

ETHICAL REPOSITIONING OF LOYALTY IN NIGERIAN POLITICS: TOWARDS ELIMINATION OF KAKISTOCRACY

EVARISTUS IFEANACHO, PH.D
DEPARTMENT OF RELIGION AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
NNAMDI AZIKIWE UNIVERSITY, AWKA

ABSTRACT

Man is naturally a social animal and consequent upon this fact he lives in community and is thus guided by ethical principles that direct his conduct towards living a better life. Since he lives in a society there comes the obvious need of electing leaders that will be piloting the affairs of the community so as not to relapse into anarchy. Such election being a human exercise has equally to be guided by moral principles which will ensure that leaders with impeccable character and moral probity are voted in mindless of political loyalty and affiliation. Therefore, the welfare of the State has to be the guiding force. Only in this way can government by the worst (kakistocracy) be thrown overboard. This research aims establishing the necessity of graduating to meta-politics that places high premium on seeking for candidates with the political correctness that benefits everyone regardless of political, religious, ethnic affiliation. The researcher will employ descriptive methodology to expose the necessity of injecting ethical principles in the political process. Through the analytic approach the research will explore into the moral recklessness involved in political process. Based on that, metapolitics will be recommended as a way forward because it transcends the ordinariness of political engagement. In the end, the researcher will emphasize on the importance of seeing beyond mere political loyalty and thus repositioning it on the foundation of rationality rather than self-interest.

Keywords: Ethics, Political loyalty, Kakistocracy, Machiavellian tactics, Metapolitics

Introduction

Politics in Nigeria has experienced and continues to experience a chequered history. Time and time again it has assumed different dimensions: the good, the bad and the ugly. But all the same, man cannot not be a political animal. It is in his nature. By the mere fact of living in a society, there comes the natural tendency of have a divide between the leaders and the led, the rulers and the ruled. This stratification into classes gradually begins to generate tension especially when instead of the electing the men of character and conscience into leadership positions, the worst and gang of power-mongers bulldoze their way into the assumption of power. Kukah (2014) making a classical presentation of Nigeria educational system ended up reflecting the woeful condition of the Nigeria political class thus: "The smartest students pass with first class and get admissions to medical and engineering schools. The second-class students get MBAs and LLBs to manage the first-class students. The third-class students enter politics and rule both the first and second-

class students. The failures enter the underworld of crime and control the politicians and the businesses. And best of all those who didn't attend school become prophets and everyone follow them.” The resultant effect could be wanton oppression, flagrant nepotism, shameless godfatherism and scandalous ethnic posture. When one class begins to lord it over others or when the law that is supposed to guide and guard them towards harmonious co-existence is flaunted with impunity, such impunity will go a long way to birth other attendant evils.

However, in the bid to realize their evil machinations, religion and ethnic divide are roped in as instruments of divide and rule. Unfortunately, even in this ugly turn of events, there is still a blindfolded political loyalty that pretends not to read the handwriting on the wall on account of the fact that their palms are regularly greased and their freedom trampled upon. It needs brazen courage in such a situation to champion a metapolitics that looks for goodness founded on *salus populi suprema lex esto* (The welfare of the people is the highest law) and political uprightness devoid of any political affiliation, religious bias, and tribal sentiment. It is pertinent therefore to explore into how best political correctness could be given an upper place in political loyalty? Then, we investigate into the necessity of passing every political process through the crucible of ethical principles.

Political loyalty

Loyalty is an existential given in every human community; either it is experienced directly or indirectly. Whichever way it is, the bottom-line is that it has to be strongly founded on proper evaluation via critical reasoning. Therefore, loyalty be it political or otherwise has to be arrived at not through mere sheepish following of the crowd or through susceptibility to financial bait but through a strictly reasoned decision; otherwise the tendency will be to relapse into slavery. According to Ejenebo (2023), loyalty has been defined as a strong feeling of support or allegiance. In other words, to be loyal to a person is to give support to that person. The key word here is support. If you support a person just because you don't want to disagree with him, then you are his slave not a loyal person. Support of a person within the context of loyalty must be situated in the overall good of the person being supported. When loyalty becomes blind support, then one has crossed over to the realm of slavery.

Loyalty has primarily to be directed to one's own country, state and individual. Since the nation has priority because of its macrocosmic dimension, the rest are subsumed into it. When the nation progresses based on the loyalty accorded it, surely the State and the individual will benefit from it. Whereas when loyalty to the individual be he politician or any other public figure, supplants that of the nation, the resultant effect is that the nation is abandoned to its fate. In the words of the American writer Mark Twain, “loyalty to the country always. Loyalty to the government when it deserves it.”

Besides loyalty to the country, most often loyalty to the godfather, the political aspirant, the governor, or whomsoever, is always based on some conditions that will profit the godfather and make the loyalist subservient to him. However, loyalty worthy of the name in the political context has to be founded on the political leader's shared vision of the State and how the State is to be moved forward in the progressive track. Surely, leaders who express such vision most often secure the greatest loyalty from their followers. This is based on the fact that Oke (2022) enthused that, “their personal interests became

enmeshed with a shared vision so much that they could still be remembered and still lionized long after their demise. Any mention of their names in any gathering still invokes raw emotion and empathy. For those leaders, the political office was not sacrosanct. Their power was derived from their political conviction and the sheer number and enthusiasm of their followers.”

Therefore, there is need for loyalty to be tested and trusted and not to be exhibited without a solid foundation. Unfortunately, in the words of Olaoye (2022):

No politician ever wants his loyalty tested. Although they all profess loyalty to the people, we know that their loyalty is mostly to themselves and their interests. Thus, if we ever want to get the best out of our leaders, the best invocation is the one that calls for their loyalty to be tested. ... Loyalty is a two-way thing. The followers are loyal to a leader who is loyal to them. But the overriding principle is that both the leader and the led are loyal to a set of binding principles.

According to Oke (2022a), loyalty becomes strained when a group, political association or party revolves around a particular (charismatic) personality with no shared vision or ideology other than the intention to either remain in or wrest power from an incumbent. Such loyalty is ephemeral because it is most often founded on material support. In the actual fact, a party needs to have a set of distinctive beliefs and principles to serve as a propaganda tool for its members. Without core beliefs, betrayal becomes ingrained in the party hierarchy. This will always be the rule rather than the exception. Going forward, therefore, Nigerian political leaders must learn one crucial lesson: loyalty is earned, not bought. When it is earned it perdures. But when it is bought it easily wanes. It is easier to betray a man than it is to betray his cause. For it to last it must be founded on formidable ethical principles.

Morality: inner meaning

Morality etymologically is derived from both Greek and Latin. For the former, it is “ethos” and the latter “mores;” both meaning ‘custom.’ Custom literally connotes peoples way of life – mannerism and dressing, beliefs and so on. If morality then is restricted to custom, it means confining morality to the domain of relativism, because as many as there are societies, almost so many are there customs. That being the case, we have to release morality from the shackles of custom by giving it an all-inclusive stance. That will make moral principles the same everywhere.

Morality *per se* is abstract and in potency; therefore it needs a rational being to actualize it. We can talk of rational being without morality, but we cannot talk of morality without a rational being. It will then be an ethical impossibility to subtract rational beings from the realm of morality. Both have to unite for a fruitful production.

Morality deals with how human acts relate to their norm. Without mincing words Glenn (2022) states that, “it is that quality of a human act whereby it measures up to what it should be as a step towards the objective last end of human act, or fails so to measure up.” Measuring up to what should be” and “failing to measure up” signify rightness and wrongness of an action respectively. It is the ability to decipher the goodness and badness of an act. Glenn (2022:10) put it clearly when he said that, “morality is that quality of human act which leads us to call some actions good and some evil”.

As a matter of fact, morality is intrinsically embedded in the act itself. It is not determined

by external denomination. Moral justifiability of a human act is an unavoidable quality of an act that satisfies the three determinants of moral act.

For a human act to be moral, three fundamentals have to be considered. They are: “The act itself or what a man does, the motive, or why he does it; the circumstances, or how, where, when etc. he does it.” (Fagothey 2000:145)

A human act that fails any of these conditions can be called any other thing apart from a moral act. That is why it is clearly stipulated that only those who are mentally-balanced are guided by morality. The mentally deranged fellows are exceptions to this rule since they act unconsciously.

Though moral action involves individual choice, it should not be precipitated to the suitability of individual liking. Individual convenience should not blind us or force us to relegate morality to the background. Morality should not be tainted with subjectivism, for if subjectivism is universalized, it boils down to beckoning Hobbesian state of nature to take the stage. There will no more be any moral justifiability or unjustifiability of human act. Therefore, it will entail individuating morality which will never augur well with human race. Advisedly, Scruton (1982) quoting Kant writes “every rational being must so act as if he were by his maxims in every case a legislating member of the universal kingdom of ends” (p.71).

Morality then is unconditional, all-binding, obligatory and inspired by reason. It is not two-pronged, but straightforward. Either you choose it or you lose it. It is the autonomy of the will which is imperative; as opposed to heteronomy of the will which is conditional.

Moreover, Aristotle consolidated morality by making happiness the *summum bonum* (highest good) of human conduct. In fact, Aristotle (2012) made it abundantly clear that, “the only ultimate moral rule is one enjoining us to maximize the sum of happiness.” Happiness is different from pleasure. It is not the immediate aim of every action but only an ultimate aim. This foreshadows the teleological nature of his moral theory.

In sum, although there are many notions of morality, it is conspicuously out-of-place to cling to ethical subjectivism. This is because it makes morality less a general principle. If do-as-you-feel becomes the order of the day, great will be the disorder in the world. In fact, morality is not tribalistic, neither is it guided by favoritism; indeed it is no 'respector' of person. Rather, it judges essentially the rightness and wrongness of all actions that are truly human like political actions.

Political power vis-à-vis morality

Power taken generally touches many aspects of life. For Parson (1970) it is understood as the general capacity of a social system “to get things done in the interest of collective goals” (p.181). It has more to do with “ability, capacity, virtue, potency, faculty, process of change of becoming operative.” (Encyclopedia Britannica, p.697) In biology for instance we talk of power of hearing, in Physics, the power of accommodation, in economics we hear of purchasing power, in International politics; we talk of super-power, and so on.

However, when we talk of power in the political context it “would in the words of Arendt (1970) “mean the consent of the governed that is mobilized for collective goals, that is, their readiness to support the political leadership” (p.4-5). “Man's influence over man as

manifested in government or the state” (Encyclopedia Britannica, p.85). Arendt (1970) opines that “power corresponds to the human ability not just to act but to act in concert. Power is never the property of an individual; it belongs to a group and remains in existence only so long as the group keeps together. When we say of somebody that he is “in power” we actually refer to his being empowered by a certain number of people to act in their behalf” (p.44).

It was Albert Camus who unreservedly said that “we cannot do without dominating others or being served.” Even the man of the bottom rung still has his wife or child. If he is a bachelor, controls his dog. So everyone is a ruler in his own small kingdom and accountable for it to whomever it may be. The king is a ruler over his subjects, a husband in his family, the woman also has her own power in the family, even the servant is not left out, he rules over the meager properties entrusted to his care. Each is questionable for the things or people within his area of jurisdiction; such is the diversity of power.

Power portrays itself as the proverbial hydra, spreading its tentacle to every nook and corner within the reach of its piercing tentacles. Even the houseboy politicizes over the properties he is placed in-charge of; which one is to come more closely to his umbrella of protection. The one that appeals to him enjoys his favor more.

We at times cast blames on the rulers of the state for manipulating the gullible masses to achieve their own designs. But when we are placed at the helm of affairs, we observe that we are not innocent of the same mischief we condemned. Ours may be even more drastic.

Be that as it may, a good government has to be guided by the common salve- “*salus populi suprema lex esto*” (the welfare of the people is the highest law). So, political leadership *ipso facto* has to be for the good of the entire citizenry and not for the benefit of the privileged few at the expense of the majority. Aristotle (2021) succinctly said that, “in the state, the good aimed at is just; and that means what is for the benefit of the whole community” (p.207).

We seem to have given a wait-a-bit wave to morality. This is because all we have so far said concerning politics have to be narrowed down to morality so as to sift the good qualities from the bad ones. Syllogistically put: all human acts are governed by morality; politics is a human act, therefore politics is governed by morality. The validity of this syllogism is highly incontestable and incontrovertible. Politics has to undergo the scourging scrutiny of morality before it is published as good or bad. Morality is the parameter by which the goodness or badness of an action is measured. Politics manifests itself through the human agents. Remove human agents, politics vanishes. Since human agents are the instruments of politics, the presence of morality becomes an inevitable condition. To divorce morality from politics is to jettison politics from the realm of being a human act which is totally impossible because the major players in politics are human beings and not animals. Therefore, to divest morality from politics will be tantamount to denying politics the aroma with which it is spiced which is the use of reason. When that is done, the government by the worst is willy-nilly instituted.

Kakistocracy: inner meaning

Kakistocracy is derived from *kakistos* (worst) which is the superlative of the adjective *kakos* meaning bad and the comparative is *kakiov*; and *kratia* refers to power.

Kakistocracy is “government by the worst element of a society,” was coined in 1829 by Thomas Love Peacock. Kakistocracy (literally, government by the worst) proliferates in weak and disorganized political systems that repel the talented and attract the incompetent and most soiled. It is really the case of the incompetent in power. Obviously, sometimes they come together producing a government that is both criminal and useless. When the two coincide, the kleptocracy and the kakistocracy feedback on each other. In fact, kakistocracy though fell into disuse formerly has of recent begun to assume the centre stage in some countries like Nigeria where in the words of Ornestein (2017) the most inept and cringeworthy kind of government is in existence. Its trademark is raw ineptitude, corruption, disruptive governance garnished with a harvest of impunity and total disregard for legitimacy.

Politics devoid of morality

Niccolò Machiavelli reflecting the political realism of his time in his small book *The Prince* captured how acquisition and retention of power was totally divested of morality. He presented politics as a battle, a do-or-die game. What is important is victory regardless of any type of evil that could punctuate the means. What is needed is the grabbing of power. Consequently, politics turned into a game of permanent interest and not permanent friends. In that craze for political power, morality is totally thrown overboard. Legitimacy and ethical principles are sacrificed at the altar of political expediency. They do not bother on what will be the long term effect.

We do not need proficiency in contemporary politics to know that many countries remarkably Nigeria have turned corruption into a routine of symbiotic “chop-i-chop” philosophy. It is carried out with impunity. In fact, Nigerian politicians seem sunk deep in Machiavellian tactics consequently stripped politics of any moral content. It is a tactics that exalts lie at the expense of the truth. As Machiavelli (1981) has it, “one must know how to colour one's actions and to be a great liar and deceiver. Men are so simple, and so much creatures of circumstance, that the deceiver will always find someone ready to be deceived. For him, a prudent ruler cannot and must not honour his word when it places him at a disadvantage...and no ruler ever lacked good excuses to colour his bad faith” (Machiavelli 1980:100). In fact, the ruler in the words of Machiavelli (1981a) “should not deviate from what is good, if that is possible, but he should know how to do evil, if that is necessary” (p.101). Such advice is indicative of uprooting morality from political process.

From the happenings in the 2023 presidential and gubernatorial elections in Nigeria, one could evidently notice a barefaced application of Machiavellian tactics. Among them were: exploitation of religious and ethnic divide, disenfranchisement, calumny, political thuggery and arson, vote selling and vote buying, manipulation of election result (rigging) to mention but a few. All these were geared towards the final glorification of power. Believe it or not, all these were adopted to surmount all the stumbling blocks in the wheel of progress. These according to Okoye (1987) are indicative of the fact that, “politics has become a lawless game, in which anything that beats the enemy is sanctioned, in which rules and promises change with ghastly realities of the power

struggle, and the successful is often a combination of confidence-man and show man, a mastermind of putsch and roguish pleasantries..." (preface)

Exploitation of religious and ethnic divide/peaceful protest

Nigeria is not only characterized by ethnic diversity but also religious diversity. The two major religions are Christianity and Islam. Normally adherents of each religion are driven by the credo of their religion. Religion normally upholds moral values and preaches their observance in order to ensure good living. According to Mbiti, "it is religion which tells what is right and what is wrong... religion enriches people's morale for the welfare of the individual and society at large" (p. 177). Man is a religious animal and Nigerians particularly are religious people. Based on that, religion plays a pivotal role in the training and formation of minds. Adeleye (1988) put it rightly thus:

Religion breeds an ideal heart in man to be conscious of the need to have a clean heart. By this, he will grow to have a philanthropic or patriotic thought before venturing to lead or represent his people in government of the state. In another words, religion will prepare the mind of man to be a good politician who will constantly fall back upon his religion to guide him. The teaching or threats of religion are expected to guide him to be able to lead his people aright as a politician with fear of God in him. He will never consider himself first, rather he knows that he is the servant of the electorates. (p. 165)

Political aspirants have now and again exploited religion to their own advantage. In fact, Magbadelo (2003) maintains that, "religion, as volatile as it is, remains a veritable instrument for political manipulation in Nigeria. Politicians across the ethnic divide have found religion more useful in mobilizing support for their candidacies or parties than ethnicity. This is so because it is the belief of the religious bigots that the two religions cut across ethnic identities." (p.64-65)

Disenfranchisement

Exercise of franchise is a constitutional demand that ought not be denied to any person that has attained the required age. In that regard Ochei (2022) opines that every citizen of Nigeria who has attained eighteen years old of age has the right to vote and be voted for during elections. This is a political right guaranteed by the Constitution. When people are debarred whether advertently or inadvertently from exercising this right, it is called disenfranchisement. Besides, this takes various forms. At times the registration of voters becomes an uphill task for the electorate that many get disenchanted and frustrated because of unwarranted bottlenecks in the process. Sequel to that, zeal regarding voting gradually begins to wane in the face of an enormous volume of uncollected voter's cards, the large number of deregistered voters and several unsuccessful efforts by most newly registered voters to collect their Permanent Voter's Cards (PVCs). These obvious cases not only instill the fear of disenfranchisement but also make it very obvious and worrisome.

In another context, the arrival of voting materials is consciously delayed to an asphyxiating point so that those that are without elastic patience would back out. This strategy is used by one party to dispossess another of votes. When that is done, their chances of emerging victorious become slim in that particular polling unit. More so, there

could also be broad daylight snatching of ballot boxes from polling units by political hoodlums to the utter consternation of the helpless voters. In these ways people are denied of exercising their civic responsibility.

Moreover, the commencement of the election may be delayed so as to accommodate only few voters, leaving many.

Campaign of calumny

This is the public assassination of one's personality. It is the dragging of one's name or reputation to the mud of public shame. It is slandering and damaging of one's character. Take it or leave it, calumny has continued to play a significant role in elections in Nigeria. The politicians openly hurl abuses on each other. It is always a clear campaign of calumny geared towards de-marketing opposition candidates in order to reduce their electoral value to one's advantage. Bemoaning the situation of Nigerian election, Aji (2023) lamented that the political campaigns are usually but unfortunately “saturated with all kinds of manipulations, fake and unsubstantiated media narratives, and character assassinations to project one candidate as a better choice over the other. Unfortunately, this trend in our political history has shifted our campaigns from an issue-based process to some jamboree gatherings intended to excite supporters and further impoverish the masses through sharing of peanuts to buy over voters.” In this way, they fought vigorously to win by hook or by crook. Consequently, it involves a damaging confrontational posture of blackmailing. In fact, the attempt is to reduce one's to nothingness. This method is used mostly by those who cannot capture discipline through their speeches. As a last resort they take to political name-calling and pouring out uncomplimentary and poisonous innuendos on their opponents. This is politically inappropriate and depicts a lack of political hygiene in speech.

Vote selling and vote buying

It is pertinent to consider vote selling and vote buying. Chaudhry (2023) raised the concern that “a culture of vote-buying, poll-rigging and manipulation has seeped into our electoral process and threatens to destroy the very foundations of our democratic traditions and undermine the integrity of our elections” (p.247). Vote buying and selling is a phenomenon that has permeated the process of democratic election. According to Agbi and Saka-Olokungboye (2019), it is the process

whereby political parties, their candidates or agents seek to buy the vote of an electorate in an upcoming election. Vote buying and selling can take various forms such as a monetary exchange, as well as an exchange for necessary goods and services. This practice is often used to incentivize or persuade voters to turn out on elections and vote in a particular way” (p.146).

It is the commercialization of the voting process implicitly guided by the principle of *do ut des* (I give that you may give). Evidently, money politics has become the order of the day. The display of affluence at election most often determines to which side victory tilts. It is no more the will of the people that objectively determines victory rather the will is swayed by money. There is however no gainsaying the fact that money is important with regard to putting the logistics in place, but when the election is totally beclouded by the spray of

money, the danger looms. As Obasanjo (2005) enthused, with so much resources being deployed to capture elective officers, it is not difficult to see the correlation between politics and the potential for high level corruption. The greatest losers are the ordinary people, those voters whose faith and investment in the system are hijacked and subverted because money, not their will, is made the determining factor in elections. Can we not move from politics of money and materialism to politics of ideas, issues and development.

In the current quagmire, it is evident that after so much money has been spent to secure victory, corruption will definitely reign supreme. More so, since there is lack of legitimacy, it will be very hard for such politician to secure the trust of the people. Agbi and Saka-Olokungboye (2019a) maintain and rightly so, that, effective and efficient governance are based on the tenets and practice of democracy. A legitimate government must be the one that enjoys the trust and support of the majority of the people. Legitimacy engenders trust and support of the people to government policies and reform agenda. Sadly, money politics, vote buying and selling erode this very important attribute of democratic government. This is because, the people believe that those who rule them must do so on the basis of popular consent, freely expressed as the tonic required to make the people make material sacrifice that reform agenda, social, political or economic inevitably demand. The fact is that, without legitimacy, there is no trust, and without trust there can be no genuine political support (p.149).

In sum, vote buying and selling obstructs the democratic process by meddling with the rights of citizens concerning the making of free decision in their choice of who is to represent them and their interest. Such situation goes to install political charlatans as leaders. Be that as it may, we must also continue not only to interrogate but also churn out a veritable means of extirpating the undue use of money and the weaponization of poverty by moneybag politicians.

Political thuggery

Political thuggery in the words of Rasak, B. & Garuba, R.O. (2017), is an “act of political violence or behaviour by ruffians hired or instigated by politicians to intimidate their opponents. It is the intentional use of physical force threatened against another person or a group or community that either results in injury, death, psychological harm or deprivation within a political circle” (p.4). According to Mandyen (2017), it is usually geared towards influencing an electoral process with objective of gaining an unfair political advantage over another and geared towards winning political power by subverting the ends of the electoral and democratic process through intimidation and disempowerment of political opponents. This illegal interference with the electoral process no doubt is electoral fraud, criminal and has severe consequences on democratic stability in general and national security in particular. These political desperadoes armed to kill, kidnap, intimidate, victimize, indulge in arson and other forms of evil eventually become threats in the society. In the post-election situation, most of them turn into armed robbers, assassins etc. Corroborating, Umar (2018) avers that political thuggery generates worsening insecurity during and after elections; most violent incident in Nigerian politics was perpetrated by thugs especially during elections. Post-election violence, ethnoreligious crises, and most communal conflicts have their genesis from political thuggery which

degenerated into a large form of violence in many cities of Nigerian states. This situation led to the poor political culture and more often than not affects democratic sustainability in Nigerian politics. (p.85)

Conclusion

When the foundation of Nigerian politics is solidly laid on proper use of reason, money politics will gradually fizzle out and moral principles will serve as the attitudinal compass in our political engagements. However, it cannot be effectively done unless there is freedom of choice which is a necessary ingredient of every human act. It has to proceed from the deliberate freewill of man. In the same vein, a human act is constitutive of three essential elements namely, knowledge, freedom and voluntariness. To blot out any of these components makes the act less a human act. Politics is a human act, and such has to pass through the crucible of moral determinants.

Political leaders kill, rig, maim, mudsling, calumniate and upset each other's apple-cart, with the intention of gaining and maintaining themselves in power. By so doing, politics is radically emptied of its moral ingredients and kakistocracy sneaks into the realm of governance with a total lack of legitimacy. Leadership in the real sense of the word should be the embodiment of the nation's dream, serve as a shining, a surrogate God, for the citizenry to follow the path of progress. Arrogance, confrontation, power intoxication and aversion to constructive criticisms are not the marks of good leadership. The leaders themselves should be transparent with honesty, justice and other virtues. Only in this way can government by the worst be nipped from the bud.

Recommendation

Loyalty remains vital in the life of man as a political animal. The researcher however recommends that political loyalty has to be guided by proper vision and use of reason. According to Attah (2023), our people are now more enlightened to know that one needs to go beyond party affiliation, religious affiliation, ethnic inclination to seek the good; and vote for that goodness or good person in whichever tribe, party, or religion that he/she is found. Goodness is an abstract moral principle that is made concretely manifest in human action. Such ethical principles must be sought for in any candidate that presents himself/herself for any elective post.

People need to know whom they want in any particular office under contest and bear in mind that hiding under a party for the pursuit of selfish interest does not do any good. Clueless attachment to party to the detriment of good governance is not but too myopic a political inclination.

We must graduate to the level of metapolitics because political process should no longer be based on mere political affiliation or personality but rather on who knows his onions and ready to prove his mettle. It entails mental transformation and re-orientation.

Finally, borrowing the advice of Aji (2023a) political actors must recognize that great democracies thrive on transparency and accountability of institutions; hence, politicians must know that they have moral and legal obligations to seek the welfare of the people and maintain a durable template of governance.

References

- Adeleye, M.O. (1988). Religion, Politics and Society. In: Adewale S.A. (ed). *Religion and Society: The Nigerian Experience*, Ibadan: Orita Publications. 60-75.
- Agbi N. and Saka-Olokungboye N. (2019). Money politics, vote buying and selling in Nigeria: An emerging threat to good governance, *International Journal of Advanced Academic Studies*; 1(2): 146-152.
- Aji, V. (2023). of campaigns of calumny, money and integrity of our democracy, <https://dailytrust.com/of-campaigns-of-calumny-money-and-integrity-of-our-democracy/> retrieved 31/3/2023.
- Alhaji, A.U. et al., (2016). Effect of Political Thuggery on Sustainable Democracy in Nigeria, *Sahel Analyst: Journal of Management Sciences*, vol.14, No.3, 75-88.
- Arendt H. (2018). *On violence*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Aristotle (2012). *Ethics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Aristotle (1995). *Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Attah, A. (2023). People'll vote candidates, not parties. DailySun 2/2/2023.
- Ejenebo, D.T. (2022). “**Tinubu, Osinbajo and politics of loyalty**”, **ThisDay 30/1/2023**.
- Fagothey, A. (2000). *Right and reason*, North Caroline: TAN Books.
- Glenn, P.J. (2022). *Ethics: A classical manual in moral philosophy*, St. Louis: Generic Book.
- Machiavelli, N. (1981). *The Prince*, New York: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Mbiti, J. (1990). *Introduction to African Religion and Philosophy*. London: Heinemann.
- Magbadelo, J.O. (2003). The politics of religion in Nigeria. *World Affairs: The Journal of International Issues*, Vol. 7, No. 2.
- Obasanjo, O. (2005). Political party finance Handbook. Independent Electoral Commission (INEC) Abuja.
- Ochei, A. (2022). **Does disenfranchisement affect the validity of an election?** <https://businessday.ng/news/legal-business/article/does-disenfranchisement-affect-the-validity-of-an-election/> retrieved 2/4/2023.
- Oke, T. (2022). **When loyalty becomes a dirty word**, <https://punchng.com/when-loyalty-becomes-a-dirty-word/> 10/5/2022.
- Olaoye, W. (2022). “May your loyalty be tested,” Premium Times, 23/1/2022.
- Okoye, M. (1987). *The beard of Prometheus*, Ilafracombe Devon: Arthur Stockwell Ltd.
- O r n s t e i n , N . (2 0 1 7) . A m e r i c a n k a k i s t o c r a c y . <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/10/american-kakistocracy/542391/>
- Parsons, T. (1970). “Authority, Legitimation and Political Action,” in his *Structure and Process in Modern Societies*. Glencoe, III.: Free Press.
- Peschke, K.H. (1991). *Christian ethics*. Vol.1. Bangalore: Theological Publications in India.
- Rasak, B. & Garuba, R.O. (2017). Political Thuggery and Women Participation in Politics in Nigeria. Vol. 8(1):63-76. *Political Science Review*.
- Scruton, R. (2001). *Kant*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.