy for the country, the essential aim of which shall be:

a. Healthcare for all citizens;
b. Free medical services in all institutions of learning; and
c. Free medical services to the aged and the handicapped.

To achieve these, PDP shall:

a. Ensure that all Nigerians, particularly the young and the aged, shall have access to free medical services.

b. Provide free immunization to all children;
c. Progressively establish primary health centres, equipped with pharmacies, within the reach of every Nigerian, particularly the rural dwellers;
d. Progressively provide General Hospitals in all Local Government Headquarters; and specialist hospitals in all State Capitals;
e. Encourage research into traditional medical practices and integrate these practices into the orthodox medical system;
f. Equip and expand the Teaching Hospitals in the country;
g. Embark on a mass training of paramedical personnel to meet the needs of our populace;
h. Encourage more students to train as medical doctors;
i. Provide special incentives for medical practitioners and other medical personnel with particular emphasis on those located in remote areas;
j. Stimulate the local production of medical drugs and other supplies;
k. Encourage family planning by providing family planning services and materials free of charge;
l. Regulate private hospitals, medical clinics, and pharmacies to protect Nigerians against exploitation, and
m. Make and enforce stringent laws against the manufacturing and sale of fake and adulterated drugs; and promote a healthy physical environment by intensifying the present periodic environmental sanitation exercises.

Education:

Education is an important social instrument for national unity amongst the diverse peoples of Nigeria. The party in government shall:

(a) Ensure that the educational system is improved upon;
(b) Ultimately provide free, functional education at all levels;
(c) Integrate into the formal education system the political education of the citizenry with emphasis on the provisions of the Constitution of the state and democratic principles;
(d) Foster and expand education at all levels and fields of knowledge; and Encourage private and voluntary organisations to establish schools subject to compliance and adherence to existing government policies.

To achieve these, PDP shall pursue the following:

(a) Promotion of pre-primary education by encouraging the establishment of private Nursery Schools in such a way that every Nigerian child shall have the opportunity to start education at the nursery level;
(b) Provision of:
  (i) Free and compulsory primary education;
  (ii) Free and compulsory junior secondary education; and
  (iii) Free qualitative senior secondary education.
(c) Expansion of the Unity School System as models and as instruments of fostering national unity;
(d) Greater involvement of private individuals and agencies in the delivery of education services, subject to government regulation;
(e) Establishment of adult and continuing education centres to promote mass literacy among Nigerians;
(f) Provision of technical educational institutions with well-equipped workshops and adequate and well-trained teachers;
(g) Encouragement of the establishment of private universities, polytechnics and colleges of education subject to government regulation;
(h) Adequate funding of university education;
(i) Raising of the social and economic status of educational personnel through improved conditions of services;
(j) Free university education for all students of science, technology and medicine;
(k) Provision of Federal Government Scholarships on merit;
(l) Provision of library, laboratory and workshop facilities in all schools and colleges;
(m) Encouragement and promotion of the running of consultancy units in all Universities;
(n) Guaranteeing of full academic freedom in the university system;
(o) Encouragement of entrepreneurs to provide the hostel accommodation affordable to university students;
(p) Aggressive training of teaching personnel and enforcement of the requirement that the National Certificate in Education shall be the minimum qualification for primary school teachers;
(q) Provision of special facilities for the schooling of the children of nomads; and
(r) Provision of adequate educational facilities and manpower for the handicapped.

Internal Security:

Objectives of the party shall include:

(i) Promotion of policies aimed at guaranteeing security of lives and safety of property.
(ii) Ensuring discipline, probity and accountability among security agents.
(iii) Improving police-community relations.
(iv) Promotion of professionalism within the police, prisons and other security agencies.

To achieve these, PDP shall:

PDP government shall endeavor to stem the wave of violent crimes in the country by:

(a) Equipping the Nigeria Police Force with modern equipment;
(b) Providing more and relevant professional training opportunities to the Force, at local and international training institutions;
(c) Motivating the Police Force with enhanced conditions and environments of service;
(d) Providing enlightenment and educational program about the actual roles of the Police and their relationship with the civil society;
(e) Providing enlightenment programs for the public on how to complement the work of members of the Police Forces, and Re-organising the prison system to ensure:
    i. Decongestion of prisons and improved accommodation for inmates; and
    ii. The provision of more positive rehabilitation programs.

Energy:

It shall be the goal of the PDP Government to supply electricity to all cities, towns, villages and settlements in Nigeria, and encourage private participation in the search for and use of alternative sources of environmentally sustainable energy.

To achieve these, PDP shall:

(a) Involve the private sector in the generation and distribution of energy;
(b) Equip and motivate the National Electricity Power Pic to more effectively play its leading role in the energy sector;
(c) Maintain and equip the country's energy generation and distribution plants to enable them supply uninterrupted energy for industrial and domestic use;
(d) Promote the supply of energy through the solar system;
(e) Intensify the implementation of rural electricity supply schemes; and
(f) Ensure the linking of all Local Government Headquarters to the National Grid.

Water Supply:

Objectives of the party here shall be:

(a) To provide the people of Nigeria drinking water in urban, semi-urban and rural areas;
(b) To provide water for large stock needs of the country; and
(c) To provide surface water for irrigation.

To achieve these, PDP shall adopt the following strategies:

(b) The tapping of underground water; and
(c) The protection of domestically usable surface water against pollution and contamination.

PDP shall therefore:

(a) Ensure the supply of potable water to a!! urban and rural communities in the country;
(b) To construct dams for irrigation, hydro-electric energy and treatment plants;
(c) To ensure the introduction of water and sanitation program throughout the country; and
(d) Encourage the local production of water treatment chemicals.