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Abstract
Development does not take place in a vacuum but in a society of people with cultural practices. Culture is an all-embracing entity, a vehicle to total development. The basis of development is culture and any nation that aims at progress without its culture is only deceiving itself by engaging in self-immolation. Culture, when promoted and enhanced becomes the spring board for progress. The present systems of practice of politics with bitterness against certain ethnic groups are inimical to the development of the nation. It is against this background that this paper considers the culture of politics as the bane of development in Nigeria, where we shall adequately analyse our conceptual schemes in the direction of the challenges of our needs and interest. Through critical analysis we are able to subject our beliefs and social practices to the searching light of criticism and thus likely able to promote the kind of self-understanding that would provide some basis for determining the kind of socio-cultural reconstructions that would be required to attune Nigeria to changes in the environment and their existential demand. The primary concern of this paper is to appraise and reconstruct that there is an interface between culture, politics and development using a theoretical skill to elicit changes both in the sociological and mental outlook of Nigerians. This paper employs the analytic and critical method of philosophy with the view of showing the negative influence of culture of politics on the overall development of Nigeria. The central argument of this paper is that culture of politics from a negative standpoint is so high that every policy of government at different levels is assessed from the standpoint of its impacts on the wellbeing of particular ethnic groups rather than on the country as a whole. The paper concludes that Nigeria needs leaders that are sensitive, patriotic, accountable and imbued with demonstrable vision that can harness our cultural diversity for the progress of the nation in all ramifications.
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Introduction
Nigeria cultural diversity remains a treasure largely unexplored in her continued quest for national integration and ceaseless drive towards nation-building; yet from independence to date, it has been one story of hate and denigration of the nation’s cultural heritage. Worst hit are the Nigeria’s traditional languages which are increasingly going into extinction. On all fronts we appear to be losing our traditional sense of moderation; discarding our lifestyle for foreign ones. In place of our fading traditional institutions are alien socio-economic and political structures, whose organisation, disposition, values and orientation are often tailored to suit other peoples’ values and idiosyncrasies. Our economic, political systems and philosophies are largely a poor mimicry of those of the western society’s. We think nothing of adapting them to suit our peculiar situation. We have had to contend with a dying sense of communal life, a chaotic socio-political order, institutional fragility, systemic decay, economic disequilibrium, violence and perennial political instability. Specifically, the dilemma of the Nigerian politics borders on how to resolve the recurrent bickering, the menace of urban violence, political intolerance, desperation, rascality and assassinations, among other vices. From this scenario, it is clear that prebendal politics and the existence of an irrelevant state threaten our traditional way of life, our value system and, above all, our collective cultural heritage. Yet, we need to know that, there is no record yet in history of a real ‘nation born out of a cultural womb alien to it’ (Ayande, 77).
Nigeria lacks a viable “culture compass” and an ideology rooted in culture. It is therefore imperative that we re-create a worthy polity based on the culture and traditions of her people specifically tailored to her peculiarities, “in rational interaction with the dynamics of globalization” and on the underlying principles of the twenty-first century technologies. (Ayandele, 81) We are ultimately concerned with the Nigerian political economy and the need to organise production, distribution and exchange of services for societal harmony. Since culture is a way of life, there is an urgent need to reconcile its substance with the prevailing struggle and unhealthy contest for power and attendant disorder that has become the nature and character of our politics. Can we use culture to entrench a stabilising agent and effective tool for arresting the tide of poverty, unemployment and misery? Can we use culture to entrench progressive human development, enhance creativity and increase productivity for the common good which is the essence of what sustainable development is all about? This paper seeks to examine the core concept of culture, politics, and development with a view to discussing their inter-relatedness within the context of Nigeria.

**Conceptual Clarification Culture**

There are as many interpretation of this phenomenon as there are scholars and students. Although Ayandele E.A was apt in his conception of culture as “what man interposes between himself and his environment in order to ensure his security and survival”. Udu Yakubu's exposition on the substance of culture is broader. He suggests that; for human beings to build houses, cultivate farms, construct bridges, dams or electricity-generating plants, provide qualitative formal education, manage successful businesses, or organisations control population growth, prevent or cure sicknesses and diseases, ensure social trust, good governance, law and order etc. they need albeit critically receptive body of ideas and beliefs, designs, techniques and methodologies, rules and regulations, that is, a culture (Udu,2002:4). Again, an age–long but relevant definition of culture as a concept in contemporary discourse was espoused in 1897 by the English anthropologist E.B Taylor. He defines culture as that complex whole, which includes shared ideas, knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society. He reasoned that though culture is something that cannot be seen, heard, smelled, touched, or tasted, it has been in continuous existence for years. Implicitly, culture is very real, and so important that without it, human societies, human existence, would be quite impossible (As quoted by Bates and Julian, 1975: 23).

Alan P.Bate and Joseph Julian rightly observed that, it would result in a catastrophe if, by any means the prevailing culture of mankind was wiped out – yet leaving the human species biologically intact. But for culture- with globalization, information and communication technology-men would have lost all knowledge of even the basic means of survival such that, within a short time, the entire species would disappear forever. They therefore contend that it is only through a secure understanding of this concept of culture that we can have a good insight into its significance and appreciate its essence. Suffice to stress that culture cannot be transmitted biologically, hence can only be preserved from the past and transmitted into the future by learning. Characteristically therefore, culture entails all that people have learned and preserved from past collective experience. Quite remarkably, individuals in all culture-conscious societies spend years learning necessary minimum cultural heritage. It is generally agreed of course that the value, volume and complexity of culture grow with time, even though some parts of are lost or discarded in the process.

Culture encompasses the tangible and intangible as it also incorporates the subtotal of the material and immaterial tools, art work and work of art of a people and knowledge accumulated by the people. The peculiarity of a given culture is a function of its distinctiveness as it relates to its impact on the attitudes, aspirations, motivations, representations, skills, and behaviour of the people celebrating some and discarding others.
Suggestive of shared ideas, culture is meaningful only to that set of individuals who make it manifest in their relation with one other. Culture offers a 'summation and distillation' of the past that provides sound basis for living in the present and marching into the future. Therefore, viewing man comparatively in relation to other forms of life, culture becomes his primary 'means of survival and adaptation.' This perhaps distinguish man from other species (Bates, et. al. 1975:25). Culture is self-regulatory as it largely controls and guides social behaviour. It can be sustained and kept alive only by social behaviour. As behaviour often alters culture, culture always changes out of the inevitable departure of actual behaviour from what culture prescribes. it thus precedes and becomes attendant upon social behaviour (Bates, et. al, 1975:27). The centrality of the concept informs the development of a number of sub-concepts and vocabulary of terms Chief among these are: values, norms, and role. These are three variables that are instrumental to meaningful understanding of the relationship between culture and social behaviour as noted earlier.

Culture is conceived of as experience limited to a choice range of creative activities in society. Here culture is likened to dance, music, drama, painting sculpture and literary works, indigenous films, storytelling and sometimes culture sites, as they relate to their economic and tourism significance. There are certain characteristics of the human species which cut across all societies; these are the human person itself and its physiology, rites of passage, plants and animal life, kinship, communal, religious, and political systems and various features of existence and experience common to the human race. (Camilleri, 1986:26) Within this category a person is regarded as cultured only to the extent that he comports himself in a manner that meets certain minimum universal standard. Outside this but equally popular in literature is the culture of working, thinking and human relationships that appears to have been used to distinguish a certain category of people from the other. Simply put, the culture of a group of people is everything they do which is not strictly biological (Babawale, 2007:10). While it may be academically expedient to acknowledge these classifications (as in exhaustive as they are), it is practically necessary to add that any conceptualization of culture thus restricted in form or practice, as identified above cannot rise to the challenges of development. The reason for this is that it may be practically impossible to pursue development in any sphere of human experience without thinking and acting culture. This may have therefore been partly responsible for the disconnect between culture and developments in our national life.

Politics
We would examine some of the definitions of politics within the standpoints of our discourse; this is because there are definitions as there are scholars as well. According to Michael Curtis; “Politics is organised dispute about power and its use, involving choice among competing values, ideas, persons, interest and demands.”(Curtis, 1968:26) The manner in which power is obtained, exercised and controlled, the purpose for which it is used, the manner in decisions are made, the factors which influence the making of those decisions, and the context in which those decisions take place, are all reflective of the nature and character of politics in any country. In the words of David Easton, politics implies “authoritative allocation of values”. In plain language, politics is the struggle for power. It comes to play in a situation of conflicting wills and it involves rallying popularity, winning support and conciliating wills (Johari, 1987: 10). Geoffrey and Peter conceive of politics as involving everything like activity of the individuals and their groups, for the reconciliation of conflicting interests without undermining or destroying the a sense of security and participation among members of the community (Vernon and Dyke, 1962: 133) Thus, to a large extent, politics implies some kind of participatory governance. Within this context, a working definition of politics suggests the way in which group, organisation or society understands and orders its social affairs, especially as regards the allocation of scarce
resources, the principles underlying this task and the means by which some people or groups acquire and maintain a greater control over the situation than others.

Vernon V. Dyke insists, for example that an activity is political when it relates to a public issue, and it relates to a public issue when two conditions are met. First, it must relate to decision – making of a group, that is, it must concern group policy, group organisation or group leadership, or it must concern the regulation of group inter-relationships. Second, it must come within the realm of the controversial as Quincy Wright reasoned earlier. Similarly, for J. C Johari, politics is the integrating factor of civilised life. Every organisation is political in the sense that it must formulate, implement and evaluate policies for itself for harmonious intra or inter–group relations. Organisation is also political in the sense of being constituted by human beings. Given human sense of reasoning, misunderstanding and disagreements are bound to arise. In the natural process of reconciling these lies the inevitability of politics, the essence of which is built around a single purpose– the common good (Johari, 1987:42). The term politics has acquired a new meaning in the context of development, it hinges upon the political activity carried on in human environment, in time and space, and thus a product of economy, the society, history and geography. What appears basic to all these expositions are such variables as: struggles for power and over scarce resources; inevitability of controversy and possibility of chaos in the process; yet the end of sustainable politics must be geared towards the common good. We have attempted this clarification in order to have a clearer understanding of the issues at stake. Besides, through this exercise; we easily establish a nexus between culture and politics on the one hand and meaningful growth and development on the other.

**Development**

The concept “development” has its root from the French word “veloper” meaning “to wrap”. To develop therefore means to “un-wrap” or to change and become larger, stronger or more impressive, successful or advanced. Many liberal theorists see development as economic development, which could be determined in the terms of the growth of Gross National Products (GNP). Thus Meier defines development as “the maximization of the growth of GNP through capital accumulation and industrialization” (Meier, 1989:6). In this view point, development means change which “often follows a well-ordered sequence and exhibits common characteristics” (Thirlwill, 1979: 8). Therefore, for many liberal theorists, development means “the capacity of a national economy, whose initial economic condition has been more or less static to generate and sustain an annual increase in its Gross Natural Product (GNP) at rates of perhaps 5 to 7 percent or more” (Todaro, 1979: 87).

The notion of development in terms of Gross National Product is a one-sided and faulty assessment of development. Development entails more than the economic aspect of people lives. A significant development in a country like Nigeria must take into account man as a whole and not just an aspect of him. This supports the notion of subjecting development to multidisciplinary interpretation and usage, these various perceptions only contribute to showing the richness as well as the problems associated with the concept of development. The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) distinguishes between two sides of development. One is the formation of human capabilities and the other is the use people make of their acquired capabilities. This implies that development could be at the level of individual and also at the level of the society. At the level of the individual, development could be psychological, affective, intellectual, moral and spiritual. It could be also be physical material or economic. At the level of the society, development could be scientific and infrastructural technological and economic, social and political (Offor, 2014:97). Development is therefore a multi-layered phenomenon with a complex web of inter related associations. The question is therefore, which instrument or mode of governance is most
suitable for achieving such well-rounded development, described by Wiredu as one in which material advancement and social or moral development are mutually reinforcing?

Culture, Politics, and the Crises of Development in Nigeria.
The unfortunate developments in contemporary history in Nigeria have generated public concern about future of Nigerian federation as a political entity. Quite disturbing is escalating regime of violent crimes, religious and ethnic tensions. Consequently, economic and social relationships drifts into state of comatose in most commercial cities which justified the fears of many that the nation may not be able to navigate the storm of uncertainty too far. Security challenges, religious intolerance coupled with massive corruption in public places have dominated every national discourse. The insurgent question has been politicized with attendant consequences on human lives and properties. The culture of fear with mutual suspicion determines every aspect of human relationships. Sadly, the capacity of the state to contend with these challenges obviously is below expectations.

Nigeria has been a perennial victim of the devious manipulation of ethnicity, regionalism and religion. Colonialism and its multi-dimensional impacts remain one major factor of socio-cultural economic and political significance in Nigeria history that accounts partly for this twist of fate. The centrality of this epoch was informed more by the supposed artificiality of the Nigerian federal system which has the heritage of ‘ethnocentricity and divisiveness’ as against the desirable spirit of the operation and cohesion as precondition for sustainable development in the federal context. (Otoni, 1964:5) Colonialism ensured that Nigerians lost the sense of pride and confidence in their own culture. Consequently, “the technical inferiority of the traditional culture vis a vis ‘the technical superiority of the Europeans’” large amount for the accounts for high esteem in which the dominant Europeans were held. (Armstrong and Matiu, 1999:3).This imperialist ideology accounts for why Nigerians strive to copy anything and everything European, from religious practices, styles and tastes of education and assumption of European identities. Consequently, there has been a tremendous neglect of, and destructive prejudice against, everything traditional. It has also resulted in in the hybridization of the Nigerian elite who have been neither fully western nor African in their tastes, preferences and values. Similarly, colonialism left in its wake the perpetual division of Nigeria along ethnic lines against the spirit of communalism that pervaded our traditional societies. This in itself is anti-development in addition to constituting a veritable obstacle to the nation's quest for national integration. A distinguishing feature of post-colonial Nigerian politics is the preoccupation of the country and its leaders with achieving both unity and stability anchored on peaceful co-existence of the country's disparate nationalities.

Scholars are of the opinion that we may have failed in exploring the traditional inter-tribal communal relations, which thrived on the recognition of our differences and respect for our visible distinctiveness. Gupta, (1968) cited in Obafemi Olu “Cultural Diversity and National Development” (2005:9) argues that the linguistic situation in Nigeria is not entirely different from what obtains in other new independent nations. As he observed, most new nations are based on plurality of segmental groups. The national tie of the people to their segmental group is often valued more highly than their civic ties with the nation. This point was buttressed by Peter Ekeh’s theory of the two publics, ‘the primordial ‘and the ‘civic’, which reflects the deep-seated dislocation between culture and traditional values on the one hand and the Nigerian nation state and politics on the other hand. Contextually, the primordial public is perceived as a ‘sacred moral universe of sacrifice and duties ’typical of traditional communal life. Conversely, the civic public is conceived of as a profane amoral world characterised by instrumental relationships premised on the accumulation of rights rather than duties (Omafume, 1982: 23). Similarly, (Joseph, 1996: 8-11) also postulated about 'prebendalism and clientelism.' Both point in the direction of appropriation of the state to
service sectional enclaves. Integration of culture into the body politic and our ideologies has therefore become necessary to harmonise loyalty and centralise commitment. We agree with Armstrong when he said that there is hardly any developed or emerging nation in the world that is not artificial in the sense in which modern Nigeria that resulted from the British colonial experience is being classified (Armstrong, 1999:4).

Arguments abound in literature to suggest that there are many multi-ethnic nations in the world whose development appeared to have been informed more by commitment to traditional values, celebration and patronage of cultural heritage, credible vision, defined mission and greater sense of belonging and above all, responsible statehood, being the most potent panacea for ethnic consciousness and loyalty. Okwudiba was of the opinion that “...ethnic groups are not necessarily homogenous entities even linguistically or culturally” (Okwudiba, 2006:31). Thus, we must strive to explore what is common to us all, to champion the course of our development. As Ikime rightly noted, “...whenever the issue of Nigerian unity comes up for discussion, there is a tendency for many a Nigerian to be apologetic, to find excuses which are deftly paraded as reasons why we have, almost necessarily, to remain disunited (Ikime, 1984:4). On his part, Biodun Adediran reasoned that constant references to the negative aspects of our plural character were among the machinations of early European writers. Among many fallouts of their writings was a ready negative impression on our cultural heritage upon which subsequent historians based their writings. For example, they are quick to amplify the impossibility of forming an enduring nation state from the ashes of what in their own thinking, was a mere collection of disparate groups of people (Adediran, 1999: 4). To them, achieving integration was a mirage but to us, here lies an issue that calls for a renewed interest in our own history if sustainable national development is of utmost importance to us as a people within the context of the present federal structure. Consequently, we need to “fasten on our differences,” and harness those aspects of our culture that are unifying, in order to enhance national integration.

As opposed to our traditional economic system with its enviable features of healthy competition, fair exchange and so on, Nigeria's pseudo-capitalism brought about by the west only succeeded in entrenching polarization deepened further by liberal democracy. As noted by many scholars, the class nature of our contemporary society brought about by this pseudo-capitalist leaning also constitutes a major impediment to sustainable development. Politics and democracy should be rooted in the family. In Nigeria, individuals who mostly do not represent the interest of the people control contemporary political development formally. While it is often assumed that there is grassroots democracy, the fact is that people at the grassroots are only mobilised behind some individuals selfish agenda, hence meaningful participation barely take place. Ortserra observed that, different from what tradition preaches, in Nigeria, the grass roots people are merely used as “inputs in the political industries to manufacture political positions” (Ortserra, 1999: 25). The implication of this is the growing disconnection between the electorate and elected officials, the state and the citizens. The most viable option lies in a recourse to our family traditional system that would be communal in character and hinged on egalitarian principles. We share the views that class rule is based on the protection of the interests of a class. This ensures that politics is not geared towards solving the problems of society but addressing the interests of individuals and cliques. We must therefore be prepared to eliminate class rule as it was in our traditional setting, encourage mass participation, and ensure that the societal interest, takes precedent over personal interest, in order to guarantee social harmony. By whatever interpretation, democracy is not alien to Nigerian culture. History is replete with varying democratic practices that cut across the various traditional institutions in Nigeria. There are existing traditional practices among the Nigerian people that are synonymous with contemporary expositions on democratic governance both in principle and practice. Such practices among the Igbo village democracy and our cross cultural extended family as with the Yoruba, Tiv,
Edo, Nupe and so on, could be incorporated in the conduct of our conduct of politics to instill discipline, and re-enact integrity, respect, and such other virtues as could promote peaceful co-existence. These can provide the basis for sustainable democratic governance.

We must add that our traditional sentiment abhors appropriation of collective patrimony, much in the same way it frowns at dictatorial tendencies in whatever guises and the lack of accountability on the part of trustees of our collective communal interest. “Power was shared vertically as everyone had a say in how society was governed. Abuse of power was curtailed vertically by the various structure put in place to effectively check on the powers of the ruler” Without mincing words, we need a kind of cultural renaissance to enable us face the challenges of governance in the twenty-first century. Nigeria (Babawale, 2006: 51). By this, I mean the patronage of culture, which should concern itself with the entire way of life of the Nigerian people; their creative, artistic, scientific and technological capabilities, benefiting there from economically, morally and politically (Bello, 1999:46). We must not fail to re-echo the fact that there had always been effective inter-personal and inter-group relationships amongst our people before the European incursion. This complex tradition of ethnic interaction cut across groups and societies, including the Yoruba, Jukun, Nupe, Binis, Idoma, and Igala to mention but a few. Characteristic of traditional institution were the prevalence of kinship, dynasty, and emirate system amidst notable intra and inter-societal migration of people as against isolated settlement as western scholars would tend to suggest. Without being too historical, the point must be made that the extensive interaction also meant years of admixture of populations. Indeed, it provided a context within which diffusion of culture traits as well as cultural affinities and heritage of common sojourning thrived.

One significant aspect of the collective history of Nigeria's ethnic nationalities is that they were linked at several points and over time by the myth of common ancestry, cross border commercial transactions, among other exchanges and ideas that seem to weld them into a unified entity (Babawale, 2006: 1). All of these naturally favour possible conception of a federal system that could have thrived on mutual understanding and cooperation were it not for the colonial interlude. Justification for a revisit of our cultural heritage is premised on the conviction that the substance of our cultural heritage can still be harnessed and explored for sustainable development. However, the challenge before us borders on raising the level of consciousness of the citizenry on the positive aspects of Nigerian history, playing down the negative and retrogressive aspects of our culture and appreciating what can be borrowed from our past to sustain the present and guarantee our future as a people through accelerated development. This calls for commensurate understanding of the issues involved in order to generate an enduring solution. Indeed, given the peculiarity of a people, our culture can serve as a vanguard of change through the value system. In any case, since our interest in the past is in the present and this present is shaped not only by on-going tasks, but also by future aspirations, our intellectual engagements with our culture and value system would be rewarding if it helps in clarifying for us yesterday’s experience, today’s task and tomorrow’s possibilities. The definition of philosophy as a rational and critical activity helps in creating a tradition of thinking and discourse whose main focus will be on issues affecting the interests and aspirations of the people. Any society that neglects this role does so at his own peril; because philosophy in its critical and rational role, serves to challenge a people’s established views of themselves and their condition as a precondition for redefining who they are and what they can be. The reappraisal of the culture and value system is to identify its strengths and weaknesses. This reappraisal is philosophical imperative have the potential of promoting self-understanding that would provide some basis for determining the kind of socio-cultural reconstruction in our society.
Conclusion
In this paper, we have tried to establish that our politics has been and is still chaotic, impeding growth and development. One reason for this is the total neglect of culture in our national life. The challenge before us is to make use of our cultural institutions to facilitate the reorientation of our youths and political actors to imbibe the spirit of brotherhood and serve, cultivate a sense of commitment, among other virtues of societal significance. This will go a long way in stemming the tide political intolerance, character assassination, political violence and political rascality. Apart from periodic interaction with the youths through programmes, agencies of government should actually begin to organise refresher course for key political actors who are presumed agents of change. We need to embark on massive public enlightenment programmes that would encourage the people to take their citizenship responsibilities more seriously. Not only should they participate more actively in the political process, they must invest their time and energy in the choice of the right men and women that would make policies. The nature of Nigerian politics at the moment gives cause for grave concern. Political contestations seem to be regarded s the equivalent of warfare- the winner takes all and the loser loses everything. Nothing is better than winning and nothing can be worse than losing. In this context, violence takes centre stage at election time. Politicians all over the country are willing and prepared to acquire power and retain it at all cost. What results from this mind-set is a spiral of violence and a high level of insecurity in the society. A major problem confronting our society today is the character of our political parties. There is a total breakdown of discipline and lack of focus in many of the parties. Indeed, we can say that many of the political parties lack the essential attributes of political parties, They neither articulate the interest of the populace nor even possess the wherewithal to curb the excesses of their members.

Indiscipline within the nation’s political parties has turned them into war machines defending the “fortresses” of warlords masquerading as political leaders. Parties’ leaders attack one another on all fronts over all manners of issues. Members insult the leadership of their parties without restrain and they viciously attack their parties on issues they themselves should resolve. Party gatekeepers/godfathers determine which candidates would run for an elected office after fleeing potential contestants of huge sums of money. This practice inevitably breeds anew crop of looting and thieving politicians who need to recoup their “investments” at all costs. These parties have a fixation for capturing power while totally neglecting the non-power aspects of political contestations. Under the scenario enacted above, meaning political competition cannot take place. There is an urgent need for the nation’s politicians to develop a code of conduct that would guide their representatives in government. Informed opinion in the country insists that the government of the day has not spent enough time to reform the nation’s politics. Tragically; the political process is the hub that drives the economy.

Our politics, as mentioned earlier, remains uniquely Hobbesian. There is the need for a return of law and ethics into our politics to signpost total departure from the garrison politics that is threatening so visibly to test our polity apart. Our politicians must be able to organise truly competitive elections whose outcomes are uncertain ex ante. Uncertainty of outcomes remains the predictable characteristic of truly democratic elections. Politicians must come to terms with the possibility of today's winners becoming tomorrow's losers. There is an urgent need for our politicians to imbibe democratic attitudes. It is difficult to build democracy without democrats. The political elite must understand the language of compromise, negotiation and dialogue. More can be achieved through dialogue than through conflicts. They must learn to persuade and not coerce. Chinua Achebe once asserted that “the trouble with Nigeria is simply and squarely on leadership” (Achebe, 1983). There is no better proof of this statement than the evidence of bad leadership and “politics of the belly” that abound at all levels of government in Nigeria. The high level of corruption and
evidence of bad governance that we see before us are there to show that Nigeria lacks good quality leadership. To move forward as a nation, we need a new breed of leaders that are sensitive, patriotic, accountable and imbued with demonstrable vision (Armstrong and Matiu, 1999: 4). We must admit that, a way out of our socio-economic and political crisis is the adoption of what Adebayo Adedeji describes as “a social economy paradigm of development which assumes the launching of a development process that is socially just, economically productive, ecologically sustainable, politically stable and participatory, and culturally vibrant” (Babawale Tunde, 2006: 40) Return to culture must not be seen as a return to the past but, rather, an appreciation of the resources of the past and its contributions to the present as well as our imaginative response to such contributions in the light of our present problems and as a strategy towards our development in the future.
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