

POLITICS OF STATE CREATION IN NIGERIA; A STUDY OF SOUTH EAST ZONE

NDUKWE KALU EGWU; ELUCHIE OKECHUKWU C.; ONYEBUEKE, PRECIOUS C.; & NWANORUO MERCY

Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, Abia State University, Uturu

DOI Link: <https://doi.org/10.70382/bjhss.v7i6.016>

ABSTRACT

This study focused on Politics of state creation in Nigeria; a study of south east zone; In Nigeria, the issue of state creation has continued to be a source of worry to many citizens in the country. This paper took an important view of state creation and Nigerian Federalism with a view to proffering solution on Nigeria's National unity. Secondary data was employed in this study as data were collected from available literature. While adopting review and trends analytical approach, the paper revealed that state creation e though brings even development, it has also been responsible for the major political delimain Nigeria such as ethnic crisis, inter and intra party crisis, religious bigotry, Boko haram and secession and so on. It therefore recommends among other things that the challenges of geo-political balancing can only be resolved by enthroning inclusive democratic governance. The implication of this is that there

Introduction

Nigerian gained political independence from British Colonialists on October 1, 1960 and opted for Federal system of government and the multi-system. Importantly, it should be noted that the factors that gave rise to a federal system of government in Nigeria were, among other things, the desire for political independence with the belief that it can only be gained through unity, the hope for economic advantage, the desire for administrative efficiency, the need to accommodate diverse groups, the share historical experiences coupled with similarities and differences in colonial and indigenous political and social institutions,

is n stability unless credible leadership is witnessed in the polity of Nigerian state.

Keywords: State Creation, Geo-political zone, Ethnic minorities, South East.

and the influence of the British government in constitution making in the ex-colonies which was aimed at closer association between colonies and British policies (Awolowo 1947). The above factors played a very significant role in the establishment of a federal system of government in Nigeria in 1954 which was eventually ratified by the 1960 independence constitution. Essentially, the post-independence politics that triggered off could not sustain democracy sequel to political malnutrition, competition, struggle for power, inter and intraparty crisis and the electoral malpractices which eventually led to the termination of the shaky democratic governance under the weight of the military on January 15, 1966, barely five years after independence (Nkwede, 2010).

The military presence in the governance of the country was observed for thirteen years between 1966-1979 during which it plunged Nigerians into a 30 years civil war (Akaakuma, 2005). The military terminated its first outing in governance of the country and handed over power to a seemingly democratic set of civilian rulers on October 1, 1979 but again collapsed after four years under another limitary *coup d'etat* on December 31, 1983. The military junta despite their failed promises to hand over power to democratically elected civilians ruled the country for another sixteen ears (1983-1999) before returning power to civilian regime.

Empirically, the political competition arising from the experiment of governance so far eloquently indicated that issued of state creation generally is not actually free from centrifugal and perifungal pulls. The persistent demands for state creation among other things have become one of the most intractable problems bedeviling Nigerian federalism. It has thus been characterized by intense conflicting struggles for socio-economic and political development of all sections of Nigerian political system.

Successive regimes and leaders have attempted to implement programmes and strategies geared towards instituting and stabilizing democracy in the quest and pursuit of national integration in Nigeria but these efforts have not been able to enthrone sustainable national unity in the country. It is against this backdrop that the cardinal purpose of this article therefore, is to essentially understand and analyze federalism and state creation in Nigeria; and its implication on Nigeria's unity and national development. However, the specific objectives are;

- To ascertain whether state creation triggered off the problem of National disunity in Nigeria.
- To investigate whether state creation has implication on Nigerian federalism.
- To proffer solution on Nigeria's national integration.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF SOUTH EAST ZONE

The southeast geopolitical zone of Nigeria is made up of five states, namely, Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu and Imo state with eighty-five Local Government Areas (LGAs) and a population of over twenty million people dwelling in over ten commercial cities and large towns. Apart from agriculture as the mainstay of economic activities for the majority in the rural communities, the zone is also known for its commerce and trending activities with a preponderance of micro, small and medium indigenous industries that are into manufacturing, fabrication and agro-allied produce. Agriculture thrives very well in the area because the zone is endowed with arable land. The main food crops grown in the zone include cassava, rice, cocoyam and maize while the cash crops include oil-palm, rubber, cocoa, banana and various types of fruits. The zone is blessed with solid minerals and natural resources in rich deposits such as crude oil, natural gas, bauxite and iron ore, sand stone, lignite, Karoline, clay, coal, tin, columbite, etc. the zone has high potential to attract investments in the following areas:

6. Agro-allied industries (Cassava starch and flour as well as fruits and vegetable canning).
7. Textiles (cotton socks, fishing nets and mosquito nets).
8. Industrial minerals/quarrying (glass industry, table ware, aggregate plant including stone crushing plants).
9. Plastics industry (plastics manufacture, bottles, flask, cans, tubes and bags tiles) and
10. Chemical industry (polyethylene, explosives, self-adhesive tape, pulp and paper).

STATE CREATION AND THE CHANGING PATTERNS OF NIGERIA

The amalgamation of Northern and Southern protectorates in 1914 was the major road map for Nigerian federal, even though the process was designed and tailored to aid the consolidation of the British colonial rule of the hitherto two Nigerian, because the amalgamation was designed to bring Nigerians under one administrative rule, it unwittingly caused some serious dislocation and contradiction in the structure of the

traditional Nigerian society (Chukwu, 2002). As a corollary of this, then, came the brewing of nationalism spirit in a people that now saw themselves more as Nigerians with different cultures, religions and level of development were forced into a socio-political tango without consultation or preparation by the British and with little or no fallback options for the people involved.

In order to resolve the problems that inevitably reared their heads, the British colonialists, who were mostly astute in political treachery and subterfuge divided the country into three regions following Arthur Richard's Constitution of 1946. The rationale for the adoption of regionalism was not to rectify the consequences of their odious machinations but rather to pacify the natives to enable them continue to enjoy the latitude to continue the exploitation of the abundant resources (Ezechukwu, 2013).

The fact that fusing such entities with equally proud and self-accounting cultures, and administrative ideologies was disaster waiting to happen, did not bother the British overlord. In point of fact, the amalgamation and subsequent subdivision of the country into regions became an extension of what had happened at the Berlin Conference of 1885 where and when European powers merely carved out and shared African on a map among themselves.

At independence in 1960, power over the regions was given to Nigerian-born citizens, and that sparked-off agitations of more political accommodation. Agitations to address the imbalance in the polity led to the creation of Mid-Western region from the already existing Western Region in 1962 making Nigeria a federation of four regions in accordance with the 1954 Lyttelton Constitution.

It was not long before the cracks became yawning canyons and the pretentious efforts of the post-independence leaders who had mounted slogans of "Unity" caved in under the impact of differences that were becoming impossible to manage. The political turmoil, imbroglio and tatty that surrounded the first republic (1960-1966) gave the military the impetus to intervene in the governance of the country on January 1, 1966. After the first coup and under the shortlived military government of Aguiyi Ironsi, the country was reorganized under a unitary or central system of government.

- Following the counter-coup of 29th July 1966, which resulted in Aguiyi Ironsi's deposition and assassination, Nigeria was reorganized as a federal country, with the federating regions being divided into newer entities and all first-level subdivisions being renamed as state by General Gowon in 1967.

The subdivision of the four regions into 12 states in 1967 by General Gowon is hereunder recapitulated.

1967:

- Eastern Region was divided into East-Central (Enugu), Rivers (Port Harcourt) and South-Eastern (Calabar) States;
- Northern Region was divided into Benue-Plateau (Jos,) Kano (Kano), Kwara (Ilorin), North-Central (Kaduna), North-Eastern (Maiduguri), and North-Western (Sokoto) States;
- Western Region was divided into Lagos (Lagos) and western (Ibadan) States; Mid western region Bendel (Benin).

The subdivision of the four regions into 12 states in 1967 did not go down well with some regions and this culminated in the Mid-western and the State of former Eastern Region to call for secession from Nigeria as the states of Biafra and Republic of Benin, resulting in the Nigeria Civil War which lasted for 30 months and ended in 1970.

1976:

In 1976, six years after the end of the 30 months Nigeria Civil War, the states, state/boundaries and names were further reorganized thus:

12. Benue-Plateau state into Benue (Makurdi) and Plateau (Jos) states;
13. East-Central State divided into Anambra (Enugu) and Imo (Owerri) states;
14. Federal Capital Territory (Abuja) formed from parts of Niger and Plateau States;
15. North-Eastern state divided into Bauchi (Bauchi), Borno (Maiduguri) and Gongola (Yola) states;
16. Western state divided into Ogun (Abeokuta), Ondo (Akure) and Oyo (Ibadan) states.

1987:

- Akwaibom state split from Crosss-River,
- Katsina state split from Kaduna

1999:

- Abia state split from Imo;
- Bendel state divided into Delta Edo;

- Enugu state split from Anambra;
- Gongola state divided into Adamawa and Taraba;
- Jigawa state split from Kano;
- Kebbi state split from Sokoto;
- Kogi state formed from parts of Benue and Kwara;
- Osun state split from Oyo;
- Yobe state split from Borno;

1996:

- Bayelsa state was split from Rivers;
- Ebonyi state was formed from parts of Abia and Enugu;
- Ekiti state was split from Ondo;
- Gombe state was split from Bauchi;
- Nasarawa state was split from Plateau;
- Zanfara state was split from Sokoto.

Consequently, the 1996 state creation exercise brought the total number of Local Government within the federation to 774 and Nigeria became a federation of 36 states including Federal Capital Territory, FCT, Abuja. Despite the creation of Nigeria into 36 states, Nigerians have been cacophonously demanding for the creation of more states. Similarly, irrespective of the 774 existing Local Governments in the country, the demand for more local government creation has been on the increase. However, since the 1996 state creation, no new states and local government have been created. Though, the 1999 constitution part II section 8 (1) made provision for state creation subject to an act of the National Assembly approved by simple majority of all the states of the federation supported by a simple majority of members of the House of Assembly approved by a resolution passed by two third ($\frac{2}{3}$) majority of members of each House of the National Assembly.

ADVANTAGES OF STATE CREATION IN NIGERIA

Several reasons have been adduced for the agitations for more states. One of the building blocks which has indeed, sustained the quest for state creation is the belief that development will obviously accompany state creation. The extent to which this logic is evidently accompanies state creation. The extent to which this logic is evidently amenable is a matter of checklist of artifacts since the meaning of

development has not been comprehensively understood by many, hence the common man has been brainwashed and convinced to believe that economic dimension alone constitutes development. It has been argued that the creation of states focuses on the distribution process to the neglect of the production aspects thereby militating against the mobilization of the creative energies of the population toward growth through the transformation of the productive forces of the society (Elaigwu, 2013).

Another argument advanced for the creation of states is that political stability cannot be achieved without it. But a veritable question that comes to mind is, has political stability been guaranteed in spite of the increase from twelve to 36 states? Obviously, political stability of any nation is strongly championed by the unity of the groups of people in such a country. Unity of purpose addresses the issues of stability but when the people are not united, probably because of tribalism, statism, ethnic chauvinism and religious bigotry, and craze for power, political stability is wished away in such a country.

Similarly, the minority problem and political domination have been split out as one of the factors for demand for more states. Evidently, federalism advocates for the right of minorities to be identified as corporate units of the body politics of the nation. Unfortunately, the creation of states based on minority problems has led to the unlimited for state as more minorities have continued to emerge. This was basically observed in Nigerian situation when 12 states were created in 1967, and by 1975 more minorities have emerged and were clamouring for states of their own. Awolowo (1975) disturbed by the minority problems and coupled with the 1952 Census-Report identified fifty one (51) minorities based on linguistic groupings. Implicitly, if states were to be created on the basis of minority problems, by 1975 we would have had fifty one (5) states, but only 19 were created based on the submission of Awolowo thus:

It is clear, therefore, that under the linguistic principle, the number of states in the country cannot in the long run exceed 51. However regard to the size and wealth of the country, this should not by any manner of means be a worrying prospect. In the mean time, however, I have advocated eighteen states, simply because, from my knowledge of the minorities, I have thought that most of them would not be viable. And viability, in my considered view, is a matter of administrative relativity. Consequently, I have grouped together minorities which are geographically contiguous, and

which, I believed being together, would be administratively viable, and free from the fear of majority ethnic domination (Awolowo 175).

From this stand point, therefore, minority areas which fear domination by others opinionate that the more the number of states into which an ethnic group is split, the better for that group taken as a whole since revenue is allocated to the states on the basis of equality and population. However, the baseline is that all will be well if ethnic groups are divided. Advocates of the dichotomy are basically the elites who cannot accomplish their political ambition in their present state of residence and hence the division of the state would be a viable option for carving out political empires for them.

Furthermore, state creation has also been connected to the impact on the equitable distribution of resources. But has been dismissed as untrue on the basis that the concentration of the country's banking system has been in the urban centers except pockets of banks located in the rural areas. Ake (1979), rightly observed that the creation of states in 1976 led to new growth points in the already relatively overdeveloped states.

Another argument penciled down is that in order to bring the government nearer to the people, there is need for creation of more states. Subscribers to this reason believe that the distribution of important amenities obviously bring those areas closer to the seat of government. This argument is far from the truth because, in spite of the creation of 36 structures from 2 regions, the country has continued to witness an unprecedented period of crisis of development, irresponsible and inefficient representation, particularly at state and local levels. More so, the government white paper on Irikefe panel of 1976 pointed out that agitation for states led to bad governments and the second republic of 1979 is a living fact in Nigeria. Unarguably, the endless demands for more states should not be the only instrument of democratic government process in a federal system; rather an efficient and strict adherence to the democratic tenets and governance system that has the interest of the people in mind will be a better instrument for achieving this purpose.

It is therefore, reasonable to maintain that most of the arguments advocated for the creation of states are not quite convincing and leaves many questions unaddressed and as such may not be taken for granted. This is essentially so because these reasons are mere masquerading of the class interest in order to partake in the sharing of the national Cake and the booty of power. For Nnoli (1978), they are mere

rationalizations of the interest of certain segments of the population which cannot be openly and publicly advocated.

JUSTIFICATION FOR STATE CREATION IN NIGERIA

Historically, the North and South divide is the major reason for state creation in Nigeria. This is so because prior to Nigerian independence in 1960, the North and South conflict led to the creation of regions in 1946. The post independent crisis between the North and South again led to the creation of 12 states in 1967 which had a strategic significance. Ayida (1987) observed that:

The most sensitive political threat to the stability of the Nigerian federalism was North/South confrontation and it was of strategic significance that the number of Northern states should be seen to be equal to the number of southern states. This was the important consideration which could not be made explicit in the days of "gathering storm" in early 1967.

The above statement provokes a lot of criticism which retaining its substance of truth as the issue was laid bare during the second republic when the Southern states agitators reacted vehemently against the imbalance posed by the 19 states structures.

Paradoxically, the essence of federalism is equality of states. Moreover, the historical frictions and constant/conflicts with high level of suspicious and fear of domination that characterized the relationships between and among component units of Nigerian federation in the past certainly make the provisions of section 126 (2-4) of the 1979 Nigerian Constitution and section 8(1) of 1999 Nigerian Constitution *functus officio* that a presidential candidate is elected only if he satisfies a minimum number of votes cast in $2/3$ of the states. Implicitly, the number of states in each of the geo-political area acquires political relevance. For this reason, those agitating for more creation of states should tread with caution with a view to ensuring that the North and South have equal number of states.

Another justification for state creation is the economic significance of the role of states in a federal system. Experience has shown that if a particular state is split into two, more resources would be allocated to the area. The federal allocation of resources are evenly distributed to states on the basis of 50% federal equality and 50% on population. Economically, the state is split into two; more resources would be allocated to the area. The federal allocation of resources are evenly distributed to

states on the basis of 50% federal equality and 50% on population. Economically, the state that is split into two would be entitled to these resources at the peril of the other state that is left behind.

Importantly, additional states would offer opportunities for political participation through representation or through appointments. Politically, this stems from the fact that a state like Ebonyi if divided into two states would get more representatives in the National Assembly since each state has equal representation in the National Assembly. Again, the creation of new states would mean accelerated promotion of the civil servants and bureaucrats of the newly Created states and massive contract awards, and eventually led to proliferation of elite formation (Elaigwu, 2013, and Ogunlola, 2013).

Furthermore, additional states as noted by scholars would lessen the resources base of states and make them financially nonviable and solvent. This has been noticed in the past state creation. For instance, Eastern Region accounted for 65.4% of the output of oil by 1967 and the Mid-west 34.6%. The bifurcation of the former Eastern region in 1976 into 3 states, drastically reduced the output of the oil producing areas thus; Rivers 57%, Bendel 34.6%, East central state 2.8% (Elaigwu, 2013). With the new arrangement, East Central state had its resources base adversely eroded, while the new rivers state acquired more resources and its eldorado.

DISADVANTAGES OF CREATING NEW STATES IN NIGERIA

Creation of states in Nigeria was a common feature of military governments which ruled Nigeria at different periods. Now the matter of state creation has come up again, what with members of the National Assembly debating the bill for the creation of some proposed states. But at this critical political juncture in Nigeria, and given the happenings in our polity, do we need more states in Nigeria? The indisputable fact is that most of Nigeria's 36 states are economically unviable and unsafe. For example, while people are starving to death in some states, insurgents, bandits, and terrorists are abducting people for ransom in other states of the country.

Before the creation of states started in Nigeria in the late 1960s, we had four regions: Northern, Eastern, Western, and the Mid-Western. Regionalism, which was practised in Nigeria then, was a component of our parliamentary system of government that lasted between 1960 and 1966. At that time, all the regions in the country strove to outpace one another in diverse areas of national development.

So while the Northern Region was known for groundnut pyramid, the Western Region excelled in cocoa production. And the Eastern Region excelled in palm oil produce.

More so, then, Chief Obafemi Awolowo, the Premier of the Western Region, who tended towards the left, espoused the principle of democratic welfarism, and implemented free education policy in the Western Region. In the east, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe was instrumental in the building of the University of Nigeria Nsukka. He also played a significant role in the establishment of the financial institution, African Continental Bank ACB.

But it is incredulous that those notable politicians who inhabited our political space in the First Republic couldn't solve our country's ethnic and religious problems. As a result, we had the bloody coup of January 1966 and the counter-coup of July 1966, which threw Nigeria into a cauldron of violence. That political violence snowballed into the Nigeria-Biafra civil war, which lasted for three years.

In order to stop the secessionist bid of the Eastern Region, General Yakubu Gowon split the country into a 12-state structure. His deft manoeuvring (creation of states) could be rationalised on the grounds that it was done to prevent the disintegration of Nigeria. But successive military rulers, who ruled the country, created more states so as to ignite our country's development and ensure the inclusion of all Nigeria's tribes and ethnic groups in the governance of Nigeria.

Cultural and religious affinities, economic viability, landmass, and population were believed to be the factors which our past rulers considered when they created new states. But our scrutiny of the states has shown that our leaders created the states whimsically. Or they might have created them to achieve their own ends and please their friends.

Take for example, a town in Enugu State whose indigenes have their kith and kin in Kogi State. So it can be seen that the creation of states in Nigeria has divided a people who share the same ancestral roots instead of uniting them. And a great majority of the states in Nigeria are so financially emasculated that they depend on the centre, perpetually, for their survival and sustenance.

However, the proponents of the creation of new states have argued that creating new states in Nigeria would bring government nearer to the people and ensure that there is balance or parity as to the number of states in the geopolitical zones. And they posit that the creation of new states in Nigeria will lead to the establishment of states' civil service, which will employ new workers, thereby reducing the number of unemployed people in Nigeria.

But they had glossed over the fact that the creation of states brings about the vexed matter of boundary adjustment and the sharing of jointly-owned properties. Matters that border on demarcation of boundaries and sharing of jointly owned properties

by two states are not resolved easily. Often times, the matter would degenerate into violence and shedding of blood. The breakout of violence in any part of the country can lead to the destruction of infrastructures, loss of human lives, and, possibly, the disintegration of Nigeria.

Again, state creation will, no doubt, lead to increase in the number of National Assembly members, which will jerk up the cost of governance in Nigeria. At present, Nigerian lawmakers receive humongous wages when compared to their counterparts in other countries. Reducing the cost of governance in Nigeria is the clarion call of well-meaning Nigerians. Our leaders should execute deeds that will better the lot of the hoi polloi instead of carrying out policy actions that will stall our national development.

So the stark fact is that the proponents of creation of new states in Nigeria want fiefdoms or political empires over which they will preside in order for them to have the opportunity to loot our public exchequer. State governors are being accused of seizing financial allocations meant for local governments. To continue exercising control over the local governments, many state governors are dilly-dallying and shilly-shallying regarding the conduct of local government elections. In many states of Nigeria, appointed local government chairmen are holding sway over local council areas, and not elected local government chairmen.

Yet the local government, which is the grassroots government, is pivotal to the development of rural towns in Nigeria. Starved of money, the appointed local government chairmen, who are political puppets, cannot perform their statutory functions and execute policies for the people. And they live in mortal fear of the state governors, who can relieve them of their posts.

But it is the entrenchment of true local government autonomy that will ignite the rapid development of the semi-urban areas and rural towns in Nigerians. Not many rural towns in Nigeria have customary and magistrates courts, which should handle judicial matters that border on petty crimes, marital matters, and others. And trunk roads in those towns, the maintenance of which fall under the local government areas, are neglected.

Therefore, the Federal Government should make the third tier of government in Nigeria, that is, the local government, truly autonomous rather than create new states in the country. It should also return the country to the practice of regionalism by collapsing the states into regions or geopolitical zones, each of which will have a leader. However, the Nigerian Constitution should be amended or a new one written to accommodate this proposal. Making a new constitution for Nigeria has become an

overriding imperative based on the fact that new political realities and conundrums have cropped up in the country.

Now, it should be obvious to all right thinking and patriotic Nigerians that the proponents of creation of new states in Nigeria are egoistical and unpatriotic politicians, who are seized with the feelings of insularity and clannishness. They want political empires over which they will preside in order for them to have unhindered access to the public treasury.

STATE CREATION IS NOT THE SOLUTION TO ECONOMIC CRISIS: GOOD GOVERNANCE IS

In the colonial period towards the independence, the various nationalist bourgeois political class, as a way of ensuring their political influence had canvassed for regional governments as the best means of bringing their 'people' into the limelight of civilization. But aside the fact that the regionalization of the country was not a product of democratic decisions of the oppressed people, the demand played into the manipulative hands of the colonial administrations, which was seeking exit route from the self-created contradiction of granting self governance to the colonies and sustaining control of the colonial economy in favour of imperialism and capitalism. It took very little time before the self-interest of the nationalist bourgeois politicians truncated their own regional arrangement as exemplified by a new contradiction of who to control the central government, and the internal schisms within each region. This eventually led to the military take-over in 1966 and Civil War which lasted 30 months.

The continuation of the bankrupt policy of dividing the country as a way of curtailing internal strife amongst the political class, led to the creation of 12 states in 1967. When the strife could not be curtailed by this policy, the country was further divided into 19 states by the Murtala/Obasanjo military government in 1976. The central argument was to give identity to the minorities and create a sense of nationalism as against sectional interests. But the reality is that the real reason for the balkanization is to divide the people along artificial geographical enclaves so as to make the undemocratic rule over the people easier. Thus, between 1987 and 1996, the Babangida and Abacha's highly corrupt military regimes almost doubled the number of states from 19 to 36 without any taken into account the opinion of the working and poor masses to be divided. Ironically, none of the official reasons for more state creation has been justified by reality. On the issue of unity, the country has been divided more than ever with crises such as the Aguleri/Umuleri, Warri/Itsekiri.

Ife/Modakeke etc., arising from such division of the country. We are witnesses to how indigene-ship is used by state political actors to determine distribution of scholarship, employment, appointments, etc. Despite creation of states, the country is bedevilled with serious internal strife, most of which occur within states as exemplified by the recent Jos crisis.

Moreover, virtually all these states are dependent on petro-dollar from the federal purse; thus they are unviable economically. Withholding of state allocation for just a month is enough to cause total economic standstill in many states. Meanwhile, unlike in the late 1970's and early 1980's, when as a result of the existence of welfare state and Stalinist Soviet system, states invested in the economy and industry, the current neo-liberal system with a mix of the worst neo-colonial/imperialist spices, have meant destruction of the minimally functional economy of many states no thanks to privatization of state industries, commercialization of public service and pervasive corruption of the political class, among others. Creation of more states is just another means of siphoning public resources and resolving sharing formula crisis among the corrupt political class. Already, just 17, 474 politicians in power consume over N1.3 trillion of the nation's wealth. Therefore, creating more states, aside providing some few jobs will only be another means of looting public resources by a new political class in these new states. This explains why politicians and big businessmen are the arrowhead of the agitation.

Also, the point that more state creation will assuage the feeling of marginalization by various ethnic groups is a ruse. The fact is that the process that leads to creation of the states is usually undemocratic as no platform or forum is provided for the working people to decide democratically whether they want new state or not. In other words, state creation usually only reflects the self-interests of the bankrupt capitalist politicians who want their own empire. Sooner rather than later, this will give way to further quest by other political class for control. It should be stressed that the growth of ethnic feeling is a reflection of economic and political isolation of the working masses, and absence of viable pan-Nigerian working class political alternative to galvanize the anger of the working and poor people for genuine political change. With the absence of this political platform of agitation, the masses are left with no other choice than expressing their frustration and disillusionment through sectional, ethnic, communal and religious means, which are generated by the bankrupt bourgeois political class but sooner than later can consume the whole society with multiplicity of sectional crises. This is why the labour movement must lead other pro-worker, pro-masses organizations in building a fighting bottom-to-

top, democratic, mass political party of the working people that will chase away the current capitalist politicians and enthrone a working people's government committed to massive development of human and material capacities of the country for the benefit of all as a step towards a genuine socialist society, against the current divisive but exploitative neo-colonial capitalist system.

CONCLUSION

It was observed that state creation has often expressed itself in terms which are opposed to national unity and integrity, and sometimes challenging to the legitimacy of the state. It is crucial to understand that state creation greatly consolidates federalism in mature democracies of the world. More importantly, state as a political structure is more compatible with the empowerment of a multiplicity of ethnically diverse groups. It may be true to some extent that the popular clamour for state creation in Nigeria is deeply rooted in manifest diversity of languages, tribes, cultures, religions and nationalities, which are fuelled by a sense of deprivation. It must equally be noted that the brain box of state creation is strongly supported by Nigerian foremost political leaders, progressive and scholars of unquestionable patriotic integrity, because of the consensus that state is a necessity in Nigerian political engagement.

In ensuring that our tomorrow becomes better than our today and our yesterday, Nigerians and their institutions must gird their lions to believe in ourselves and stop apportioning endless blame and compunction on Lugardian contraption. The civil war that erupted between Biafrans and the rest of Nigerians should perhaps be a wake-up call, which Nigeria needed to value the contraption and re-examine its promises. We should all rather make up our minds to make this political marriage, which like most Catholic marriages, have become almost indissoluble. We should all strive to make it a marriage that would not be that of the Jonah in the belly of the Whale but that of the marriage in Canaan. While that of Jonah's brings about excrement, the other brings about offspring and progress. I subscribe to this because governance is a sine qua non in effecting the compromises that the federal process demands.

Even as the south east zone continue to agitate for the creation of Aniomaor Ndokistate to help balance up the zone to a six state structure on like other zone that has six state approximately, in order to help curtail and as well solve the problem of agitation for good governance, stability and development in the zone, thereby bringing peace and orderliness as case may be.

REFERENCES

- Akaakuma, A. (2005). Efficiency Norms and the Crisis of Governance in Nigeria. *African Journal of Indigenous Development*, 2 (1),87-102.
- Ake C. (1979). *Social Science as Imperialism: The Theory of Political Development*. Ibadan: University Press.
- Awolowo, .O. (1975). Case for the creation of States on Linguistics Bases in Voice of courage, selected speeches of Chief Obafemi Awolowo. Akure: Fagbamigbe Publishers.
- Awolowo, O. (1947). *Path to Nigerian Federalism*. London: Faber and Faber
- Ayida, A.A (1987). *Rise and fall of Nigeria*. Lecture Delivered During the University of Jos Convocation on January, 23.
- Chukwu, D.O. (2002). *An Introduction to Nigerian Political History*. Enugu: Rhema Publications.
- Elaigwu, J. I. (2013). *Experience Practice and of in Federalism Africa: Way Forward*, Text of Lecture at Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Kofo Abayomi Street, Victoria Island Lagos, Tuesday November, 12.
- Ezechukwu, U. (2013). Our Man Lord Frederick Lugard, Daily Sun, Monday December, 30.
- Nkwede, J. O. (2010). *Fiscal Federalism and the Challenges of Good Governance in Nigeria: An Analytical Discourse. The Nigerian Journal of Management Research* 5 (3),35-55.
- Nnoli. O., (1978). *Ethnic Politics in Nigeria, Enugu*: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Ogunlola, A. (2013). *The Malady Called Federalism in Nigeria*, Nigeria world. Com, Chicago; Illinois, U.S.A.