Abstract
Nigeria is at crossroads. It is beset with crises of nation-building and development, triggered by its refusal to confront the national question germane to its survival as a plural country. The paper sets out to find out how federalism in Nigeria has helped in Nation building or national integration. It is important to note that Nigerian federalism has achieved a great deal in winning for the political system, the loyalty and commitment of its subjects. In spite of the formal separations, the states and the nation have shared functions of government. the federal grants to states have encouraged cooperative practices. Another area of cooperation, is the political integration of states and nation in critical policy making points. The National Assembly, the Senate and House of Representatives. It is important to point out that there has been areas of continuing tension between the National government and States- derivation principles as it affects oil producing areas and Sharia laws as it affects the Nation and Sharia States. Above all the impact of these dual loyalties, the performance of national tasks, but with necessary attention to State interests and loyalties are essential ingredients in nation building and national integration.
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Introduction
The British brought together the various Nigerian people whose languages and cultures were different and began the long process of amalgamation-that brought all the people under one political unit-Nigeria. The first amalgamation took place in 1906, when the colony of Lagos was joined with the protectorate of southern Nigeria to become the colony and protectorate of Southern Nigeria. The only reason was for he British to take advantage of the resources of the hinterland. A bigger amalgamation took place in 1914 when the North and South of Nigeria were brought together for economic reasons. In 1939, sir Benard Bourdillin, Governor of Nigeria, divided the southern provinces into two regions Omolewa (1986). As a result there was a northern region with Kaduna as the administrative centre, a western region with Lagos as the administrative centre and an eastern region with Enugu as the administrative centre. Lagos was also Nigeria’s capital. Nigeria, was standing on this culturally, linguistically, and ethnically different regional tripod on the eve of independence.
on October 1, 1960 very predisposed to the proclivities of a new state-emerging from colonization.

In Nigeria, this very process of the formulation of a sovereign civil state among other things stimulated the sentiments of parochialism, and ethnicity because it introduces into society a valuable new prize with which to contend.

The doctrines of the nationalist propagandist to the contrary notwithstanding Nigerian tribalism is in their political dimensions not so much the heritage of colonial divide and rule policies as they are the products of the replacement of a colonial regime by an independent domestically anchored purposefully unitary. Though they rest in historically developed distinctions, some of which colonial rule helped to accentuate (and others of which if helped to moderate), they are part and parcel of the very process of the creation of a new polity and a new citizenship” Geertz (1971).

Thus, Nigeria is a country where size, cultural and linguistic diversity, historical particularize and considerable decentralization prevail (Max Beloff, 1953). This is the view of Max Beloff and James Madison’s “diversity hypothesis” which states that the more diverse the elements within a political system, the better it is suited for federalism, and more homogenous the political society the better for unitary forms.

Therefore, discussion of the characteristics of the federal relationship can only be meaningful in the context of a federal arrangement, which came into being on January 01,1900 and later the amalgamation of the north and south in January 01,1914.

It is against this background that this paper considers federalism and Nation building in contemporary Federal Republic of Nigeria.

**Nation Building**

According to Ake (1979:9), is the problem of winning for the political system, the loyalty and commitment of its subjects. In this sense, nation building is synonymous with National integration. National integration refers to the process of bringing together culturally and socially discrete groups into a single territorial unit and the establishment of a national identity. In this sense national integration presuming the existence of an ethnically plural society like Nigeria, in which each group is characterized by its own language or other self-conscious cultural qualities, but the problem may also exist in a political system which is made up of once distinct independent political units with which people are identified. National integration thus refers specifically to the problem of creating a sense of territorial nationality which overshadows or eliminates-subordinate parochial loyalties, Weiner (1971).

At this point it is important to ask why new nations with pluralist social orders require more national integration/national building. According to Weiner (1971:646) there are seven factors:

Firstly, colonial governments were not concerned with national loyalties but with creating classes who would be loyal to them as a colonial power.

Secondly the colonialist viewed the development of national loyalties as a threat to his political authority, the new leadership of the emergent state views it as essential to its own maintenance.

Thirdly, colonialist permitted limited participation and the parochial sentiments of local people rarely entered into the making of any significant decisions of essential interest to policy makers. Fourthly, once the new nations permit a greater measure of public participation, then the integration requirement of the system are higher.
Fifthly, the new elite in the new nations have higher standards of national integration than those of their former colonial rulers, and thus creates new integration problem.

Sixthly, once areas of policy are in the hands of a national regime, then issues immediately arise as to which sections of the country and communities are affected adversely or in a beneficial fashion.

Finally seven, once the state takes on new investment responsibilities—whether for roads and other projects—questions of equity are posed by the regions, tribes, and linguistic group which make up plural societies.

Geertz (1971) states that it is the nature and pattern of the plural societies that determines public polices that guide the patterns of social relationship of groups within the new nation. Geertz (1971) enumerated four patterns that include:

1. Countries in which a single group is dominant in numbers and authority and there are one or more minority groups.
2. Countries in which a single group is dominant in authority but not numbers.
3. Countries in which no single group by itself commands a majority nor is a single group physically dominant.
4. Countries of any combination in which one or more minorities cut across international boundaries.

In general there are two public policy strategies for the achievement of national integration according to Geertz 1963 (1971):

- The elimination of the distinctive cultural traits of minority communities into some kind of “national” cultural group—a policy generally referred to as assimilation “Nigerianization” or “Detribalization”.
- The establishment of national loyalties without eliminating subordinate “cultures.
- The policy of “unity in diversity” which has been “dubbed federalism” and politically characterized by “ethnic arithmetic” as practiced in Nigeria.

According to Deutsch (1966: 3), the process of nation-building could be seen as an architectural design or a mechanical model that could be built based on authority, needs, and plan of the designer. To achieve unity, Emerson (1967: 91-98) believes that at this stage, nation-building involves the citizens’ loyalty towards their country of residence, and reduces their prioritizing towards their own ethnic. There are researchers that refer to them as a community that is formed historically through the sharing of similar territories, economy and traditional elements that embody language, culture and name. Most countries involved in the process of nation-building are former colonies.

Originally, nation-building referred to the efforts of newly-independent nations, notably the nations of Africa but also in the Balkans, (Harris, 2012) to reshape territories that had been carved out by colonial powers or Empires without regard to ethnic, religious, or other boundaries (Deutsch & Foltz, 2010). These reformed states would then become viable and coherent national entities (Walker, 2011). Nation-building includes the creation of national paraphernalia such as flags, anthems, national days, national stadiums, national airlines, national languages, and national myths (Hippler, 2005 & Anthony, 1986). At a deeper level, national identity needed to be deliberately constructed by molding different ethnic groups into a nation, especially since in many newly established states colonial practices of divide and rule had resulted in ethnically heterogeneous populations (Harris, 2012).

However, many new states were plagued by "tribalism", rivalry between ethnic groups within the nation. This sometimes resulted in their near-disintegration, such as the attempt by Biafra to secede from Nigeria in 1970, or the continuing demand of the Somali people in the Ogaden region of Ethiopia for complete independence. In Asia, the disintegration of India into Pakistan and Bangladesh is another example where ethnic
differences, aided by geographic distance, tore apart a post-colonial state. The Rwandan genocide as well as the recurrent problems experienced by the Sudan can also be related to a lack of ethnic, religious, or racial cohesion within the nation. It has often proved difficult to unite states with similar ethnic but different colonial backgrounds. Whereas successful examples like Cameroon do exist, failures like Senegambia Confederation demonstrate the problems of uniting Francophone and Anglophone territories (James, Jones, Crane, and Cole DeGrasse, 2007). The process of nation-building is an effort to develop the spirit of patriotism and solidarity to create a country whose people share a common identity. The major aim is to foster national unity by developing a new nation and an integrated race (Hippler, 2002:1-3).

A 2003 study by James Dobbins and others for the RAND Corporation defines nation-building as "the use of armed force in the aftermath of a conflict to underpin an enduring transition to democracy (James, Jones, Crane, and Cole DeGrasse, 2007). Comparing seven historical cases: Germany, Japan, Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo, and Afghanistan, "in which American military power has been used in the aftermath of a conflict to underpin democratization elsewhere round the world since World War II," they review the lessons learned. This definition of nation-building is substantially different than those which see nation-building as the province of people within a nation. The definition centers around the building of democratic processes, but many argue that the use of the military to bring about democracy may be inherently contradictory. Whether nation-building can be imposed from outside is one of the central questions in this field, and whether that can be done by the military is a further part of the question (Stephenson, 2005).

According to Wikipedia (2013) Nation-building refers to the process of constructing or structuring a national identity using the power of the state. This process aims at the unification of the people within the state so that it remains politically stable and viable in the long run. Nation-building can involve the use of propaganda or major infrastructure development to foster social harmony and economic growth. It is also the development of behaviors, values, language, institutions, and physical structures that elucidate history and culture, concretize and protect the present, and insure the future identity and independence of a nation. For the purpose of this paper the following definition of nation-building is provided: Nation-building is the intervention in the affairs of a nation state for the purpose of changing the state’s method of government. Nation-building also includes efforts to promote institutions which will provide for economic well being and social equity.

**Federalism**

Two schools of thought explained the meaning and nature of federalism. The orthodox school led by K.C. Wheare sees federalism as condition and the revisionist school led by Fredrich sees it as process.

Wheare (1963) state rigid conditions for he concept of federalism. According to Wheare 1963: “federalism means the method of dividing powers so that federal and regional government are each, within a sphere, coordinate and independent”.

Wheare (1963:1) conceptualized federalism with the American union as the basis of his thesis. He sees federalism as the formal division of powers between levels of government. According to him “federal government is an association of states so organized that power are divided between a general government, which in certain matters independent of the governments of the associated states, and on the other hand, state governments, which in certain matters are in their turn, independent of the general government”

Wheare (1963:10) further states that people will adopt the federal system if they desire a single coercive force in some aspects and independent of the units in other aspects. He added that “by the federal principle, I mean the method of dividing powers so that general and regional governments are each within a sphere, co-ordinate and independent”.
This statement of the federal principle is qualified by Wheare’s pointing out that it is a principle of organization and practice whose ultimate test is how the federal system operates. Wheare further listed conditions under which such a polity can exist and be sustained. These include among others, the formal and legal divisions of powers and responsibilities among levels of government as manifested in a written constitution, the establishment of an independent judicial system particularly the Supreme Court.

Although, Wheare has been criticized by other commentators for being legalistic, formal, rigid, euro-centric and idealistic, his formulation continued to serve as the springboard for subsequent analyses. Friedrich (1966:286) in an attempt to avoid the pitfalls of Wheare took a rather broad view of federalism, and argued that federalism is a process rather than a design. He argued that federalism should be seen as a process by which unity and diversity are politically organized and this process includes, like all political phenomena, persons, institutions and ideas. He asserts “that federalism, is a general principle of social organization and that the degree of federalism in a political system is a function of sociological and not legal criteria”.

He also sees federalism as dynamic and contended that the federal instrumentalities can be found in several forms of political systems, ranging from centralized to decentralized. He affirmed that studies in contemporary times sort the dynamics of federalism not within its legal construct or constitutional document, but in the social forces that link or underline the political process.

Livingston like Friedrich observed that the essence of federalism lies not in the institutional or constitutional structure but in the society itself. He maintained that federal government is a device by which the federal qualities of the society are articulated and protected.

Livingston as quoted in (Akinyemi et al, 1979) further identifies the territories’ demarcation of diversities as a distinguishing characteristic of federal government. In his words ‘these diversities may be distributed to the members of a society in such a fashion that certain attitudes are found in particular territorial area, or they may be scattered widely throughout the whole of the society. If they are grouped territorially, then the result may be society that is federal. If they are not grouped territorially, then the society cannot be said to be federal….But in the former case only can this take the form of federalism or federal government. In the latter case, it becomes functionalism, pluralism or some form of corporatism”.

Perhaps, what is more unique about Livingston’s postulation is the introduction of the notion of “spectrum federalism” because it removes the rather common idea of an ideal federalism. As he asserts “federalism is not an absolute but relative term; there is no specific point at which a society ceases to be unified and becomes diversified. The differences are of degree rather than of kind. All countries fall somewhere in a spectrum, this runs from…. A theoretically wholly integrated society at one extreme to a theoretically wholly diversified at the other”.

Riker (1964:12) viewed federalism from a more static perspective, as a bargain struck by the component units. He argues that the federal bargain emerges when all relevant parties concerned are ready and willing to make a deal. He said two factors bring about such bargain:

a. The desire by the leaders to expand their territorial control, usually either to meet an external military or diplomatic aggression and aggrandizement,

b. The presence of some external military diplomatic threat or opportunity.

He above conditions, Riker claims, are responsible for a federal union to be centralized or conversely peripheralized. In the case of a centralized federal system, federal authority tends to overawe constituent governments. In a peripheralized
federation, subordinate governments have greater influence over the affairs of the whole society than rulers of federalism.

Etzioni (1962:44) in his contribution offers a systematic and logically though not perspective on the process of interpretation. His conceptualization of integrative forces as either coercive (military), utilitarian (economic sanction) or normative (propaganda) is suggestive of the sociological variable that help in explaining the federal form of government. Etzioni’s central theme is concerned with power. For him, politics is nothing short of the exercises of effective political power by an identifiable central authority. More than that, he stresses the relevance of the attitudes of leaders and decision-makers to the process of integration for unification.

From this perspective, federalism belongs to that group or class of political systems devised to bring about unification of political communities. The end product of these communities’ reaction to the federal situation, occupy what Livingston calls spectrum federalism. Hence the euphemism about unity in diversity talked about federalism in Nigeria and India, or devolution in the United Kingdom becomes meaningful.

Appadorai (1975:495) in his postulation expressed the dire need for clear division in certain issues under mutual agreement. He explains that “a federal state is one in which there is a central authority that represents the whole, and acts on behalf of the common interest, and in which there are also provincial or state authorities with powers of legislation and administration within the sphere allotted to them by the constitution”.

According to him, federalism is a political contrivance intended to reconcile national unity with the maintenance of state rights. He also recognized the formal division of governmental powers by the constitution and the supremacy of constitution as distinctive features of federalism.

Awa (1976:1) sees federalism “as the coming together of different (sometimes also distinct) political units under a single political umbrella, a central authority (government) that faithfully represents the whole and acts on behalf of the whole in such areas as external affairs, which are in a sort of social contract agreed to be to the mutual interest of the different constituent units”.

Nwabueze (1983:1) throws more light on the concept, by stating that “federalism is an arrangement whereby powers of government within a country are shared between a national (nation-wide) government and a number of regionalized (i.e., territorially localized) governments in such a way that each exists as a government separately and independently from the others, operating directly on persons and property within its territorial area, with a will of its own, and its own apparatus for the conduct of its affairs and with an authority in some matters exclusive of all others”. Thus, federalism implies and involves.

a. The existence of more than one level of government (central government), as powers and functions are vertically shared among the federal, regional, or state, as well as the local governments, within each having its own constitution, flag, coat of arms, anthem, etc.

b. The powers and functions of each level of government are derived not from the central government but directly from the constitution, and are separate vertically between the tiers of government.

c. These powers are usually explicitly embedded in the legislative lists-exclusive (for the federal government), concurrent (for federal and states/regions), and residual (for regions/states or local governments).

d. The existence of written and rigid constitutions.

e. Separation of powers among the various organs of government

f. Balance sizes of federating components.

g. Adequate funds to enable each component unit and the federal government operate.
h. Dispersed authority since the different tiers of government have their respective functions.

i. Resources in regions or states are controlled by the states and an agreed quantum paid into the central pool.

j. The various levels of government operate as coordinates and equals, instead of subordinates or super-ordinates (Wheare, 1963; Ransom, 1943).

Federalism in actuality is all about treaty making. Therefore, it could be contended that without the legal framework, it would be difficult for sociological factors to work effectively.

From the above, three things are clear. First, is that constitutional specification is the starting point of any federal arrangement. Secondly, social, political and cultural factors determine and affect the nature of any federal system. Thirdly, federalism is a concept for promoting unity in diversity and has to be worked upon by the country to reflect economic, social, cultural and historical reality.

Wheare, while referring to the practice of federalism in United States argued that for federalism to work, certain institutional requirements must be fulfilled. They include according to Vines (1976):

a. Drawing of boundaries between the governmental activities of nation and states.

b. Establishment and maintenance of identity of national governments and state governments.

c. Political integration of nation and states: this orthodox view of federalism has been criticized for being legalistic and rigid.

While, Wheare’s definition of federalism neglects sociological factors, which are crucial to an understanding of the dynamics of federalism, Fredrich recognized sociological factors.

The second school of thought led by Fredrich (1964) defined federalism as “the process of federalizing”. Important and inherent in this reformulation is that federalism is a general principle of social organization and that the degree of federalism in a political system is a function of sociological and not a legal criteria. Nigerian type federalism coincides with this definition since the government from 1967 has tried to create states and local governments for people of identical cultural and social background. Thus from the civil war period in 1967 to 2000 the government engaged in the creation of states and local governments for a number of reason. Some of these reasons are socio-political and economic.

According to Elekwa (2001) one of such reasons is the political decision to ostensibly bring governance closer to the people through the creation and recreation of states and local governments especially during the long years of military rule bring the number of states to 36, with a Federal Government Capital Territory Abuja and 774 Local Governments (Federal Republic of Nigeria Constitution (1999). Even with this number of states and local governments there are still a number of culturally distinct groups agitating for states or local governments.

Moreover, the federal system-it became clear-was not just a series of formal prescriptions. It settled the most serious political issues, including the allocation of authority between the nation and states, the decision of which government should perform what functions and the provision of means of which both the national government and the states established and maintained an identity. The federal system was organized around three themes (Vines, 1976) as listed below:

**Boundary Settlement:**

The establishment of boundaries was implemented both by a positive allocation of certain powers to the national government and states and by curtailing their authority through a denial of certain specified powers. The division of allocated powers involved granting to the national government a list of enumerated or specifically delegate powers listed in section

**Establishment and Maintenance of Identities:**

In a historical sense states were created by the federal government and did not have well-established traditions and long political experience.

An important task of the various constitutions have been to establish concurrent legislative list as in part II section 4 of the second schedule of the 1999 constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. What is notable of the 1999 constitution is the there is no residual list of function for local government as spelt out in the 1975 and 1988 Federal Republic of Nigeria, Constitutions.

**National and State Integration:**

In thinking about federal system it is a mistake to conceive national-state relations largely in terms of rivalry or potential competition. The constitution to a large extent separate nation and state functions of government and also secured a substantial amount of integration between the two levels. Integration was accomplished by the merging of identities in important national institutions and by providing for cooperation between the two levels in performing certain functions.

Perhaps the most important factor making possible political integration between the two levels is the scarcity of officials with a clearly defined identification with the national government.

Instead, the majority of national officials are chosen and retained in office by procedures that strengthen interests and identification with the States, resulting in the creation of a group of national office holders who also have links to the states. Although each set of national officials has somewhat different links with the states their ties are quite definite.

In the senate, where members participate in the passage of all national legislation and other special functions as well, their memberships tie them firmly to the States. Selected three from each state and officially representing the states, the senators are chosen in elections by an electorate qualified by each state.

In the House of Representatives members also vote on national legislation. House members allocated to each state are chosen within federal constituencies which shall be as contiguous as possible and be such that the number of inhabitants in it is as nearly equal to the population quota as is reasonably practicable (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999).

In the selection of other elected officials, domination of political parties by the states is important imprinting local influences. According to (Vines, 1976) the most frequent characterization of parties, so aptly reflecting the influence of the States, is that they really have little national identity or organizational character; but are loose collections of State party organizations.

Although there are undoubtedly political and social features that contribute to parties’ lack of a national identity, a basic factor that interests the parties in the state rather than the nation is the presence of electoral contests and elective offices in state elections. Without elections, parties cannot win offices and so control the institutions of government. on the other hand, candidates who want to win and retain national office must also work within these state political parties (Vines, 1976).

The allegiance of the president is more ambiguous and may be tilted either toward the nation or the states. In an important respect, the president seems to be clearly a national official as he presides over the nation and handles national problems. Yet he too has ties to the States. His nomination takes place in party conventions where the choice is made by state party delegates.

The national judiciary are composed of officers who have minimum responsiveness to the states because of the nature of their job. In the same vein administrators within the
national government may have the clearest national identification and least ties with the States. Although the top cabinet members and administrators are chosen by president and presumably reflect his thinking and interests, the other members of the bureaucracy are more independent and under the protection of civil service laws. Administrators’ ties with the state are therefore minimal and tier identification with the national government may become all engrossing (Vines, 1976).

Considering the national government as a whole, only a portion-and none of the legislative or presidential officials-is without state ties. In consequence, the states are important centres of political activity and the customs of national policy are frequently measured there. The impact of these dual loyalties, the performance of national tasks but with necessary attention to state interests and loyalties are essential ingredients in nation building or national integration.

This is borne out by the fact that the variety of state interests, the nature of the rivalries and competition expressed in the senate and national assembly i.e. the legislature may not be between state and national but among different kinds of states or between different districts of a state and the whole state.

Cooperative Federalism:

With respect to finances, short expressions are often used to refer to styles in the relationship of a nation to state. one such term is “cooperative federalism” as reference to cooperative procedures, usually money grants that characterized national state relations (Vines, 1976).

Such grants usually had the national government giving funds to states for the accomplishment of certain purposes and to be used and administered at the State and local levels. For this kind of allocation to be effective and efficient, it has to have clearly stated objectives formulae, principles and criteria.

Akinde (1976) outlined the need for proper justification of the allocation of federal discretionary grants to state governments. According to him the criteria for his allocation must be rooted in impartiality, non-discrimination and equity as conditions of federal stability. The allocation of conditional grants have been supported based on the following reasons:

1. Conditional grants are device for achieving a national minimum standard in the level of some essential services all over the federation. The assumptions are that the Federal Government, as the principal repository of the national interests, owes it a duty to equalize opportunities for, and access to, the national minimum standard in the process of certain basic services for every citizen wherever he may live in the whole federation. As Akindele has noted, such use of the federal spending power naturally raises the question of who is to determine which service should meet the national minimum standards, how to determine what constitutes the national minimum standards and whether the importance of public function, ipso facto, justifies federal investment. (Vines, 1976).

2. Conditional grants or federal grants-in-aid also introduces flexibility into the operation of the constitutional system. According to this rationale, conditional grants are a means of pragmatically realigning financial power to constitutional responsibilities between federal and state authorities. It is possible, the argument goes, to device a federal fiscal system which perfectly aligns financial power with legislative responsibilities once and for all. Accordingly bearing in mind that the tax fields of the federal government usually have greater growth generating capacity than those of the state governments, federal fiscal transfer is said to be a good device for adjusting the inelastic state revenue for their continually expanding responsibilities Vines (1976).
Due to the disparity in the economic resources of the state governments, tax burden varies from state to state. Residents of comparatively wealthy states are more likely to have lighter tax burden than those of the poorer states for a given level of public service. Yet in a federation which sees the need for equalization of opportunities, a disproportional imbalance in the tax burden across the country cannot but encourage population and revenue movement away from those poorer states where the burden is comparatively onerous; thus aggravating the situation in those states. Federal grants may therefore be weighted in favour of the comparatively poorer states in order to improve the capacity of these state governments to provide better services and to lessen the burden of taxation on the citizens they serve.

Closely linked with the foregoing is the fourth argument that federal non-statutory fiscal transfer is a device for redistributing wealth in the name of balance and even natural development. Geographically balanced economic and social development is often said to be politically stabilizing factor in any federation.

**Creative Federalism**

Creative federalism is another expression that relates to the styles in relationship of a nation to the states. In this arrangement multiplicity of grants are made to local governments and state officials for improvement of highways leading to communities, and to help the farmers out of the mud. Under such grant programmes the objective is primarily to achieve the goals of economy and efficiency.

Since states contributed a large share of funds normally 50 percent at least. It is assumed they would want to administer the programs with economy and efficiency.

Grants should be extended to communities, cities, non governmental public bodies, universities, private individuals and group rather than using already established channels through state governments.

**Permissive Federalism/the Advent of Revenue Sharing**

The term “permissive federalism” has been sometimes used to refer to a style of state-national relations typified by the concept of the sharing of revenues by the national government with state and local governments. The style is permissive because the states are helped with their financial problems with large grants of national money but not restricted by onerous conditions attached to the grants or limited by narrowly defined purposes.

This is practiced to some degree in Nigeria, but some stats if not all states do not release monies to local governments through the states-local government Joint Accounts.

**2.2 Theoretical Framework**

There exists an avalanche of eminent theorists that produced extensive interaction in the field of inter-group relation in plural societies/states. Integration theory had served as an effective way of achieving and preserving both integration and stability in deeply divided societies. The Nigerian nation-state is a pluralist state and there are many theories of national integration which would be suitable for studying the Nigerian national-state. Some of the theoretical approaches include the functionalist, the federalist and the cybernetic. The functionalist approach requires the study of Nigeria within the primordial ethnic, cultural, economic, linguistic and religious heterogeneity and the need to drive the citizens into a homogenous unit which may permit participatory government (Hass, 1964). This may be performed through the process of political socialization.

The federalist model extols the creation of a central government that coordinate the constituent units, while the cybernetic approach emphasize the establishment of contacts and promotion of interactions through which the component units would understand and appreciate themselves better. These approaches are said to contribute to effective national integration which fosters political unification of the component parts into one whole unit.

To this extent, this study adopts integration theory as propounded by Myron Weiner. According to Weiner (1965), integration may refer to the process of having together
culturally and socially discrete groups into a single territorial unit. This definition presupposes that there is in existence an ethically-pluralist society in which each group is characterized by its own language or other self-conscious cultural qualities. This territorial integration implies that the territory must be in existence under the control of one state and one government, like the Nigerian State and that the authority of the central government must be firmly established over all the country’s territories.

The ultimate goal of national integration as a process (irrespective of the preferred strategy) therefore, is the political unification of the constituent units into one whole nation, the type of Plato’s polis (city-state). This is known as the process of state building, as opposed to the process of nation-building.

National integration is one among the five types of integration identified by Weiner. The others are: territorial, value, elite-mass and integrative behavior (Weiner, 1965). According to Weiner, national integration refers specifically to the problem of creating a sense of territorial nationality which overshadows or eliminates subordinate parochial loyalties. This integration involves amalgamation of disparate social, economic, religious, ethnic, and geographic elements into a single nation-state, a homogenous entity, the like of Plato’s Polis, the city-state. This kind of integration implies both the capacity of government to control the territory under its jurisdiction as well as to stimulate a set of popular willingness by the people to place national interest above local or parochial concern towards the nation generally. Also, where national integration thrives, the individuals realized their rights and privileges identify fully with the state and owe allegiance to it, because they see themselves as standing in direct relation with it (Plato, 1969).

The values of Federalism

There are benefits in running an economy based on federalism. First, the federating units can be perceived as growth poles with the advantages of push and pull effects. Second, the federating units would design policies, strategies and programmes that would accelerate the growth and development in their jurisdictions. Third, aggregating the socio-economic activities of the federating units would result in a dynamic, strong and growing economy, all things being equal.

Though the constituent federating units do cooperate and collaborate, the driving force behind a viable federal structure is wealthy competition among them (the federating units). Consequently, the entire system benefits with each federating unit attempting to produce goods and services optimally. Sometimes, the competition can be cut-throat as each unit tries to outsmaart the other. An example of this could be through incentives like generous tax brakes to attract investors. Citizens even exploit the situation by moving to units with a better provision of goods and services; the citizens simply vote with their feet.

To a large extent, the united states of America, USA, Canada and a few other countries, mirror an ideal federal structure. In the case of the USA, the centre is not weak. The federating units (states) were autonomous and independent before deceiving to come together to form a federation. Hence, each federating unit decided what powers to relinquish to the centre. It is, therefore, not surprising that in the USA, competitive federalism is practiced without negating co-operation among the states. It is for this reason that in spite of the huge size of that country and the numerous layers of sub-national governments, the sharing of resources among the federating states is rather straight forward. The federal government becomes an umbrella with selected relevant functions such as defence, foreign policy, immigration, customs and some broad social policies. This is not to suggest that there are not tensions in the American federal system; disagreements are debated and settled through engagements and dialogue.

Furthermore, federal values most prominently mentioned are the benefits associated with the maintenance of a diverse pluralism on the one hand and achievement of social
efficacy and a broad national purpose on the other. The diverse and different states will conserve the values of pluralism, while a viable national government will discover a sense of national purpose and social efficacy. Although we have had our portions of crisis in Nigerian federalism, a contentious issue here is that oil royalties and rents which it was agreed before independence that 50% should accrue to the region of origin, but which changed with different federal leaders is still unresolved. First of all, General Yakubu Gowon, seized the offshore oil, while General Olusegun Obasanjo reduced the 50% to 30%. Shehu Shagari cut it to 2% while Mohammed Buhari reduced it further to 1.5%. However, Ibrahim Babangida shored it up slightly to 3% and in October 1992, inaugurated the oil and mineral areas development commission, charged with responsibility of compensating the communities, local government areas and states which have suffered damage (ecologically and environmentally) and deprivations as a result of oil prospecting, opening up the affected areas and effectively lining them up socially and economically with the rest of the country by producing various forms of infrastructural and physical development.

However, the oil-bearing communities are asking for more complete royalties and mining rents reparation/compensation and self-determination or autonomy as a lasting solutions as far as they are concerned (Okafor, 1992).

The pluralistic value of grassroots policy has not be completely served by the nearly automatic extension of grants to all the states. This is because revenue allocation in Nigeria has failed to fully attain this objective. The federal regime’s stronghold over revenue allocation is implemented by supreme political power, exercised for more than two-thirds of Nigeria’s history by the armed forces, and almost always by leaders from the north who disregard the principles of derivation which was in existent before 1966. It is hoped that in this democratic dispensation the granting of 13% derivations to oil producing areas is a step in the right direction to hold our fragile federation in place.

Conclusion

Among the complex interactions in the federal system two themes stand out in the relations of states to nation (Vines, 1976). In spite of the formal separations, the states and the nation have shared the functions of government. The grants helped and encouraged cooperative practices. In many policy areas the states and the nation have found it profitable to cooperate so that the national government furnishes fiscal means and social emphases while the state provides local implementation.

Another area of cooperation is the political integration of states and nation in critical policy making points—this National Assembly, the Senate and House of Representatives. It is important to point out that there have been areas of continuing tension between the national government and states-derivation principles as it affects oil producing areas and Sharia laws as it affects the Nation and Sharia states. Above all the impact of these dual loyalties, the performance of national tasks, but with necessary attention to state interests and loyalties are essential ingredients in nation building or national integration.
REFERENCES


Okafor, N. (1992), “*Oil Producing Areas Fury*”. The Guardian Newspaper,


