

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE AND THE SURVIVAL OF DEMOCRACY IN NIGERIA: LESSONS FROM REHOBOAM'S LEADERSHIP

Favour C. Uroko

Department of Religion and Cultural Studies,

University of Nigeria, Nsukka

favour.uroko@unn.edu.ng

Abstract

The paper studies the moral significance of civil disobedience to leadership arrogance in Nigeria's democratic setting. It was discovered that Nigerian leaders treat the citizens as non-relevant immediately after assuming political office. They promulgate policies which are anti-people. There is high level of social injustice, leadership hubris, and corruption in Nigeria. This has led to Nigeria winning the prize for the country with the poorest number of citizens in the world beginning from 2018. Anybody that tries to question the arrogance of the leader is severely dealt with. Unfortunately, due to fear, the citizens have resorted to solace and things have degenerated to a very bad state in Nigeria. This is similar to the situation of the Israelites in I Kings 12. Rehoboam took over his father as the leader of a united Israel. During the period of his inauguration, Jeroboam led a group of Israelites to Rehoboam to seek for social justice, fairness, egalitarianism and development. Rehoboam underestimated their civil powers. The people of Israel took it upon themselves not to be loyal to his leadership. The kingdom of Israel divided into two. It is on this light, that this article studies the situation of leadership hubris in Nigeria with its concomitant effects on the Nigerian society. It also lays emphasis on the significance of civil disobedience to the development of Nigeria democracy. A narratological analysis and the descriptive phenomenological method were used as the methodologies in this study.

Keywords: Civil, Disobedience, Rehoboam, Democracy, Shechem Assembly, Solomon, Israel, Judah

Introduction

The expression "civil disobedience" is accredited to Henry David Thoreau in 1848. He was born on July 12, 1817, and died on 6 May 1862. He was an American poet, author, historian and a tax resister. The American government at this point in history were collecting state poll tax which in the short run was to enable them to carry out their war in Mexico and also to enforce the fugitive slave law. Thoreau was not comfortable with this development. He insisted that paying the tax was a way of participating in injustice. But, Thoreau made it clear that he was ready to pay any other tax that would lead to the betterment of the

society. According to Steve (2015, n.p), "Thoreau asserts that because governments are typically more harmful than helpful, they, therefore, cannot be justified. Democracy is no cure for this, as majorities simply by virtue of being majorities do not also gain the virtues of wisdom and justice." Steve further explains that Thoreau exhorts human not to just wait passively for a chance to vote for justice, insisting that what is needed is for people to be just. This is not to say that people have an obligation to devote your life to fighting for justice, and equity but people do have an obligation not to commit injustice and not to give injustice their practical support. He exhorts people not to just wait passively for an opportunity to vote for justice, because voting for justice is as ineffective as wishing for justice; what you need to do is to actually be just. This is not to say that you have an obligation to devote your life to fighting for justice, but you do have an obligation not to commit injustice and not to give injustice your practical support. Thoreau was kept in jail. Thoreau states: "Under a government which imprisons any unjustly, the true place for a just man is also a prison" (Lawrence, 2007). His actions helped to force a reassessment of society's moral parameters of the United States. Thoreau sees civil disobedience as a way of ensuring the rights of the citizens to the government. The argument of Thoreau against the government influence Mohandas Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr., and President John F. Kennedy, among others. Elizabeth (1849) summarises thus: "Is a democracy, such as we know it, the last improvement possible in government? Is it not possible to take a step further towards recognizing and organizing the rights of man? There will never be a really free and enlightened State until the State comes to recognize the individual as a higher and independent power, from which all its own power and authority are derived, and treats him accordingly."

Civil Disobedience as a concept needs to be defined in the context of this paper. According to Gandhi (1921, n.p), it is the "civil breach of unmoral statutory enactments". Civil disobedience is the active, professed refusal of a citizen to obey certain laws of the state, and/or demands, orders, and commands of a government, or of an occupying international power. Civil disobedience is sometimes defined as having to be nonviolent to be called civil disobedience. Civil disobedience is sometimes, therefore, equated with nonviolent resistance (Piero, 2007). Like other modern states, Nigeria prefers the democratic system of governance. This is because the rights and duties of the cities are assured in the constitution. These rights were imputed into the constitution so that the government don't exercise its powers to the detriment of the citizen. Hence, Dewey (1937, 134) sees democracy as the necessity for the participation of every

mature human being in the formation of the values that regulate the living of men together: which is necessary from the standpoint of both the general social welfare and the full development of human beings as individuals. The general social welfare of the people is the paramount concern of any well-meaning government. However, when this concern is been relegated to the background, the citizens, under due process can seek a way of telling the government that their rights have been trampled upon. Civil disobedience and violence are two ways that citizens could employ in the fight for their welfare. However, violence is a non-democratic method of passing grievance because it leads to the destruction of lives and properties. Civil disobedience is a public, non-violent conscientious yet political act contrary to law usually done with the aim of bringing about a change in the laws or political act (Jean & Arato 1994, 771). Disobedience in itself is the refusal to obey laws, however, when this refusal is organized, with the aim of correcting certain abnormalities, it could be seen as civil disobedience. They accept arrest and punishment, a submission which signifies acceptance of the prevailing system and acknowledges a moral obligation to obey the law (Lyons 1998, 31).

Nigeria citizens are hapless considering the state of the nation. Those in leadership positions have made of mockery of democracy. Nigeria has leaders who are very arbitrary in their rulership. They treat citizens like the downtrodden. According to Segun (2014), Nigeria leaders are using the instrument of state to intimidate and harass innocent citizens. The citizen's rights are trampled upon. The promises which they make doing their campaign are not carried out when they ascend leadership power. There is a lack of justice, liberty and equality. There is high nepotism, hubris, and narcissism. There is no free speech and near-absolute totalitarianism. Weyler (2014) on his own part says that if we lived in a society that was governed by logic and common decency, then these actions might not be necessary, but we do not live in such a society. We live in a society governed by money and power, hoarded by a tiny elite – the 1% – to the detriment of most people and all of nature. This lack of respect for rule of law by those in the leadership cadre has led to abject poverty on the citizenry, lack of infrastructural development and moral collapse in all sectors of the society. The citizens are helpless due to the lack of knowledge on their role in governance and governmental control. Ogbimi (2018) cries out that wise people would not wait for the individual that qualifies as Mr Great Leader before putting-up the serious efforts needed for building a great nation. He further insisted the lamentation over poor leadership will continue for centuries if the citizens fail to take appropriate steps. It is also to be brought to public notice

that, the few individuals who have voiced out their dissatisfaction with autocratic government, or corrupt government have been witch-hunted by the government in power, notwithstanding the democratic system practised in Nigeria. It was on this note that Asira (2006, 117) concludes that “a situation where nobody expresses his views cannot be described as democratic.” It is in this light that this paper examines the relevance of civil disobedience to the survival of democracy in Nigeria, seeking clarification and insight from Rehoboam Leadership Model.

Rehoboam is an Old figure. He took over from his father as the ruler of Israel. The people of Israel were dissatisfied with the father’s method of leadership, and they met him at Shechem and appealed to him to stop the bad policies of his father. Hershey and Linda (2004) write that Rehoboam sought counsel from two different sets of advisors. The elders advised him (I Kings 12:7) to take a gentle approach with the people and thereby ensure their eternal loyalty. The advice of the elders affirmed that a leader is a servant of his followers and his role is to serve them. This advice would be consistent with many management theories of today. Hershey and Linda (2004) furthermore reveal that Rehoboam's young friends advised him to take a tough line with the people and say to them (I Kings 12:14): "My father made your yoke heavy, and I shall add to your yoke! My father chastised you with sticks; I shall chastise you with scorpions!" Rehoboam followed the advice of his young friends and responded harshly to the people. He challenged the people for questioning his authority. The aftermath is the fall of Israel. One of his officers was killed by the angry Israelites. Rehoboam for fear of attack on him flees to Jerusalem (Cohn, 1985, 30).

Forced labour under Solomon

The “occasional items of information provided regarding Solomon’s administrative arrangements suggest an increase in bureaucracy over David’s arrangements” (Miller & Hayes, 1986, 204). Solomon placed twelve *nissabim* (officers) over all Israel who were to ensure better administration. During the period of David’s reign, there was an official in charge of forced labour (cf. II Samuel 20:24). However, Solomon employed a different approach.

Solomon reign was characterised by the employment of forced labour gangs, who were saddled with the responsibility of placing the burdens of the kingdom on the subjects. In I Kings 5:13-16, King Solomon raised a levy out of all Israel and it numbered over 30,000 men. Hence, Solomon did not only give physical

burden on the people of Israel but also the financial burden. It got to a point where one of the force-labour gang, Jeroboam, who was placed in charge of the forced labour of the house of Joseph, revolted against the King and fled to Egypt. His life was sought after by King Solomon for questioning his authority. In the next section, it will be argued that these injustices against the citizens perpetrated by Solomon had both a long time and short time effect. As a limelight, after the death of Solomon, the Jerusalem controlled government split into two, viz: the northern kingdom (Israel, Ephraim) and the southern Kingdom (Judah). Miller and Hayes (1986, 220) lament that the separation left the two kingdoms weak. Hostilities between them over the next half-century drained their strength even further. There were four decades of hostilities between the two kingdoms that is from 924 BCE to 885 BCE.

The Shechem assembly

The *zeqenim*, the elders of Israel (Evans 1966, 273) met Rehoboam at Shechem. Rehoboam was to take over from his father, Solomon as the leader of Israel. Before the coronation took place the assembly requested certain reforms in the policy followed by Rehoboam's father, Solomon. The Shechem assembly was led by Jeroboam (Waldman 1970, 215). They pleaded with Rehoboam to lift the undemocratic policies that his father –Solomon–has laid on them. This policy according to Malamat (1965, 52) is that:

Solomon, during his latter(sic) years, adopted an increasingly oppressive policy. True, he introduced foreign trade and increased the national income to a very great extent. But his wisdom seemed to have failed him in his last days when his hand grew heavy upon the people. After all, 1400 chariots, 12,000 horsemen, and considerable infantry were a burdensome yoke in those days. He built his foreign policy around international marriages, not necessarily through the love of foreign women as much as from a desire to keep the peace. But all this engendered hatred toward the regime and full-scale opposition.

Thus, in I Kings 12:

³Then they sent and called him, and Jeroboam and all the assembly of Israel came and spoke to Rehoboam, saying, ⁴“Your father made our yoke hard; now therefore lighten the hard service of your father and his heavy yoke which he put on us, and we will serve you.” ⁵

Jeroboam approaches Rehoboam twice (2 Chr 10:3; 10:12). However, Rehoboam totally dwelt on increasing the burdens that his father –Solomon–lay on the people. He told them:

¹⁴ and he spoke to them according to the advice of the young men, saying, "My father made your yoke heavy, but I will add to your yoke; my father disciplined you with whips, but I will discipline you with scorpions."

There were two political groups which Rehoboam consulted –the elders and the young men. However, Rehoboam’s decision to follow the younger men’s counsel was orchestrated in order to fulfil God’s word (10:15) (Itzhak 2017, 9). This is because the Ahijah's prophesied Jeroboam's rise to power. It says that Jeroboam first got his idea of becoming king from Ahijah's prophecy. But that prophecy itself told him that he would have no chance of wresting the kingdom from Solomon, but that he would wrest it from Rehoboam (Gooding 1967, 184). However, Jamieson, Fausset and Brown (1871) contend that Rehoboam's tendency to depart from the true religion was due to his mother's influence. His mother was Naamah, an Ammonitess, and one of the foreign wives whom his father Solomon had married. Instead of Rehoboam thinking of how to reconcile with the northern tribes, but adjusting some of his undemocratic policies, he resorted to war with northern Israel. Rehoboam went to war against the new Kingdom of Israel with a force of 180,000 soldiers. For the next 17 years of Rehoboam rulership, he was at war with his brethren. The narrative reports that Israel and Judah were in a state of war throughout his 17-year reign (2 Chron. 12:15). Furthermore, when the people were languishing in forced labour, poverty and pains, without lack of food or shelter, Rehoboam was comfortably managing 18 wives and 60 concubines. They bore him 28 sons and 60 daughters (2 Chronicles 12:18-21), just in the ways of his father, Solomon.

A treatise on civil disobedience

Several scholars –Russell (1971, 245-256) –have given their justification for civil disobedience. According to Russell, civil disobedience aimed at altering the government’s policy. These alterations are measures which are aimed at using the legal means to fight against laws that impede the rights of human being. Rachel’s (1962, 249) explains that “civil disobedience does not involve acting with disloyal, seditious, traitorous, or rebellious intent, but with intent to insist, even non-violently, the legal consequences of the act.” Civil disobedience is not pride, neither is it rebellion to cause mayhem, it is instead a non-violent way of should contempt for wrong governmental policies.

Civil disobedience is a peaceable revolution against societal inconsistencies. This is in a bid to frustrate the government to make a u-turn in its policies and arrangements. Hugo (1962, 251) lucidly explains that: “anyone commits an act of

civil disobedience if and only if he acts illegally, publicly, non-violently and conscientiously with the intent to frustrate (one of) the laws policies or decision of his government.” Weyler (2014, n.p) narrates that

...history shows us that civil disobedience is often necessary when the relatively weak face the relatively strong. When power is out of balance, as in most cases of social justice advocacy, civil disobedience may be one of the few tactics left for citizens. And thus, the weak have confronted the strong throughout history: The Quakers, Gandhi, the Chipko movement, the suffragettes, labour movements, Martin Luther King, Rosa Parks, Mairead Corrigan Maguire, Nelson Mandela, Aung San Suu Kyi, Greenpeace, and countless others. Peaceful confrontation, not just words, creates social change.

The features of civil disobedience include:

- a. If the law is wrong, due to the fact that it is more heinous to obey than to disobey.
- b. The act is justified if the consequences are positive, that is, the innocent will not suffer much, or there will not be a general break down of law and order.
- c. The act of civil disobedience must not be a route to gain fame or revenge against a government. The motive must be pure.
- d. The intention of the protester should be made known to the government before embarking on civil obedience. Browlee (2013, n.p) explains that the protester seeks not only to convey her disavowal and condemnation of a certain law or policy but also to draw public attention to this particular issue and thereby to instigate a change in law or policy.
- e. The protester must be prepared to sacrifice time, energy, prestige and even his life.
- f. The act must be moral and directed towards changing certain anomalies.

Civil disobedience encourages both active followership and aggressive followership. According to Ikechukwu (2017, 476), in active followership, the followers participate actively in society affair. They are highly conscious and take interest in what the leaders do. He further noted that, in aggressive leadership, the followers are sometimes confrontational. They attack the leaders when they feel that their actions are unfair to the people.

The problem of leadership in Nigeria

Nigeria is a country blessed with so many mineral, agricultural and human resources. This makes Nigeria the country that is the envy of other nations, especially in West Africa. With a population of 173 million people (BBC News 2013), Nigeria possesses three regions, with 36 states and a Federal Capital Territory, Abuja. A survey of political leadership in Nigeria, since independence in 1960, reveals the high-level corruption and leadership failure (Olupohunda, 2012). Adedoyin and Terri (2016, 93) write that “the prevalence of corrupt leaders in Nigeria has a tremendous(sic) adverse effect on the quality of life, living standard, and national psyche.”

Leaders in Nigeria are no longer servant leaders. Leaders tend to be totalitarian and authoritarian. Nigeria is said to practice democracy, this “assumption is problematic when drawn into the experience of African countries where often scholars decry and explain poor living conditions of citizens with the lack of quality democracy and good governance” (Allen 2009, 160). Some of the reasons that have helped in the authoritarian lifestyle of regimes in Nigeria are the way that power has been much vested on the president. Many economic and political powers the president uses to achieve his selfish aims and objectives. Agbaga (2006) narrates that “This centralization of power, security, and financial resources in the presidency constitutes a major obstacle to the realization of Nigerian democracy. The authoritarian rule by an institutionalized oligarchy constitutes the main structural obstacle to deepening democratic rule in Nigeria.” Ebegbulem (2012, 222) explains that this gross violation of the rights of the citizenry is seen in the accumulation of wealth at “the expense of national development without devotion to the cause of the people . . . has criminally mismanaged the country’s affairs and resources. Nigeria’s political leaders, during electioneering campaigns, make fantastic promises in order to win elections, but as soon as they secure the people’s mandate, the people are shortchanged of the dividends of democracy.”

Corruption is another problem of Nigeria’s leadership. The rich few continue to rule at the expense of the many poor. The citizens are left to wallow in poverty and wants. The resources which are supposedly meant for them are diverted into private pockets. This is an action that calls for civil protest. Lending more support, Omar et al (2001,42) lament that corruption exacerbates poverty and disproportionately affects those of lower income because it pulls resources from the national treasuries, placing the money into the bank accounts of a few individuals who are powerful in the political arena. These politically powerful individuals control the state resources anyhow that they want it, without any

considerations to the ordinary citizens. The citizens are left to wallow in starvation, poverty and hunger. According to Kwanashie (2007, 16) “the proportion of the poor in Nigeria had doubled over the previous two decades, during which time the country received over USD300 billion in oil and gas revenue; if internal policies were adequate and the resources effectively utilised, the situation would have been far better than what obtained at the end of the military era in 1999.” Authoritarian and corrupt leadership is not relevant to development in a society and it is a poor leadership model which has been identified in Nigeria as a major hindrance to sustainable development (Gberevbie, et al, 2017).

Tribalism is also another critical problem affecting leadership in Nigeria. The “formulation and implementation of parochial ethnic and religious policies by the political leadership both at the national and state levels to the detriment of the overall developmental goals” (Gberevbie, et al, 2017,4) have sustained Nigeria’s leadership challenges. According to Chukwuma (2012, 42-43),

The bane of leadership in Nigeria, even Africa, is the preponderance on the self: one’s ethnic interest, one’s political affiliation, one’s religious set, one’s family and such selfish syndromes. A true servant does not discriminate against such sentiments, because his leadership is idea and vision driven and not self- 43 centred. Just as an actor does not choose his audience, even so a leader should not select or discriminate between those who voted him and those who did not.

It is due to these factors above sketched, that the citizens have accepted their fate of neglect and low self-esteem. The citizens who have tried in one way or the other to voice out against this anomaly have been dealt with by the government in power.

Impacts of bad leadership on Nigeria’s development

Due to the bad leadership that has been going on in Nigeria, for a long time now, the consequences are enumerated below.

1. **Poverty:** The necessities of life include food, housing and clothing. When a person is deprived of these, it leads to poverty. Poverty consists of a core of basic necessities as well as a list of other necessities that change over time and place (George, 1988, 208). Poverty is not restricted to one dimension, e.g. income, but it manifests itself in all domains of life, such as housing, education, health (Deleek et al. 1992, 3). Nigeria became the

poverty capital of the world in the year 2018. At the end of May 2018, Nigeria had about 87 million people in extreme poverty, compared with India's 73 million and also extreme poverty in Nigeria is growing by six people every minute, while poverty in India continues to fall (*Vanguard News paper*, 2018). So many persons in Nigeria are displaced. They have no home to stay. Their displacement was necessitated by either natural disasters or conflict among rival groups mainly with a religious undertone. This high level of poverty is caused by the recycling of bad leaders in Nigeria's polity. It is poverty that has led to the high level of prostitution and kidnapping in Nigeria. People are poised to survive by whatever means they can find.

2. **Unemployment:** In Nigeria today, so many people have no work to do. This includes both the skilled and unskilled, and educated and the uneducated. Unemployment results when those willing to work are unable to find work to do. When there are available chances to employ, advertisement is not made in the media, to avail everyone the opportunity of marketing themselves. Instead what is obtainable are nepotism, tribalism, and high-level secrecy in employment processes. According to the National Bureau of Statistics says the country's unemployment rate rose from 14.2% to 18.8% in 2017(*Vanguard Newspaper*, 2017).
3. **Low literacy rate:** This refers to the rate of people who are not attending a formal school. This is caused by their inability to pay for their fees. Unfortunately, some of these economically disadvantaged people are intelligent. These people, if given the opportunity to enter school would have contributed immensely to the development of Nigeria. Government neglect and corruption have increased the number of dropouts from formal schooling. The northern part of Nigeria bears a high percentage of illiterate individuals in Nigeria. According to the NBS, the states where the majority of people can neither read nor write are those in the Northeast, Northwest, and North-central. The data shows that Yobe State has only 7.23 per cent literacy level, the lowest in the country (Ajibola, 2017). UNESCO's National Programme Advisor on Education, Dr Mohammed Alkali laments that 65 million Nigerians remain illiterates (Muhtar, 2015).
4. **Maternal/ Infant morbidity and mortality:** Due to lack of provision of essential health care facilities in health centres, some women have lost their lives as well as the lives of their unborn and born infants. There are cases of no doctors in hospitals when a woman in labour develops complications. There are reports of 'pay before service' procedure in

hospitals, without considerations given to the life of the mother and her unborn child. According to Tobi (2018) Dr. Duduyemi Adeola the Programme Officer with the Nigerian Urban Reproductive Health Initiative 2 (NURHI 2) reveals that the 2013 Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey (NDHS) Maternal Mortality Ratio in Nigeria is 576 deaths per 100,000 live births and this figure is just an estimate as not every death is documented. She further states that annually, for every hundred thousand live births in Nigeria, 576 women die due to neglect. These incidents are higher in the north with as high as over thousand mortalities per 100, 000 live births. Some of the causes of these deaths include bleeding, unsafe abortion, and obstructed labour. According to the World Health Organisation and the United Nations Children Emergency Fund (2015), Nigeria has approximately 58,000 maternal deaths, accounting for 19% globally. Put differently, at least 800 women die in every 100,000 live births. Northeast has the highest maternal mortality rate, compared to other regions, with 1,549 deaths per 100,000 live births.

Rehoboam's leadership and Nigeria's leadership challenges

In Israel Rehoboam inherits an oppressive government policy from his predecessor. This is akin to the Nigerian situation in which each successive government tends to increase the burden on the people. Furthermore, Rehoboam was not intellectually and politically ready to man the position bestow on him. This made him consult with peers who were ever ready to dish out wrong policy and blueprints in governance. In Nigeria, some leaders got to the position when they are not intellectually and physically capable. This results in a lack of economic blueprints for viable society progress. Ocholor (2011, 267) laments that: as a result of their intellectual incapacity, lack a good understanding of the purpose of government, they –the chief executives - see their positions in government as opportunities to make money for themselves and favour their friends and relations. When offices are given to people either for money or by the favour of he who bestows them, it would not be surprising if the beneficiaries lack the knowledge needed for the positions they occupy and so, like their benefactors, prove inefficient.

The failure of youths to live up to expectation is equally seen here. The short-sightedness of youths who are supposedly seen as leaders of tomorrow is very worrisome. Rehoboam consulted with the youths and got into the wrongs path for the rest of his rulership. This is similar to the Nigeria situation, where the youths who are supposed to stand up against bad policies and corrupt acts have

joined in the menace. Leaders used them at will in the destruction of lives and property. They are being intellectually and politically short-changed. According to Salami (2013, 24-25), "It is very common to find government officials flaunting their ill-gotten wealth thereby making them the envy of the youths. The youths want to make quick and easy money and generally want to live in the fast lane. Increasingly, youths are being disoriented by the *get-rich-quick* syndrome of politics and engendered corruption in the last two decades. Many of them are beginning to share the view that hard work does not pay in Nigeria."

The way forward

This silence in the face of bad leadership is a way of approving the survival of bad policies and governance. In Achebe's book, "A Man of the People", the people who were suffering under a bad government where envisaging when their children are going to eat their own share thus: "Let them eat . . . after all when the white man used to do all the eating, did we commit suicide? Of course not... it may be your turn to eat tomorrow. Your son may bring home your share" (1966, 161). This is the situation in Nigeria. It is no longer the leaders that have failed; the citizens have failed to the extreme. When the citizens fail to speak up in the face of arbitrary leadership, the situation of Nigeria will continue.

There is a need for the revitalisation of pressure groups. This is because it is through these public platforms, that the citizens can effectively halt governmental mismanagements. This pressure groups could coerce it followers to boycott their duties to the government, to legitimately press home their demands. It was on this note that Weyler (2014, n.p) recalls that the activist, who wishes to change society, must find a means to enter the large-scale public discourse where truth can gain traction. The people must tell their story, and the dynamics of the narrative requires drama, characters, encounters, and visible commitment. Thus, we witness Gandhi making salt at the seashore, Rosa Parks refusing to move from her seat on the bus, the Quakers sailing boats into nuclear test zones, or Greenpeace sailing boats into whaling fleets or Arctic oil grounds.

Unions should also rise up to the occasion by boycotting schools and offices where public services are provided. This will partially halt effective governmental bureaucracies, hence, the government is forced to retrace their corrupt and non-peopled oriented policies. When the government fails to improve the wellbeing of her citizenry, civil disobedience should be used to society dissatisfaction with the scheme of things. Odutola and Ademola (1987,

212) reiterate that there should be a “collective attempts to bring about a change in certain social institutions or to create a completely new social order.”

There should be non-violent protests by the citizenry which the media covers. Members of the third realm of power should be invited to cover the protests and proceedings. This would indict and force the government to heed to the demands of the citizens. The procedure of refusing to pay taxes could also be used to fight against a failed government. When the government has lesser money at its disposal they would know that all along they were only in a temporary custody of tax-payers money.

Conclusion

The sorry state of things in Nigeria is based on the negligence of rights and duties by the citizens. Having known that the problem of Nigeria underdevelopment is leadership, the citizens have that moral obligation to make sure that leaders live up to expectation. For instance, Gandhi in India, and Mandela in South Africa used civil disobedience to partially collapse governments with the aim of fighting against wrong policies. Weyler (2014) corroborates that civil disobedience is very important due to the fact that the powerful tend to leverage their power into more power for themselves and never relinquishes power willingly. So the people, the relatively powerless, must find a way to engage the powerful in a sphere that employs its modest strengths: Public displays of moral integrity. The more that citizens continue to endure injustice, lack of social welfare and hubris of Nigerian leaders, the more the bad leaders continue to carry out their inhumane rulership. Civil disobedience is a form of participatory democracy. It guards against a violation of the moral principles underlying the constitution of Nigeria. The people of Israel led by Jeroboam used civil disobedience and they were able to achieve their set aims and objectives.

Reference

Achebe, Chinua. *A Man of the People*. London: Heinemann, 1966.

Agbaga, A. *Democracy and Governance Assessment of Nigeria*. http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pnadi079.pdf (Accessed March 11, 2018).

Ajibola Amzat, “Nigeria’s unemployment rate rises from 14.2% to 18.8%.”

December 23, 2017. <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2017/12/nigerias-unemployment-rate-rises-14-2-18-8/> (Accessed October 25, 2018).

- Ajibola Amzat, "Despite decades of funding, literacy level in the northern states remains low." <https://guardian.ng/news/despite-decades-of-funding-literacy-level-in-the-northern-states-remains-low/> (Accessed 24, 2018).
- Allen, Fidelis. "From "Authoritarian Rule" to "Democracy" in Nigeria: Citizens' Welfare a Myth or Reality." *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences* 1, no. 2 (2009): 152-192.
- Asira, Asira. "The Relevance of Civil Disobedience to the Survival of Democracy in Nigeria." *African Journal of Religion, Culture and Society*, 1 no.1,(2006)
- BBC News. "Nigeria profile – Facts. BBC", (2013). <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-13949547> (Accessed October 22, 2018).
- Brownlee, Kimberley. *Civil disobedience*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/civil-disobedience/> (Accessed February 14, 2018).
- Chukwuma Anyanwu, "Theatre And Film As Catalyst To Leadership Change In Nigeria ." *Nigerian Theatre Journal A Journal of the Society of Nigeria Theatre Artists (SONTA)* 17, No. 2 (2012).
- Cohn, R. L., "Literary Technique in the Jeroboam Narrative." *Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 97, no.1 (1985).doi:10.1515/zatw.1985.97.1.23.
- Deleeck, H., van den Bosch, K., and de Lathouwer, L. *Poverty and the Adequacy of Social Security in the EC*, Aldershot: Avebury (1992).
- Dewey, John. "Democracy and Educational Administration." *Planning and Changing* 22 (1937): 134-40.
- Ebegbulem, Joseph. "Corruption and leadership crisis in Africa: Nigeria in focus." *International Journal of Business and Social Science* 3, no. 11 (2012).
- Elizabeth P. Peabody. *Resistance to Civil Government*, <https://www.panarchy.org/thoreau/disobedience.1848.html> (Accessed on October 22,2018)
- Evans, Geoffrey. "Rehoboam's Advisers at Shechem, and Political Institutions in Israel and Sumer." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 25, no. 4 (1966): 273-279.
- Francis E. Ogbimi. *A NIGERIA AND PROBLEM OF POOR LEADERSHIP*, July 9, 2018 ,<https://www.thisdaylive.com/index.php/2018/07/09/nigeria-and-problem-of-poor-leadership/> (Accessed October 30, 2018).
- Friedman, H.H. and Friedman, L., *Biblical Leadership: Insights for Today's Managers* . *EJBO -Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organization Studies*. 2004.

- Gandhi, *Nonviolent Resistance*, Gandhi's comment in *Young India* for March 23rd, 1921 pp. 3-4 and 14.
- Gberevbie, D., Joshua, S., Excellence-Oluye, N., & Oyeyemi, A. Accountability for Sustainable Development and the Challenges of Leadership in Nigeria, 1999-2015. *SAGE Open*, 7(4), (2017), doi:10.1177/2158244017742951.
- George, V. , *Wealth, Poverty and Starvation*, Hemel Hempstead: Wheatsheaf, 1988.
- Gooding, David. "The Septuagint's rival versions of Jeroboam's rise to power." *Vetus Testamentum* 17, no. 2 (1967): 173-189.
- Hassan, A. R., & Lituchy, T. R., "Leadership in Nigeria", *LEAD: Leadership Effectiveness in Africa and the African Diaspora*, 89-106. doi:10.1057/978-1-137-59121-0_7
- Hugo, A.B. in: Tillman Frank (ed). *Introductory Philosophy*. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- Itzhak, Amar. "The Characterization of Rehoboam and Jeroboam as a Reflection of the Chronicler's View of the Schism." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 17 (2017).
- Jamieson, Robert, Andrew Robert Fausset, and David Brown. *A commentary, critical and explanatory, on the Old and New Testaments*, 2. Scranton: Scranton & Company, 1871.
- Jean , Cohen, Andrew Arato. *Civil society and political theory*. Cambridge MA : Mit Press, 1994.
- Kwanashie, M. , Internal and external pressures for reforms. In H. Saliu, E. Amali, & R. Olawepo (Eds.), *Nigeria's reform programme: Issues and challenges* (pp. 15-34). 2007. Ibadan, Nigeria: Vantage
- Lawrence Rosenwald. "The Theory, Practice, and Influence of Thoreau's Civil Disobedienc e." <http://web.archive.org/web/20070916155105/http://www.wellesley.edu/Peace/Rosenwald/thoreau.html> (Accessed on October 29, 2018).
- Lyons, David. "Moral judgment, historical reality, and civil disobedience." *Philosophy & public affairs* 27, no. 1 (1998): 31-49.
- Malamat, Abraham. "Organs of Statecraft in the Israelite Monarchy." *The Biblical Archaeologist* 28, no. 2 (1965): 34-65.
- Miller, James and John Hayes. *A history of ancient Israel and Judah*. Westminster: John Knox Press, 1986.
- Moraro, Piero. "Violent Civil Disobedience and Willingness to Accept Punishment," *Essays in Philosophy*, 8: no 2 (2007)

- Muhtar Bakare, "65 million Nigerians are illiterates – UNESCO," <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2015/12/65-million-nigerians-are-illiterates-unesco/> (Accessed October 26, 2018).
- Ochulor, Chinenye Leo. "Failure of leadership in Nigeria." *Sophia: An African Journal of Philosophy* 12, no. 2 (2010): 1-7
- Odutola, T.O. and Ademola, A. *Sociology: An Introductory African Text*. Ibadan: Macmillan, 1987.
- Olupohunda, B. Who is the most successful Nigerian leader? *The Punch*. (2012, November 29).
- Omar, Azfar, Young Lee, and Anand Swamy. "The causes and consequences of corruption." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 573, no. 1 (2001): 42-56.
- Rachels, J. In: Tillman Frank (ed). *Introductory Philosophy*. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- Russell, Bertrand. *On Civil Disobedience*. National Youth Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, 1961.
- Salami, C. G. E. "Youth unemployment in Nigeria: A time for creative intervention." *International Journal of Business and Marketing Management* 1, no. 2 (2013): 18-26.
- Segun, Adebowale, *The Many Reasons Nigeria's Leadership Has Failed*, By Bisi Akande, <https://theeagleonline.com.ng/the-many-reasons-nigerias-leadership-has-failed-by-bisi-akande/> (2016).
- Steve Agyei. "Wealth is the ability to fully experience life, Henry David" <https://medium.com/@steveagyeibeyondlifestyle/wealth-is-the-ability-to-fully-experience-life-ae6f3ee5c62b> (Accessed on October 28, 2018).
- Tobi Awodipe, "Nigeria's maternal mortality ratio is alarming", *The Guardian*, February 24, 2018.
- Waldman, Nahum. "A Note on Canticles 4: 9." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 89, no. 2 (1970): 215-217.
- Weyler, R. "Civil Disobedience: Why direct action is necessary." <https://www.greenpeace.org/archive-international/en/news/Blogs/makingwaves/civil-disobedience-why-direct-action-is-necessary/blog/48294/> (Accessed March 20, 2018).
- World Health Organization, "Nigeria fights high maternal mortality through improved quality of care," <https://reliefweb.int/report/nigeria/nigeria-fights-high-maternal-mortality-through-improved-quality-care> (Accessed on October 28, 2018).