Abstract

The paper examines the consequences of lack of internal party democracy which exists in Nigeria's Fourth Republic political parties and the implication it portends for its party politics and democratic stability. Data were gathered from secondary sources and the information gathered were analysed under various themes. The paper contends that Nigeria's Fourth Republic political parties are not adequately internally democratic and this negates their inclination to become institutionalised and also circumscribe them from performing their democratic roles. Internal party democracy in parties inclines them towards institutionalisation and to perform their democratic roles effectively. If internal democracy is enhanced in Nigeria, political parties will be more relevant to the democratic process. It is recommended that all political parties should strive to promote internal democratic activities.

Keywords: Political parties, internal party democracy, Democratic consolidation, Fourth Republic, Nigeria

Introduction

The return of Nigeria to democratic rule in 1999 was preceded by the emergence of several political parties. It is a well known fact that the functions of political parties are essential to the realization of true democracy (Ibeanu, 2013). Some of the key tasks that political parties are expected to play in a democracy are: to solicit and make comprehensive salient public policy and public needs as well as problems recognized by members and supporters, enlightening electorates and citizens on the workings of the political and electoral process and engender general political norms, moderate contradictory demands and change them into public policies, encourage and organize citizens into taking part in political resolution and convert their beliefs into feasible policy alternatives, directing public views from governed to the government, to recruit and train candidates preparatory for public engagements, among others.

However, the ability of the political parties in Nigeria's Fourth Republic to perform their democratic roles have been hampered by the inability or refusal of these political parties to subscribe and adhere to the basic tenets of internal party democracy. The lack of internal party democracy, which was manifested in some measures in the previous republics, rare its head within the parties of the Fourth Republic. Even the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) observed in its report on the 2007 elections (INEC 2007:91) that Nigeria's political parties lack basic liberal and internal structures that could sustain a vibrant and fast-growing democratic culture. Leaders of these parties chose to run them as personal enterprises, with no regards for their parties' constitutions on election of party leadership and selection of candidates for other elections. The political parties exhibit monumental disregard for the rules and regulations that govern the process of nomination.

A famous assertion that has featured in the republic against this background is that parties cannot give what they do not have and that undemocratic parties cannot deliver or preside...
over democratic construction, not to talk of
making fundamental inputs to democratic
consolidation. An essential element in
promoting free and fair elections in the country
is the free and fair conduct of party
nominations. Most elections are ‘rigged’ before
they occur because candidates are eliminated
through various methods. These include
subverting party constitution and rules, the use
of thugs, corrupting party officials to
disqualify, or annul the nomination of some
candidates and other illegal methods of
distorting the wishes of the electorates.

Nigerian political parties have been bedevilled
by many challenges as a result of their level of
internal democracy, thus undermining their
expected roles in consolidating its fledgling
democracy (Alfa et al, 2017). This is more so
given the fact the state of internal party
democracy in the Fourth Republic parties has a
direct link with party institutionalization and
democratic consolidation (Omotola, 2009).

The failure of the political parties to ensure
equity in the election of those to represent
them often results in electoral malpractices
during elections (Ojukwu & Olaifa, 2011).
There is abundance of evidence that many
Nigerians are of the view that internal party
democracy enhances the integrity of elections
and improve the worth of leadership, political
stability, legitimacy and economic progress

Political parties in Nigeria rarely adopt
transparent processes that would enable party
members to partake in the decision making and
at the same time provide them unrestrained
opportunity to contest in elections that would
have afforded them the opportunity to be
elected as their party’s candidates (Mbah,
2011). Since 1999, Nigeria has experienced
bitter and rancorous struggles within the
parties and violent internal party relations
(Tenuche, 2011; Adesote& Abimbola, 2014;
Yusuf, 2015).

Internal party conflicts are caused mainly by
the greed of the political elites for political
power in their overzealous quest to have access
to primitive capital accumulation (Omoweh,
2012). This ugly practice in the way and
manner political parties operate retard
democratic consolidation. This is the antithesis
of the critical roles political parties are expected
to play in the democratic process. The
powerful individuals in the parties always
control their internal operations (Adejumobi,
2007). As a matter of fact, since 1999, Nigeria
has witnessed growing and disturbing
undemocratic conduct of political parties.
These include the application of undemocratic
methods in nominating party flag bearers
during primary elections (IDEA, 2007,
Omilusi, 2013).

The lack of internal party democracy in the
nomination of party candidates for election
weakens party unity and institutionalization,
and negatively affects party cohesiveness and
democratic consolidation in Nigeria. It leads to
fragmentation of parties and anti-party
activities. It also opens up litigation struggles
beclouding the electoral process. It reduces the
commitment of party stalwarts and those of
their supporters which negatively affects party
cohesion, stability and performance. In other
words, the absence of internal party democracy
in Nigerian political parties has led to internal
party disputes, war of attrition, reproach,
acrimony, coordination dilemma, cross-
carpeting among others (Yusuf, 2015).

Conceptualizing Internal Party Democracy
There is no intellectual agreement among
scholars on what internal party democracy
implies. However, consensus exists among
several scholars on some basic principles of the
concept. These include electivity, transparency,
accountability, participation, inclusivity and
representation (Mimpen, 2007). Internal party
democracy implies parties must be formed
bottom up and power should not be
concentrated but dispersed to give every
member and/supporter a sense of belonging
(Cular, 2004). It ensures support for the
promotion of the interest of the party not only
by its members, but also by the general public
and the state (Okhaide, 2012).

A party is said to be internally democratic if its
organizational structure is characterized by
participation and inclusiveness which are
catalysts of democratic consolidation (Okhaide,
2012). The first category entails the conduct of
free, fair credible and regular elections to fill
party official positions as well as those to be fielded as parties' candidates in the general elections. Secondly, it involves equal and open participation of all cadres of the party in the affairs of the party so much so that the interests of all and sundry are well represented.

Internal party democracy is a broad concept that describes a variety of processes for the inclusion of members in internal party deliberation and decision-making. It implies democracy within the party and the degree to which a party subscribes to and adheres to the basics and universally acclaimed democratic principles (Scarrow, 2005). According to Mimpen (2007), two essential instruments of internal party democracy abound; the first entails organising free, fair and periodic elections of internal party positions and candidates for representative offices. Secondly, there must be equal and open participation of all the members and groups in such a manner that would ensure that their interests are fairly represented (Scarrow, 2005).

Inclusiveness is another major hallmark of internal party democracy. This implies the broadness of the party's decision-making circle. In the view of Scarrow (2005), inclusiveness guarantees equal participation of all members of the party in taking important decisions like the choice of party leadership and nomination of candidates to fly the party's flags in general elections. Consequently, more inclusive parties would present the platform for open deliberation before the time for actual decision making processes (Hofmeister & Grabow, 2011).

The third hallmark is the degree of party institutionalisation. This implies the extent to which internal decisions and processes are formalised, as well as, the extent to which the party's collaborative structures pervade its target constituency. Internally democratic parties are characteristically institutionalised due to the fact that the rule of participation are required in order to ascertain those who are qualified to participate and how people can emerge as winners in the party's internal elections (Matlosa, 2004, Mersel, 2006, Mimpen, 2007).

A number of scholars have advanced some features of internal party democracy in the relationship between the party and the members on the one hand and that of the party structure and institutions on the other (Scarrow, 2005, Mimpen, 2007, Mbah, 2011). These characteristics include: the capacity of the party members to elect the party leaders or dissolve the leadership and their ability to elect those to be nominated into public offices, equal as well as proportional representation of minorities within the party and majority rule voting, the ability of members to exercise substantial influence on the party's platform and agenda, safeguarding the liberty of the party members including the right not to be expelled without fair-hearing; the right to have access to the information and transparency of the management of the party particularly as it pertains to fiscal accountability, freedom of expression and association within the party especially as it relates to formation of factions; and last but not least, provision for independent judicial review of intra-party democracy (Mersel, 2006).

Hofmeister & Gabrow (2011) outlined the following merits of the observance of the principles of internal party democracy:

1. It promotes the participation of the entire members in the internal affairs of the party.
2. It makes it possible for the members to express their views within the party.
3. It enhances active participation of the subgroups such as women, physically challenged, youths, minorities, etc.
4. Tolerance and accommodation of divergent opinions in as much as they are within the ambience of the basic programs of the party.
5. Adherence to the rules and regulations for the participation of members and intraparty decision-making processes.

6. The party leadership exhibits respect in its dealings with the ordinary members of the party.

Another implication of internal party democracy is that the various groups within the party would be able to largely express their opinions and grievances publicly. A party should not discourage this out rightly even though it is an indication of weaknesses for the party not to be able to mitigate open confrontation (Kristina, 2011). In extreme cases, it is practically possible for the differences between the politicians to assume a dimension that could becloud the programmatic foresight of the party. Internal differences could refine political deliberations. It could also reinforce the party if it does not stifle it in the name of enforcing its quest for unity.

Intra-party democracy is desirable because it enhances political egalitarianism by providing impartial ground in candidate selection and development of policies within the party, facilitates legitimate control of government by extending democratic ideals such as accommodation, transparency and accountability to party structures and organisations and enhances the standard of public debate through the entrenchment of inclusive and deliberative practices within political parties (Gauja, 2006).

The lack of internal party democracy in Nigeria’s Fourth Republic political parties have caused certain political developments which in turn have had serious consequences for democratic stability and consolidation. Some of the fall outs of the phenomenon are as follows:

**Paucity of Ideology**

Ideologies are significant for political parties. Ideologies “are comprehensive visions of societies and social developments, which contain explanations, values, and goals for past, present and future developments” (Hofmeister & Grabow, 2011). Ideologies give inspiration and justification to political and social action. They are a crucial instrument for political orientation.

Political parties are pivotal to the institutionalization of democracy (Lamidi & Bello, 2012). As such, political parties provide candidates, set the parameters of issues to be presented during periodic elections. The role of political parties include stimulation of the citizenry to develop increased interest in election and government activities, defining the current political matters and determine most rational choices, presenting candidates with the readiness to take issue-based decisions (Janda, 2006).

For parties to be positioned to carry out the above responsibilities, they must be propelled by distinctive ideologies which markets them to the electorates and distinguish them from one another (Lamidi & Bello, 2012). Ideology, therefore, remains a critical hallmark of political parties. A party ideology is the moral system that enshrine the sanctity of and promise between the parties and the electorates. It is an embodiment of political doctrines that give rise to political actions which give the citizens the options from which to choose how they wish to be governed (Simbine, 2004).

Ideology is a crucial part of politics because it is a veritable tool for the management of conflict, self identification, effective political mobilization and provision of legitimacy (Nnoli, 2003). The party manifesto and the strategies for their actualization are embedded in the ideology. Consequent upon this, Simbine (2005) suggested that it is imperative that parties and their programs reflect the ideological disposition which they intend to hinge their government to enable the electorates pre-empt the direction of the government and decide their line of action. When a party lacks ideology, it becomes difficult for it to organise the position of their members on political matters.

From the beginning of the Fourth Republic, the composition of the parties were a reflection of strange political bed fellows with divergent ideological wave-length. As such, the founding fathers were enmeshed in perennial internal party stalemate (Alfa, et al, 2017). The composition of the parties departs radically from what is known in the extant literature and the activities of the parties manifested them as
mere political tools for transition from the military era to civil rule (Omotola, 2009).

From the emergence of the first three political parties in the Fourth Republic, (PDP, AD& APP, later ANPP), it was apparent that the parties were bereft of ideologies (Omotola, 2009).

The Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) was seen as a conglomerate of politicians with different ideological leanings, that is the conservatives, radicals and the progressives who were constantly engaged in intraparty imbroglio. The Alliance for Democracy (AD) was a pro-Yoruba party, formed with the intrinsic goal of returning power to the South West while the All Peoples Party (APP, later the All Nigeria Peoples Party, ANPP) was a crop of politicians most of whom served under the regime of the late General Sani Abacha (Adebayo, 2008). This accounted for the widespread internal party dissent which surpassed the preceding political epochs (Olaniyan, 2009). It is revealing that the conflict resolution approach of the parties are not proactive because it is not vigorously pursued.

The Nigerian state is perceived as a conduit pipe for primitive capital accumulation by the parties that assume power while it stifles competition for leadership positions by all members (Tenuche, 2011, Lamidi & Bello, 2012). Domingo & Nwankwo (2010) asserted that the People’s Democratic Party (PDP) does not look like a party with strong ideological identity, but has been viewed as a “centrist” party that “operates more as a catch all organization that houses a range of political positions”. The party’s influence over time was based on its incumbency factor and the concomitant access to state resources and power (Alfa et al, 2017).

The politicians became constantly entangled in the tussle to control the party machineries, with the founding fathers displaying monumental dictatorial tendencies (Simbine, 2004). Some members of the party saw the parties as their personal properties and dictated the tune of events in the party.

As Simbine (2004) observed, the intraparty quagmire in the PDP led to the proliferation of unstable factions and caucuses with many party stalwarts parading themselves as Board of Trustees (BOT), elders or party leaders. The clash of interest between these factions resulted in frequent change in leadership. Within the time frame of 11 years, six persons chaired the PDP and none of them completed his tenure before being removed unceremoniously (Lamidi & Bello, 2002).

Since the parties lack ideological bases, they merely engage in cheap publicity and the party bigwigs demonstrated abysmal quest to satisfy their selfish interest (Simbine, 2005). The absence of ideologies make the politicians to act like political bats in their quest to change their party affiliations (Aina, 2002). The paucity of ideologies has also led to legislative-executive rifts despite the fact that the ruling parties at any given time (the PDP & APC) have had overwhelming majority in the National Assembly (Lamidi & Bello, 2002).

In view of the above, Adejumobi & Kehinde (2007:10) lamented thus: "First, it also led the attention and energies of the main actors within the parties, diverting their focus from urgently needed internal organisation and planning for elections. Second, it reinforced the non adherence to due process and rule of law...Third, it created fear, apprehension and tension in the political environment and decelerating preparations for the elections. Fourth, it created an uneven playing field for actors between and within political parties".

The operations of the Fourth Republic political parties, particularly the PDP and the APC indicate that they do not have any ideological inclination that could inspire them to contribute fundamentally to internal party democracy, party institutionalization and democratic consolidation. As a result, their manifestos are devoid of ideological flavour (Adejumobi & Kehinde, 2007). This robs them of the core values that could give the electorates the political basis to lend their support and attract their votes.

The flag bearers of the parties rarely hinge their campaigns on national development. Rather, they are based on the personality of the candidates. There is no marked ideological distinction between the registered political parties and as such they could be classified as
"catch-all" parties (Omilusi, 2015; Alfa et al, 2017).

The political parties manifest anti-democratic posture and fail to carry out membership drive and voter education. The parties play "stomach politics" rather than "ideological politics" and are mere "opportunistic contraptions". These kind of parties create democratic deficits rather than democratic dividends. It is practically impossible to have democracy without genuine, committed democrats and an electorate unencumbered by lack of necessities for existence (Lamidi & Bello, 2012).

Defection

Before and in the early years of Nigeria’s independence, ethnic and religious affinities were the key factors that led to defection (Okpu, 1985, Osaghae, 2000). Awofeso & Irabor (2016: 34) assert "in 1951, when the first cross-carpeting episode occurred in Nigeria, the Yoruba members of the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons (NCNC) were lobbied to cross over to the Action Group (AG) to stop Dr Nnamdi Azikiwe, an Igbo man from becoming the Premier of the Western Region". Another factor that caused defection in the First Republic was the personality clash between the leaders of the political parties and the various factions. In the aborted Third Republic, it became palpable that the state had become more notorious in its status as an instrument for primitive capital accumulation. Hence, people defect to parties to gain access to state wealth and milk it dry (Ekekwe, 1986; Sodeine, 2009). In the Fourth Republic, therefore, the protracted military rule that preceded it led to a great deal of indiscretion in the behaviour of politicians. As such, party rules were being blatantly flouted (Oviasuyi, 2006).

The formation of APC in 2013 led to a lot of defection from the then ruling PDP due to intraparty disaffection among the members. This also led the emergence of a PDP faction known as the new PDP (nPDP led by the former leader of the party, Abubakar Baraje. The coming to power of the APC government increased the tempo of defection into its camp since 2015 (Awofeso & Irabor, 2016).

Since the return to democracy in 1999, Nigeria has encountered a plethora of cross-carpeting by politicians which obviously transcend the magnitude experienced in the previous dispensations (Baiyeju, 2012). The trend has become a recurring decimal at party meetings and rallies and includes both the executive and legislative branches across the political divide (Omilusi, 2015). The spate of defections pose serious implication for democratic politics. It aptly demonstrates that the politicians see parties as tools for wealth accumulation (Mbah, 2011).

These trend of 'political prostitution' is worrisome as defection has remained the bane of party institutionalization and democratic consolidation in Nigeria (Elomba, 2010). As Mbah (2011:6) bemoaned, "it becomes dubious when politicians begin to mortgage their consciences as well as seek to pursue their private and selfish interest in the name of cross-carpeting". The rate and nature of defection contrasts sharply with the ones in advanced democracies which are anchored on principles rather than selfish interest. Consequently, the electorates are left to choose between parties on the basis of personality, ethnic affiliation, religious inclination among other primordial sentiment (Omotola, 2010).

Nigerian political parties comprise of members whose opinions are in sharp contrast and this accounts for lack of party discipline. Thus, the parties are prone to cracks and excessive defection undermining the democratic process (Aina, 2002). The defections are sometimes propelled by the quest to get an opportunity to contest election. The rate of defection are so alarming and have negative implications for the party institutionalization and democratic consolidation (Chang, 2009).

The feeling by politicians that opposition politics is not rewarding propel them to easily defect to the ruling parties (Fashagba, 2014). Those in opposition parties are often subjected to discrimination by the ruling party and are often subjected to discrimination by those in the ruling parties. Hence, the politicians prefer defection to continuous dehumanising experience. The defectors are in search of economic power which accompanies political power. As (Omilusi, 2015:5) puts it "...the
possession of state power leads directly to economic power and who holds position in the power structure determine the location and distribution of economic resources and political rewards”.

**Godfatherism**

The activities of godfathers undermine the efficiency of the parties in the discharge of their responsibilities. It reduces political participation and at times creates political apathy or alienation (Lamidi & Bello, 2002). The godfathers impose their preferred candidates on the party with the aim of using those candidates as agents in siphoning the wealth of the state at all levels of governance (Omotola, 2007).

According to IDEA (2007:7) "political ‘godfathers’ play a major role in internal party politics. Parties have formal procedures for the election of their leaders but these procedures are often disregarded; when they are adhered to, the godfathers have means of determining the outcomes”.

The role of money on the political scene and vote buying in Nigeria's party politics has placed the country at the capricious whims of the political elites through buying of political positions for themselves and their cronies (Adamu, Ocheni & Ibrahim, 2016).

In this kind of scenario, the realization of the dividends of democracy becomes remote and the prospects of democratic governance become circumscribed. This questions the legitimacy of the leaders who emerge through such manipulative process (ICG, 2007).

Several studies have unveiled gross breach of the parties' constitutions, unilateral funding of political parties and godfatherism (Omilusi, 2013). The overbearing influence of the national leader of the APC Ahmed Tinubu is a classical example in focus (Oketola & Falodi, 2015). Only candidates whose ambition had the blessing of the party leaders and godfathers could actualise their ambition (Alfa, et al, 2017).

**Political Violence**

The high incidences of political violence in the Fourth Republic calls for serious concern. This discourages people from exercising their franchise as a result of intimidation and politically motivated killings believed to have been masterminded by the politicians (Tenuche, 2011). In some instances, these are believed to be the handiwork of people who were believed to have been short-changed during the parties' primary elections and other internal party affairs (Alfa et al, 2017). Moreover, most of the ruling elites of the Fourth Republic like many of their predecessors are "corrupt, self-centred, incompetent, kleptomaniac, ideologically and morally bankrupt, visionless, intolerant, autocratic, dishonest, naive, opportunistic, and parochial" (Aliu, 2014: 7).

Elections have been marred by violence since the commencement of the Nigerian Fourth Republic. The 1999, 2003, 2007 elections were characterised by ballot box snatching, politically-motivated killings, bombings, brutalization, intimidation of voters, arson, and kidnapping of electoral officials (Omotola, 2009). For instance, Ogbonna Uche Ogbonnaya, the flag bearer of the opposition All Nigeria Peoples Party was assassinated on February 8, 2003 (Smah, 2008). Also, on July 2006, Funsho Williams, a People’s Democratic Party governorship aspirant for Lagos state was killed (Omotola, 2009). More than 300 people were killed in the widespread violence that marred the 2007 state and national elections (Human Rights Watch, 2007). Furthermore, the 2011 presidential election was marred by an unprecedented post electoral violence, particularly in the far North where supporters of Muhammadu Buhari, the presidential candidate of the Congress for Progressive Change (CPC) kicked against the outcome of the election leading to the death of several citizens. This has serious negative consequences for democratic consolidation.

**Consensus Candidacy and Abuse of Incumbency**

Consensus candidacy is one the mechanisms adopted by the political parties to nominate their candidates in the Fourth Republic which has great potentials for undermining the tenets of internal party democracy and by implication, democratic consolidation. In this regards, the party leader use various devices to foreclose
the possibility of the emergence of other candidates apart from the preferred candidate(s) who are, more often than not, are the incumbents (Alfa et al, 2017). Prior to the party conventions, the machinery of the party is thrown behind such a candidate and the convention or congress becomes merely ceremonies for the ratification of such candidacy. A typical example was the emergence of President Goodluck Jonathan as the sole candidate of the PDP in the 2015 elections. This situation enormously caused great cracks and division in the party and estranged some members particularly those of Northern extraction like Adamu Ciroma, former President Ibrahim Babangida among others (Adeniyi, 2017).

Closely linked to the above is the employment of the incumbency factor by the chief executives of the government at the various levels. These are the President at the national level, the Governors at the state levels and the council chairmen at the local government levels. Through the instrumentalities of the apparatus of the state, the incumbents manipulate the political process and influence the emergence of themselves or their favoured candidates. This has been a bane of party unity and cohesion in the Fourth Republic with the resultant intraparty crises.

Classical examples include the role played by the former President Olusegun Obasanjo in the emergence of the late President Umaru Musa Yar’Adua in 2007 and that played by former Governor Ibrahim Idris of Kogi State in the emergence of Governor Idris Wada in Kogi State in 2011 (Aleyomi, 2013, Adeniyi, 2017; Alfa et al, 2017).

Zoning

In the quest to give every geographical area at the national, state and local levels the opportunity to govern, the political parties invented the zoning formula to allow for alternation of power among the constituent parts.

While this does not give room for all interested persons to aspire as desired because of the motive for its invention, the incumbents and some party leaders abandon the formula in other to pursue their own ambition. For instance, after the demise of President Yar’Adua in 2010, there was an agreement by the stakeholders in the PDP that his Vice, Goodluck Jonathan who succeeded him, and be allowed to contest for presidency in the 2011 elections but should not re-contest in 2015 in order to allow power return to the North. However, Goodluck Jonathan jettisoned the agreement and re-contested in 2015, a situation which, as mentioned earlier, caused great defection and anti-party sentiment and ultimately led to the defeat of the PDP by the APC in the 2015 elections. (Adeniyi, 2017)

In the PDP of today, all known rules of democracy have been thwarted. The party does not care a hoot about the processes of election or selection. In the party, it is not the people that make choice; it is the few who have seized the instruments of power that impose their will on the people. If democracy is to throw open the polity for mass participation in political affairs, the PDP has shrunk the political space, thus making democracy look like a closed shop (Agbaje & Adejumobi, 2006).

Conclusion

From the above, it is evident that the lack of internal party democracy has caused profound instability in party politics in Nigeria’s Fourth Republic, retards the prospects of party institutionalization and negated the quest for democratic consolidation.

There is no doubt of course that political parties are very essential elements in multiparty democracy. They play fundamental roles in the building and sustenance of democracy. However, since it is elusive to give what one does not have, it is incumbent on the political parties to embrace the tenets of internal party democracy in order to be well positioned to contribute meaningfully to the building and consolidation of democracy.

Conclusion

For Nigerian political parties to be well positioned to contribute fundamentally to democratic consolidation, they should be overhauled to give citizens the opportunity to freely elect those who represent them, compete freely for leadership positions. Effective institutions should be put in place (or existing
ones be reinforced) to protect the democratic principles of consolidation which includes tolerance, accountability, transparency and efficiency.

Internal reforms in the parties should be carried out with emphasis on party discipline, cohesiveness and the adherence to the tenets of internal party democracy by all political parties. Such reforms should also entail regulation and control of party finance. The entrenchment of internal party democracy requires the political socialization of political actors at both the elite and mass levels to make them democratic in orientation and actions, for democracy cannot be built without democrats.

Internal party democracy should be observed in the affairs of parties particularly in their processes of candidate selection or nomination. The primaries of the party should be conducted in a credible and transparent manner. These steps will go a long way in reducing the threats posed by dearth of internal party democracy to democratic consolidation in Nigeria’s Fourth Republic and beyond.

References


Ibeanu, O (2013) Regulating Nigerian Political Parties: Role of Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC); Being a paper presented at the National Conference on Political Parties and the Future of Nigeria, organised by the National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS), Kuru.

IDEA (2007) Political Parties in Africa: Challenges for Sustained Multiparty Democracy, Africa Regional Based on research and dialogue with political parties,


