

Restructuring in Nigeria: An Exploration of the Seismic Analysis of Social Formations

Paul A. Onuh, Chinedu C. Ike

Department of Political Science, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Nigeria

Abstract: -The myriads of the seemingly endless, now passive and now active, political haemorrhage in Nigeria has revitalized the calls and demands for the restructuring of the polity from different quarters. The effects of the amalgamation of different nations driven by colonial prerogatives and formalized in 1914 by Lord Fredrick Lugard has continued to reverberate over a century later. The character of ethnic politics played in the struggle for the control of the centre since the first republic has further amplified differences, leading to military coups, civil war, and the evolution of an increasingly centralized and top-heavy political system. This study re-examines the debate on restructuring, highlighting the issues and the prospects for Nigeria. We explored the seismic theory of social formations. We applied data gotten from secondary sources for the study. We also used the content analysis. The study found that maintaining the current political structure is not sustainable. It feeds unhealthy competition for the control of the centre, stunts socio-political and economic development, breeds mutual suspicions amongst the different ethnic members of the polity, and leads to violent armed confrontation and avoidable loss of lives. It is a significant threat to the continued corporate existence of the Nigerian state.

Keywords: Restructuring; ethnicity, development; Federalism; Seismic analysis.

I. INTRODUCTION

Nigeria, Africa's most populous country and the most populous black nation in the world ranks 1st by share of crude oil produced in Africa, and ranks 13th largest crude producer globally, accounting for 2.2% of the world's crude oil output in 2017 (OPEC, 2017), and raking in a whopping N7.3 trillion in the same year (CBN, 2017). This volume of natural resource, staggering financial wealth, and limitless human capital potentials has, however, been undermined in recent decades by ethnic and religious conflict, political instability, rampant official corruption and an ailing economy (Falola and Heaton, 2008). There are over 250 cultural groups in Nigeria (Ayatse, 2013). As the people vary, so does their cultures and traditions. Most of these cultural groups lived distinctly, while some had shared history owing to years of trade, intermarriage, conflict and certain other exchanges and interactions, prior to colonial economic and political exploitation of the territory and its peoples. The colonial adventurism and heist by the British government that was visited upon these different peoples of different culture, which saw the political domination of people in colonies called protectorates, eventually culminated into the amalgamation of

these vast territories in 1914 and the birth of the entity now known as Nigeria (Annual Colonial Report, 1914).

The mixture of a number of factors which includes: the experiences of African fighters in World War II battle theatres, insufficient expatriate manpower on the part of Britain in executing the exploitation project, the return of American universities trained Nigerians, burning embers nationalist movements around the world, led to increased involvement of Nigerians in the polity, eventually culminating into its independence in 1960. The wresting of the country from the colonial control of Britain brought joy and relief to the people of the country. A joy that is short-lived as a new vista of struggle was now unravelled. Members of different ethnic groups who played varying roles in securing the independence of the country quickly found themselves in a competition to fill in the role now made vacant by the departure of the colonialists.

The unhealthy competition to gain to control the soul of the state and gain advantage over other groups led to a series of events that further accentuated ethnic distrusts, further enforcing and bringing to the fore, the mutual suspicious that was mutually felt by these ethnic groups. The politics became bitter, messier, and began a cascade down the abyss, deeming the hopes of the giant in the 'Dark Continent'.

Nigeria has never really been a homogeneous country. Its widely differing peoples and tribes are yet to find any basis for true unity (Madiebo, 1980). Nationhood in the real sense of the concept has become very illusive for Africa's giant. According to him this unfortunate yet obvious fact notwithstanding, the former colonial master had to keep the country one, in order to effectively control its vital economic interests concentrated mainly in the more advanced and politically unreliable south.

II. THE DEBATE ON RESTRUCTURING

Restructuring as an idea and a concept is increasingly gaining currency in the Nigerian political spectrum, especially in the run-up to elections. Restructuring in Nigeria, appears to mean different things to different people and groups. While some perceive it as "re-federalization", others see it as a veiled call for secession (Farayibi, 2017). There have also been disagreements on what and how to restructure. However, scholars, activists, and political leaders seem to agree that there is a fundamental problem with the federal system in Nigeria.

Obidimma & Obidimma (2015) observed that there are a lot of issues in the practice of federalism in Nigeria, which make the practice far removed from the practice of true federalism as is obtainable in other climes. The Nigerian federalism obviously falls short of the basic features of a true federal state in aspects like the degree of autonomy of the constituent units, particularly in governmental and fiscal terms (Adekoya, 2017). This, they conclude, may among other reasons be the outcome of the manner in which the Nigerian federation evolved, when compared to states like the United States of America, Canada and Australia. Years of military incursion into the politics and governance of Nigeria was also thought to have played a role in the command structure that presently pervades the system Obidimma & Obidimma (2015).

Yaqub (2016), though agreeing that the federal system in Nigeria needs to be made 'sound' and 'functional', quarrelled with the motives of the proponents of restructuring, and was agitated as to the necessity of restructuring the Nigerian polity, given that there is a change in government (in 2015) that brought in a government that prides itself as an agent of change. Furthering, he posits that what the country should aspire for is "values of positive administrative practices". For him, the many issues that plague the Nigerian state are down to the corruption in the administration of Goodluck Jonathan (2011-2015), and administrative values and practices. This assertion could mislead one into thinking that the recurring structural issues with the Nigerian polity only emerged, consequent to the Goodluck Jonathan's time in the helm of affairs. He, however, laid the blame for the overbearing character of the centre in the Nigerian state on the 1999 constitution.

On the fiscal health of the country, Ewetan (2012) observed that the style of federalism in Nigeria has undermined its fiscal well-being. The theory of fiscal federalism and its practice are at variance, leaving the economy and the fiscal character disarticulated with far reaching consequences for development. Some of the factors that inhibit the practice of fiscal federalism in Nigeria, he identified to include, the dominance of the federal government and its preoccupation with revenue sharing from the Federation Account, the top-heavy system of fiscal relations, over dependence on crude oil revenue, conflict over sharing principle, and disharmonious federal-state relations.

Weighting in on the perception of restructuring from the South-South of the country, Adeosun, et al (2017) observed that the South-South position on resource control is that each federating unit being allowed to control and manage resources found within its territory and in return paying agreed sum or percentage of its income to the central government. This view, he furthered, is also shared by the South-East and South-West. The south-south is seemingly not against revenue allocation. However, they demand for equity in its disbursement, which the region believed could only be achieved within a

framework that allowed financial autonomy to the federating units.

Amadi, et al (2017:14) also emphasized the necessity and the rational for restructuring the polity in Nigeria. They opined that the type of restructuring that Nigeria needs now should involve: Domesticating democracy, restructuring the public sphere and political economy through polycentric planning. Domesticating democracy, they explained, entails

adapting features and elements of federalism/democratization to Nigerian realities through appropriate institutional arrangements that are self-organizing and self-governing within rule-ruler-ruled configuration; Restructuring the public sphere in order to resolve political crisis, and then linking this to how people can work together, from community level, to address diverse challenges.

It is only when it is perceived that the outcome of the interactions will be beneficial to all that groups will contribute their total cooperation, they held.

Some have advocated to the creation of more states to check the feelings of marginalization by minority groups within some states. Adetoye, (2016) in his contribution to the discourse had a run through some of the reasons that have led to the creation of states in Nigeria. Chief of which was to appease minority groups that feel swallowed up by bigger groups within the states that they found themselves in. This domination of an ethnic group by others within a state comes with real consequence in material terms, measured in the number and degree of government projects that are executed for the different peoples. He asserts that what the country had always tried to do by the creation of new states is to first appease the cravings of minority groups, in the hope that it will eventually create harmonious co-existence among the people. Giving the number of ethnic groups in Nigeria, the viability of some of the states that will be created by this continuous fragmentation is in doubt.

Scholars also weighed in on the obvious effects that the style of federalism practiced in Nigeria has had on some other aspects of the polity.

Ogbo et al (2014) evaluated the implications of the federal structure on the polity while discussing restructuring with particular emphasis on the policing institution in Nigeria. The argument here is that the unitary policing arrangement of the federation, which is a thorough going outcome of the top-heavy character of the political system in Nigeria, is inadequate for the protection of lives and properties in the country. Its inadequacy was exemplified by the crime rate in the country, particularly terrorism, robbery, rape, kidnapping and assassinations. Due to the detachment of law enforcement officers from the communities that they are policing, getting vital information that could lead to the prevention of crimes within real times becomes rather difficult.

Anatusi, & Nnabuko (2013) analysing the defects of the national structure and its effects on the economy, focused on how to curb corruption to advance the image and tourism development in Nigeria through public relations strategies. The effects of Nigeria's battered image on its tourism potentials cannot be overemphasized. They help that while authorities must act to steamy the tide of corruption in Nigeria, a conscious effort must also be employed to launder the image of the country and to change the negative perception of it as around the world. Restructuring the polity is therefore significant in the rebranding efforts.

The educational sector is not immune to the structural defects in Nigeria. Ayeni & Adeleye (2013) highlighted some of the problems with the education sector and emphasized the need to integrate and adequately adjust the educational sector into any effort on political restructuring as only in such a situation will the gains be sustained.

Contributing to the debate, Nwaeze (2017), explored the effect of the federal practice on economic sustainability in Nigeria. He held that Nigeria as presently constituted is suffering from at least political, economic and social deformities. The difficulty in solving this problem, in his view, arose from the inordinate form of federalism being practised in Nigeria. 'True' Federalism, for him, refers to a political arrangement between constituent units whereby powers of government and governance are delicately shared amongst the constituent units, in a manner that guarantees the relative autonomy of units, enhances checks and balance, and leads to productivity. Federal political orders are therefore, most desirable on the strength that it has mechanism to accommodate differences among populations divided by ethnic, economic or cultural cleavages like Nigeria. He held the view that the version of federalism practised in Nigeria, having been distorted historically, politically, socially and economically, is the bane of her economic development as it breeds hostile competition and instability, corruption and unproductive consumption.

There is obviously an agreement among scholars that the polity is defective. The structure as it is currently constituted can no longer serve the purpose of encouraging unity in diversity in the Nigerian state. Restructuring Nigerian federalism is long overdue. What is not so clear though, is how and what shape the country should be restructured into.

Abah & Nwoku (2017) while outlining the key components of a federal structure to include: a written constitution, autonomy of each government, equality of powers between the regional governments, financial autonomy, division of powers, amongst others, they however, furthered that these base provision for the composition of a federal system have been abused by succeeding governments since independence. They advocate for resource control, equal number of states for all the geopolitical zones, and strict enforcement of federal character in political appointments. The Nigerian federalism is marked by over centralization of

powers and resources at the federal authority to the detriment of the federating states (units), and any restructuring address that concern.

Governor Nasir El-Rufai of Kaduna state who also doubles as the chairman of the presidential committee overseeing the restructuring efforts of the Muhammadu Buhari administration agrees with the general idea of the necessity of restructuring. His problem though, is with the fine lines of how Nigeria should restructure. He opines that the ideas that some people hold of restructuring as a radical departure from the present status quo is just wishful thinking. He is however of the opinion that the entire purpose and essence of restructuring is to deliver fairness, meritocracy and social justice. Hence a drastic radical reorganization of the polity, which is largely unrealistic, is unnecessary as piecemeal reassignment of responsibilities from the centre (federal government) to the units (state governments) on requests will go far enough in addressing genuine burning issues bordering on restructuring. For him, restructuring can happen without legislation, national conferences, and constitutional amendment. He asserted that the APC government is clearly restructuring the polity by a means that he described as "convention and pragmatic devolution". He gave an instance to support his argument on the piecemeal approach, as he was able to get a federal road in Kaduna state capital re-designated as state road to enable the state intervene in its lighting (El-Rufai, 2017).

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Seismic theory (Stein and Wysession, 2003) explains the undercurrent of political and social activities that largely and over time throw up surface and visible reactions of significant social import. The physical, visible social reactions that are thrown up can sometimes be of little effect and at other times of significant radical and devastating proportion. The theory supposes that socio-political events ranging from those of minute significance and those of significant proportion in the polity do not just happen. They are largely consequences of undercurrents, activities and movements that have, over a period, simmered underneath, and having been left unattended, breached fault lines in the foundations of social fabrics that social formations are woven with, resulting sometimes in devastating social consequences for particular socio-political formations. It explains the reasons for change and conditions for order.

A. The Adaptation of Seismic Analysis to Social Formations

The seismic theory view social formations like physical reliefs or planetary formations as possessing a core, mantle, and crust. The seismic analysis of politics unravel what underpins the political actions that are thrown up. That is, the foundational character of the polity that is naturally the causative factor of the many political symptoms exhibited by the polity, and how that condition can ultimately effect change and the dimensions of it.

The seismic theory is an adaptation of the understanding of seismic activities have resulted in earth movement and thrown up serious physical consequences. Seismic activities refer to the activities at the core (fraught in motion) or base of the earth, for instance, which largely determines such environmental reactions like tremors, earth quakes, volcanos, tsunamis, etc. that are thrown up with devastating impacts at the surface. It usually happens consequent to continental drift which causes movement of large-scale tectonic plates that in turn causes movements of a larger number of smaller plates of the lithosphere, unleashing effects on the crust and mantle of the Earth.

The seismic analytical framework posits that there are fundamental aspects, components or central core of societies that defines them, and that are in constant interactions and frictions with similar components of other members of a larger society moving like larger tectonic plates, affecting other components of lesser degree of significance like lesser plates. The fundamental differences of social formations are defined by the boundaries of these formations, with the attendant friction either transforming, diverging, or conforming them the prevailing superior force. In relation to a political society or the interactions of monolithic entities, transformation and conformity could lead to a loss of identity, and divergence with other forms of effect. The constant movements of social tectonic plates eventually lead to ripple effects that may manifest in eruptions, social tremors or social quakes along the boundaries of fault lines. The eruptions, social quakes and tremors are sometime with devastating effects to the fabrics of societies caught up in them. Even when the heat must have cooled off, pockets of aftershocks may continue to reverberate, sustaining an atmosphere of fear and insecurity. The dimension of the movements of social tectonic plates and the degree of frictions and eruptions or quakes that may happen are largely dependent on long term strategic interests (being pursued or undermined) of groups.

The management of social tectonic frictions or their resultant quakes could either be proactive or reactionary. The identities and cores of social groups can be structured to further harmony in movement of all the groups in the system to avoid friction. This can be done by structuring the entire system so that tectonic plates or groups live the values of their cores and avoid conflicts. The major groups in Nigeria have often come in conflict with others in their social motions. While these conflicts erupt intermittently and cools off eventually, the cycle continues as the tectonic plates of different groups clash in their motion as they advance their interests. The Nigerian state could manage the fundamental frictions that exists in its core either by decentralizing to create subsystems that operate within their cores reasonably and without a need to conflict with others, or risk continuous eruption and quakes that may destroy it in the long run.

IV. THE STRUCTURE AND ITS ABSURDITIES

Fundamentally, the call for restructuring in Nigeria stems from the perception/apprehension that the federal structure and practice in Nigeria are not consistent with the spirits and letters of the doctrine of federalism as a principle of political organization.

The constitution is the basic and organic law of a state which defines the government, determines the extent of governmental sovereign powers and intergovernmental relations, while defining and guaranteeing rights and civil liberties. The consolidation of federal practice in Nigeria through constitutional codification has journeyed from the colonial Clifford Constitution of 1922, culminating in the 1999 constitution that is today, the foundation of the federal arrangement as obtainable today. The foundations of the federal practice in Nigeria was laid by the Lyttleton constitution of 1954. It introduced a clear division of powers and legislative authorities between the regions and the central government, clearly differentiating the residual powers for the regions, and the concurrent power. The independence constitution of 1960, and the republican constitution of 1963 further entrenched federal practice in Nigeria. The fortunes of federal practice in Nigeria took a decisive dive with the 1979 constitution following a brutal civil war, after over a decade of military control of politics. The military, a regimented institution with a unitary and command orientation began to play the leading role in the constitution making process, gradually modelling the political system after itself. Leading up to the civil war, the military, by fiat, created 12 states from the northern, western, mid-western and eastern regions that were. The 1979 constitution heralded the second republic and was part of the processes in preparation for the impending return to civil rule. The 1979 constitution brought about a shift from the parliamentary system ordained by the 1963 republican constitution, to a presidential system. The significant consequence of that constitution was that it gave so much powers to the executive branch at the centre compared to that of 1963. It also preserved the land use decree of 1978 which handed in authority over land and all resources within them to the federal government.

A. *The Federal Practice and Doctrine*

The federal political system and practice are based on socio-political theories on federalism. Though this theory dates back to ancient times, its practice was given impetus by its adoption in the 1787 constitution of the United States of America. Federalism provides an organizational mechanism to attain a degree of political coordination and unity within a population with a varied and diverse feature. Under it,

Separate regional units (often referred to as states and provinces), are combine for limited, specified purposes under an overreaching administration, but in such a way that the government of each separate regional unit maintains its

integrity and substantial autonomy. This is achieved by distributing powers and responsibilities in such a manner to protect the existence and authority of both levels of government (Harman, 1992: 336).

Federalism is the theory of federal principles for dividing powers between member and constituent units. Sovereignty in federal political orders is non-centralized, often constitutionally, between at least two levels so that units at each level have final authority and can be self-governing in some issue area. Typically, the center has powers regarding defense and foreign policy. Federalism refers to the linking and coordination of peoples and institutions by mutual consent, for a specified purpose without giving up their identity. It is a formula for dividing power in which, the federal and regional governments are, each within a sphere, independent and coordinate (Wheare, 1946). Macmahon (1955) evaluated the features of federalism to include: the distribution of powers between a central and constituent units in a manner that cannot be changed arbitrarily by any strata of the government; the constituent units must have significant powers to deal with important and substantial issues and must not be consigned to triviality; the central government must always seek mandate from the citizens directly, and also draw taxes from them; there is equality in the legal status of all constituent units, and can be relative in matters of size, population, and wealth.

B. On the Need to Restructure

The structure of Nigeria as presently constituted derives its energy and justification from the 1999 constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. The constitution is consequently the basis upon which political relations, economic viability, participation, legal jurisdictions, security and its coordination, etc. are laid.

The 1999 constitution was given to Nigeria by the military government of Abdulsalam Abukakar. This constitution is touted as a major problem to federalism in Nigeria. Amongst other things, the constitution gave more powers to the central government by taking more items out of the concurrent list and bestowing it on the executive list. This in turn, made the Nigerian model of federalism top heavy, leaving the constituent units overwhelmingly dependent on the centre. With crude oil sales as the main source of revenue being channelled to the centre and the revenue sharing ideology of the state being a principal source of income for the Nigerian state and its constituent units, second tier governments have been left with no choice but to constantly run to the centre, cap in hand, seeking a hand-out. The central government therefore has constituted itself into a benevolent overlord that states, without a choice will have to parry to now and again. This condition takes its toll on productivity and relative independence of the states or constituent units as they

are reliant on the centre in a manner that compromises their independence.

This situation, having incentivised the centre and thrown-up a condition where all units and individuals of the polity are jostling for a place at its table of value allocation, the stake becomes higher as politicians do whatever it takes to book a sit. Corrupt practices become a norm as politicians try to out manoeuvre each other in the implementation of the Machiavellian approach to political engagements.

The centralization of the security apparatus of the state is also a major problem with the character of the federal system in Nigeria. The coordination of domestic security is left in the hands of an overburdened central police force, the Nigerian Police Force (NPF). The security of lives and properties, therefore, becomes a secondary consideration, compared to who controls the system. States are not able to coordinate their internal security, leading to consequences of great proportion.

The manner and lines in which the states in Nigeria a structured has also been a source of major tension. There is inequality per the number of states per geopolitical zone. This argument has become relevant, considering its import on legislative decision making at the centre. The pendulum is always tilting to the advantage of a section of the country by default. Members of some ethnic groups feel a sense of inequality in the structural arrangement of the polity and of injustice, leading to fervent calls for, sometimes, secession. As the centre continue to retain its attraction, a hostile competition amongst ethnic groups continues as all major ethnic groups seek to control it to its advantage. The practice of the federal system in Nigeria has continued to threaten the identity of ethnic groups. This negates some of the strong arguments for the adoption of a federal system

C. The Benefits of Restructuring

A restructured Nigeria promises so much for the country in the present and particularly, for the future. The country has a vast landmass suitable for agriculture and endowed with numerous natural resources. More importantly, the country is bestowed with enormous human resource potential. A restructured Nigeria will utilize and maximize all of these productive factors and forces. Specific states will have to explore their comparative advantages and device the best means to create wealth. As soon as the incentives for which people stampede to access the centre are removed, the citizens will be left with no choice but to push the boundaries of their ingenuity for wealth creation. The increased specialization that comes with a restructured Nigeria will, no doubt, drive and thrive economic viability.

A sense of justice and fairness in political representation amongst the constituent units will advance national unity and development. It will largely reduce ethnic tensions and foster inter-ethnic harmonious coexistence. Once the incentives for exploiting mutual differences are removed,

and the security of the identity of all constituent cultural groups are guaranteed within a reasonable political framework, insecurities related to this social distortion would have been addressed. Nigeria would also have set a worthy example for African states with fragmented cultural identities to emulate.

V. CULTURAL IDEOLOGICAL BLOCS IN NIGERIA AND RESTRUCTURING

Nigeria is made up of, howbeit informal, geopolitical zones. Of them all, the south east appears more inclined to a holistic restructuring. The others who may be interested on restructuring but not entirely kin on it include the South-South and the South-West region. All the geopolitical zones in the North, through their leaders, have over time, made clear their opposition to the idea of any form of restructuring that may threaten the advantages that they hold at the moment.

Table 1: Geopolitical zones in Nigeria, and their state compositions

North-East (6 states)	North-West (7 states)	North-Central (6 states)	South-East (5 states)	South-South (6 states)	South-West (6 states)
Adamawa	Jigawa	Benue	Abia	Akwa-Ibom	Ekiti
Bauchi	Kebbi	Kogi	Anambra	Bayelsa	Lagos
Borno	Kaduna	Kwara	Ebonyi	Cross-River	Ondo
Gombe	Katsina	Nasarawa	Enugu	Delta	Ogun
Taraba	Kano	Niger	Imo	Edo	Osun
Yobe	Sokoto	Plateau		Rivers	Oyo
	Zamfara				

Source: Authors compilation

A. Cultural Regions and Restructuring

Nigeria is made up of over two hundred and fifty ethnic groups. While some ethnic groups are so big as to cut across a number of states, hundreds more constitute the smaller groups that are agglomerated in a number of states. The major sociocultural groups representing the interests of ethnic groups in Nigeria has also been pivotal in the debate surrounding restructuring. This has, consequently, given a cultural and ethnic tilt to the restricting debate. The major ethnic groups include Hausa; Igbo; Yoruba, Fulani and Ijaw. While groups like Ohanaeze Ndigbo, the apex socio-cultural group of the Igbo people, have been at the forefront for the debate and agitation for restructuring, some other groups like the Arewa Consultative Forum have clearly shown their opposition to it. The secretary of the group, Anthony Sani in 2017 made it clear that the body is not interested in restructuring. It spared no time in referring all advocates of restructuring to seek their desire through the national assembly, as they are sure they have the numbers (owing to the numerical strength and advantage they enjoy, as they have more states, and hence more legislators) to frustrate the efforts. The afenifere has always shown its interest in the restructuring of the polity, howbeit passive in their demands.

While they support the general idea of a restructured entity for better impact, they are not so kin on it as to make it a major element in their engagement with the Nigerian state.

Table 2: Major socio-cultural groups in Nigeria and their position on restructuring

Major socio-cultural groups	States of influence	Position on restructuring	Interest
OhanaezeNdigbo	Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu, Imo.	Supports and actively demands restructuring	Active
Afenifere	Ekiti, Kwara, Lagos, Ondo, Ogun, Osun, Oyo.	Supports restructuring	Passive
Arewa Consultative Forum	Jigawa, Kebbi, Kaduna, Katsina, Kano, Sokoto, Zamfara, Nasarawa, Niger, Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba, Yobe, Kogi, Plateau.	Against restructuring	Not interested
Ijaw Youth Council	Bayelsa, Rivers	Demands resource control	Passive

Source: Authors compilation

VI. CONCLUSION

Nigeria's existence as a state appears to be a quicksand. The degree of ethnic tension, religious tension and insecurity, crime rate, increasing number of the youthful population without gainful employment, dearth of productivity, infrastructural underdevelopment, and screeching poverty among the population has continued to threaten the corporate existence of the country. The groups and managers of the state will necessarily have to take swift action to chart a profitable course for all its peoples. Some of the course of actions open to the Nigerian state for the salvaging of its soul are: A sovereign national conference with ethnic groups as representatives that should eventually culminate to constitutional amendment; restructuring the states in order to make each constituent unit viable and self-sufficient. Having the state rearranged along ethnic lines will better meet the aspiration of the different ethnic groups and douse ethnic tension. To restructure along ethnic and cultural lines is a viable option that could be considered. First, geopolitical zones will have to be vested with powers, recognized as constituent units of the federation, and a mechanism for letting the states begin to fend for themselves be activated. States that become financially distressed and unable to fund their survival may be absorbed by others. This will create an incentive for productivity and healthy competition amongst the constituent units. Power for the control and management of large percentage of the incomes/resources from the regions are domiciled in the regions. When this is done, the dangerous competition that

makes for everyone to converge at the centre and fight to kill and to the death will be no more.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Abah E.O. &Nwokwu P. M. (2017). Restructuring the Nigerian Federalism: the Proposed Form and Shape. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, Vol. 25 (7), 1518-1526.
- [2]. Adekoya, F. (2017). Restructuring Nigeria: Pros, Cons and Matters Arising. *Unilag Law Review* vol.1 (2), 12-49.
- [3]. Adeosun, A. B., Ismail, N. and Zengeni, K. T. (2017). Resource Control and Political Restructuring in Nigeria: a View from the South-South. *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 5(8), 8-25.
- [4]. Adetoye, D. (2016). Nigeria's Federalism and State Reorganization and Restructuring: Attempts at National Integration Through Fragmentation. *International journal of academic research and reflection* Vol. 4 (2), 40-51.
- [5]. Amadi, O. S., Echem, M. O., Nwoko M. C. O &Inyikalum D. (2017). Federalism and Political Restructuring in Nigeria: Analysis of the Rationale and Challenges. *International journal for social studies*. Vol. 3 (11), 1-15.
- [6]. Anatusi, T.C, &Nnabuko, J.O. (2013). Corruption and Tourism: Restructuring Nigeria's Image for Development Using Public Relations Strategies. *Kuwait chapter of Arabian journal of business and management review* Vol. 2 (5), 76-98.
- [7]. Ayatse, F.H, &Akuva I.I. (2013). The Origin and Development of Ethnic Politics and its Impact on Post-Colonial Governance in Nigeria. *European scientific journal*, vol. 9(17), 178-189.
- [8]. Ayeni M. A. &Adeleye J. O. (2013). Education and Political Restructure in Nigeria. *Journal of education and learning*, Vol. 2 (1), 171-175.
- [9]. Central Bank of Nigeria (2017). Central bank of Nigeria Annual Report. Central Bank of Nigeria, Abuja, https://www.cbn.gov.ng/out/2018/rsd/cbn%202017%20annual%20report_web.pdf
- [10]. Colonial Reports Annual. (1914). Nigeria Report, 1914.
- [11]. El-rufai, N.A. (2017). Next Generation Nigeria: What is Restricting and does Nigeria need it? London: Chatham House.
- [12]. Ewetan O. O. (2012). Fiscal Federalism in Nigeria: Theory and Practice. *International journal of development and sustainability*, Vol. 1 (3), 1075-1087.
- [13]. Falola, T. and Heaton, M. M. (2008). A History of Nigeria. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [14]. Farayibi, A. O. (2017). The Structure of Nigeria's Restructuring Rhetoric.
- [15]. Harman, G. (1992). Intergovernmental Relations: Federal Systems. In M. Hawkesworth, and M. Kogan (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of government and politics*, (Vol. 1, pp. 336-351). London: Routledge.
- [16]. Macmahon, A. W. (1955). Federalism, Mature and Emergent. New York: Doubleday.
- [17]. Nwaeze, N.C. (2017). 'True' Federalism in a Well-Structured Nigeria: The Panacea to her Economic Development Challenges. *Greener journal of economics and accountancy*, Vol. 6 (2), 26-42.
- [18]. Obidimma, A. E. &Obidimma E.O.C. (2015). Restructuring the Nigerian Federation for Proper Functioning of the Nigerian Federalism. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, Vol.5 (9), 147-157.
- [19]. Ogbo A. I., Obi-Anike O.H., Agbaeze E.K., &Ukpere W.I. (2014). Strategic Restructuring for Effective Police System in Nigeria. *Journal of Governance and Regulation*, Vol.3 (4), 163-173.
- [20]. OPEC (2017). Annual Statistical Bulletin. Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries, Vienna. https://www.opec.org/opec_web/static_files_project/media/downloads/publications/ASB2017_13062017.pdf
- [21]. Stein, S. and Wyssession, M. (2003). *An Introduction to Seismology, Earthquakes, and Earth Structure*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- [22]. Wheare, K.C. (1946). *Federal Government*. London: Oxford University Press.
- [23]. Yaqub, N. (2016). What is in Restructuring in the Era of Change in Nigerian Politics? *Proceedings of IASTEM International Conference* (pp. 5-18). Dammam, Saudi Arabia.