MONOGRAPH

THE STATE AND CIVIL SOCIETY IN NIGERIA:

Towards a Partnership for Sustainable Development

AUGUSTINE OVUORONYE IKELEGBE Ph.D

STATE, CIVIL SOCIETY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA

By

AUGUSTINE OVUORONYE IKELEGBE Ph.D.

Professor of Comparative Politics and Public Policy
Department of Political Science and Public Administration
University of Benin, Benin City and Adjunct Research Professor,
CPED, Benin City

PREFACE

This policy research monograph is part of the on-going research of the *Centre for Population and Environmental Development (CPED)* on the research theme titled "Growth and Equity in Nigeria" in the current strategic plan (2010-2014) of the Centre. Civil society has become across the world, the non state emergent agent for providing critical social welfare, social services, humanitarian services, socio-economic empowerment, political participation, human capital development and productive economic activities. But more importantly, it has become the popular agent for instituting accountability, transparency and good governance, restraining state abuses, resisting the untamed effects of market forces and strengthening public scrutiny.

In fact, the diversity of efforts of the civil society formation in relation to critical areas of human and national existence, have made it look like it is central to governance at local, national and international levels, the resolution of societal ills and the generation of sustainable development. The international community and governments have tended to embrace civil society with high hopes and potentialities as capable of redressing the character of the post colonial states and contributing substantially to sustainable development. Civil Society Organisations are seen as facilitating divergent voices, broadening rights and freedoms, strengthening collective decision making, participation and consensus building and empowering ordinary people. This perception of centrality and even of indispensability has driven the proliferation, funding, support and increasing relevance of CSOs such that they have grown in leaps and bounds in the last two to three decades. Today, the civil society organization (CSO) sector is a major socio-economic force, a major employer and a major platform for volunteering work. The conventional wisdom today is that CSOs have to be integrated into the development process. It is in this context that Professor Augustine Ikelegbe examines the importance of building partnership between the state and civil society organisations in Nigeria so as to they can collaborate in socio-economic development in the country.

We are particularly grateful to the *Think Tank Initiative* for the Institutional support provided for CPED which has enabled the Centre to carry out the study that led to publication of this policy monograph.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACRONYMS

AAPW	Academic Associates Peace Works
BPW	Federation of Business and Professional Women
CS	Civil society
CBO	Community based organization
CDP	Community development plans
CDHR	Campaign for Democracy and Human Rights
CDP	Community Partners for Development
COWAD	Community Women and Development
CPED	Centre for Population and Environmental Development
CRP	Constitutional Rights Project
CSOs	Civil society organizations
DESOPADEC	Delta State Oil Producing Areas Development Commission
ERA	Environmental Rights Action
GMoU	Grand Memoranda of Understanding
GPI	Girls Power Initiative
IDP	Internally displaced persons
IMF	International Monetary Fund
JAAID	Journalists against AIDS
MAN	Manufacturers Association of Nigeria
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MDA	Ministries, Departments and Agencies
MWAN	Market Women Association of Nigeria
NDDC	Niger Delta Development Commission
NGOs	Non Governmental organizations
NIREC	Nigeria Inter-Religious Council
NSA	Non state actors
NEITI	Nigerian Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
NINCOF	Nigerian NGO Consultative Forum
NSWG	National Stakeholder Working Group
NUJ	Nigerian Union of Journalists
PPP	Public-Private Partnership
SDP	Sustainable development programmes
SWAAN	Society for Women and AIDS in Africa
TNOC	Transnational Oil Companies
PNI	Pro-Natura International
PREDA	Peace, Reconciliation and Development Association
WAF	Women Advancement Forum
WHEDA	Women Health and Development Association
WILDAF	Women in Law and Development

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The task of development and good governance in Africa has been so gargantuan and seemingly intractable. The failure of the efforts thus far is reflected in the fact that sub-Saharan Africa is the basin that holds the largest concentration of the poor and the poor nations of the world. It is also the seat of the most debilitating, deepened, prolonged and subsisting economic decline and development crisis (Young 1998:348).

Perhaps the biggest disaster in the continent was the failure of the developmental state, which undertook to do so much in line with the independence aspirations of Africans. This failure indicated the poor capacity and competence of the states and the pronounced problems of ineffective and inefficient management of development. The consequences of this failure has been grave as manifested in the extensive and protracted economic decline, social service decay, extensive poverty, social ferment, violent conflicts and out-migration.

The state, governance and development crises that Africa has faced led to a rethinking of the development discourse by the late 1980s particularly in relation to the continued roles of the state, the need for private sector driven development and the possible roles of the non state sector in development efforts. The interest of international organizations, international civil society organizations, development and donor agencies in the support and funding of civil society organizations (CSOs) in the third world, was part of efforts to scale down and divest roles from the failing post colonial states, to strengthen private sector driven development initiatives, promote participatory development efforts and particularly deconstruct state centralized and top down development.

Civil society has become across the world, the non state emergent agent for providing critical social welfare, social services, humanitarian services, socio-economic empowerment, political participation, human capital development and productive economic activities. But more importantly, it has become the popular agent for instituting accountability, transparency and good governance, restraining state abuses, resisting the untamed effects of market forces and strengthening public scrutiny.

In fact, the diversity of efforts of the civil society formation in relation to critical areas of human and national existence, have made it look like it is central to governance at local, national and international levels, the resolution of societal ills and the generation of sustainable development. The international community and governments have tended to embrace CS with high hopes and potentialities as capable of redressing the character of the post colonial states and contributing substantially to sustainable development. The CSOs are seen as

facilitating divergent voices, broadening rights and freedoms, strengthening collective decision making, participation and consensus building and empowering ordinary people. The CS formation has become so important that its involvement is seen as legitimizing of policies and processes.

This perception of centrality and even of indispensability has driven the proliferation, funding, support and increasing relevance of CSOs such that they have grown in leaps and bounds in the last two to three decades. Today, the civil society organization (CSO) sector is a major socio-economic force, a major employer and a major platform for volunteering work. As at 2004, the number of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) was estimated to be 100,000 in India and 500,000 in Britain (Ghaus-Pasha, 2004:4).

The conventional wisdom today is that CSOs have to be integrated into the development process. Obviously, the need for this extensive and emerging strong formation to be integrated into and synergize with the state and business to drive development is imperative. Perhaps the emergent development strategy of public-private partnership that is currently quite popular in the national development lexicon, raises the question as to whether state- CSO (organizations of citizens') partnerships too can emerge as a development model or at the least be integrated as a key institutional actor in the development process. The exact form of integration has tended to range from unfettered engagements to cooperation and partnership. However

the romanticization of CS has not taken adequate cognisance of the deep and extensive weaknesses of CSOs as organizations.

The work is divided into six chapters. Chapter one introduces the work by raises issues of current popularity of civil society in the development discourse of development countries following the prolonged crises of the state, governance and development, and economic decline since the 1980s and whether this embrace can lead to the construction of new development models beyond the recently popular public –private partnerships, that includes state-civil society partnerships. Conceptual and theoretical clarifications are made in chapter two. Attention is given to conceptions of the state, civil society and sustainable development that are inclusive of essential characteristics. Contemporary theoretical issues are raised pertaining to the role, boundaries and nature of relations between the state and civil society.

Chapter three relates the post colonial state and civil society to the challenge of development. The weaknesses of the state in conceptualizing and driving sustainable development and the roles that civil society can play in facilitation sustainable development are discussed. In chapter four, we focus on the state and civil society in Nigeria. We trace the development, roles, strategies, methodologies and challenges of civil society in Nigeria and the nature of relations between the Nigerian governments and civil society. The idea

is to place in perspective the entities and the dynamics of relations between them, which obviously constitute the context that could condition expected partnerships and sustainable developmental roles.

Chapter five constitutes the core of this treatment. Here the need for partnerships, the social bases, platforms and methodologies that such partnerships can take or have taken, the types of existing partnerships and the sites in which they have taken place or could take place are identified. Further, the benefits and challenges of partnership are identified while two cases are deployed to demonstrate existing partnerships. In chapter six, some concluding comments are made and policy recommendations relating to both the state and civil society are outlined.

CHAPTER 2

CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL ISSUES

A discourse of the relations between the state and civil society as it relates to sustainable development has to begin with the clarifications of the central concepts and their roots in some relevant contexts and issues.

2:1   THE POST COLONIAL STATE AND THE CRISES OF THE STATE AND   GOVERNANCE IN AFRICA

The state is a set of institutions that organize power and order in society in line with its set goals. It is defined by its monopolization of certain powers and central roles as:

i)   The making and execution of binding rules
ii)   The control and utilization of institutions of organized violence
iii)   The legitimate use of physical force
iv)   The extraction of resources including taxation of citizens
v)   The right to political allegiance of citizens
vi)   The right of adjudication and mediation in disputes between citizens and
vii)   The right of representation in the international community (Ikelegbe 2010:120).

The state performs critical functions as the control of territory and population; the guarantee of safety, security, public and social order and justice; the provision of public goods, social services, infrastructure and the promotion of economic progress, citizen welfare and wellbeing.

The ability, competence and potential to perform these critical roles and match attributes are dependent on state power and capacity. Capacity is both technical, administrative, regulatory, extractive, political and institutional. The competence and strength of the state is particularly critical to the performance of developmental roles. The modern state effectively, responsibly and responsively delivers on stability, security, peace, prosperity, welfare and progress of the nation state.
States can be characterized as weak, fragile, failing or collapsing, depending on the capacity and actual performance of roles and responsibilities. Fragile states are weak, have failed or are failing in providing development, economic progress and prosperity, poverty alleviation and effective performance of state extractive, allocative, regulatory, social service and security functions. They are characterized by:

i)   Fractious and factionalized elites;
ii)   Unequal, discriminatory and contested citizenship;
iii)   Conflict ridden and violent contestations for power
iv)   Challenges to the validity and viability of state power
v)   Decline of state authority and coercive powers

vi) Failing capacity to enforce law, order and security;

vii) Decline in the strength, discipline and coverage of coercive agencies

viii) Difficulty in the maintenance of authority over territory, people and border regions

ix) Collapsing public services and infrastructure;

x) Declining economies, food scarcity, huge unemployment, poverty and low income, low literacy rates, poor access to critical services;

xi) Corruption

xii) Prevalence of violent and armed politics

xiii) Tendency towards violent conflicts and crisis, civil strife and instability;

xiv) Proliferation of non-state institutions of violence and small arms (Ikelegbe 2010)

Post colonial states in Africa are not just weak and fragile but have been plagued by huge state and governance crises indicated by the following:

i) Weak attributes and performance of the substantive and empirical attributes of statehood

ii) Concentrated and centralized power and monopolization of the political process

iii) Massive hegemony, bureaucratization and politicization of the political process

iv) Inclusion of favoured primordial segments and exclusive of rival claimants and groups

v) Tenuous and weak hold on power

vi) Little authority with many groups and areas outside its control

vii) Irrelevant in many ways to the existential and survival needs of citizens

viii) Weak and ineffective state institutions;

ix) Coercive, abusive, repressive and authoritarian public institutions

x) Poor management and unaccountability

xi) Ethnicization and regionalization of power

xii) Weak legitimacy

xiii) poor, arbitrary and conflict ridden governance systems

2:2 CIVIL SOCIETY: CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL CLARIFICATIONS

Civil society (CS) is both an organizational structure and an analytical tool for the analysis of politics and development. As a structural entity, its precise content and boundary is contested. As an analytical framework, its relevance and potency is also contested.

Civil Society (CS) is the associational life of citizens characterized by common interests, civil and public purposes, and voluntary collective and autonomous actions (Grindle, 1996, Ikelegbe 2001a:2). It comprises self, autonomous and non state associations that are voluntarily constituted, self generating, self supporting and self governing (Ikelegbe 2005:243). It is those associations that enable citizens to participate voluntarily, freely and openly within the public realm, and operate and function independent of

and outside state and corporate power, though relating to them.

It comprises clusters of diverse and overlapping non-governmental institutions through which collective and shared wills and interests are articulated, projected and defended. It is the organized socio-political and economic life of citizens and communities, for the mobilization of actions and engagements in relation to their needs, interests, existence and survival. The civil society organization (CSO) is the major non-state structure by which people relate to themselves and through which they relate to the state and socio-political purposes. As Hyden (1996:92) notes, CS connects individual citizens with the state and public realm.

Civil society's essential characteristic are:
a) Associational life and activities of diverse set of voluntary organizations which are fairly autonomous of the state but relate to it and the political sphere; that are;
b) Engaged in more social-political purposes as opposed to private and economic interests and ;
c) Advance the interests and needs of members, communities, supporters and address existential conditions and social realities;
d) through voluntary actions, cooperative activities (community, intra and inter-group) and collective action, and
g) utilizing information linkages and networks of public communication.

h) Within the normative framework of citizen rights, rule of law, democratic participation, civility and pluralism.

CS then is defined by autonomy, plurality, participation, social-economic and political engagements and civility. Civility or "civic virtue" is crucial to the character of CS. It means that CS engagements embrace the values of diversity, plurality, compromise, tolerance and cooperation; adherence to rules; respect for rights, the freedom of action of the citizenry and the diffusion of power vested in CS groups and coalitions; and accept the values of exchanges, competition and consensus (Hall 1995:26, 6-7).

Civil society is actually a formation of the organized social life of citizens, the sphere of social life outside the state, in which voluntary autonomous groups compete, collaborate and cooperate over interests and preferences. It is the network of institutions by which citizens represent themselves, a realm of associational solidarity, activism and engagement, and a site of collective civic and public action. It is further a theatre of discourse, debates, deliberation and exchange of public affairs, *the arena of social relations and communication between citizens informed by law and public policy but potentially critical of them* (Ikelegbe 2003:39). It is the means and the organizational framework by which citizens influence and engage the state in struggles over influence, change, domination, accommodation and opposition

(Ikelegbe 2005:243-244; Chazan 1996:256).

There are political and sociological roots in the conception of CS. The sociological emphasizes the associations located between the state and family that are voluntarily constituted and possess some degree of autonomy. These are associations that are largely formal, legal, operating within the law but could also be informal, illegal and clandestine.

The politically rooted conception takes CS as particular associations which are associated with citizen engagements and participations that relate to the state somewhat within the context of citizen rights, rule of law and democratic representation. Viewed therein, CS refers to a broad range of associations that operate in the public realm, including the cultural, informal, primordial, survivalist, existential and business associations. The politically based conceptions recognize the political roles of civil society particularly in a democracy. Civil society then is a sphere of citizenship, democratic and political training, where citizens learn social responsibility, respect for others rights, the need for cooperation, sharing, trust and political equality (Miller 2002: 187-196).

A critical interrogation indicates that leadership, memberships, constituencies, interests and tendencies of civil society determine the issue basis, nature of relations with the state and the methods and levels of engagement with the state. Falton (1995:80-89) has identified three

structural strata of civil society organizations (CSOs); predatory, quasi-bourgeoisie and popular civil society, which is synonymous with class compositions.

The predatory CS is comprised and led by the elite, who have benefitted from rent seeking through state connections and built patron client networks. However, liberalization and adjustment policies shrank their rents and the elite then sought a strategic alignment with CS, as a platform to moderate liberalization and protect their privileges and interests.

The quasi-bourgeoisie CS situated between the popular forces and the predatory elite, were pro-political and economic reforms, and sought the retreat of authoritarianism, the emergence of democracy, private sector driven development and market reforms. The CS formation presented the opportunity to restrain the state and drive the reforms. The CS also represented new opportunities for influence, power and resources just as the support for reforms is limited to minimal undermining of their privileges and status. As CS is an alternative route, the petit bourgeoisie are interested in resources and power and are ready to fraternize with the predatory elite and the state and to mobilize the popular forces when it suits their interests.

The popular CS is dominated by the wider classes and deploys CS as a platform to address their predicaments of survival, and as an alternative

structure of social service delivery, welfare and basic needs. The popular CS was the vanguard and foot soldiers in the struggle for democracy and the resistance of reforms that took away the welfare functions of the state. The CS formation thus empowers the popular classes, strengthens their participation and provides safety nets and protection from the rapacious state and predatory state elites.

Civil society is a mosaic of diverse and heterogeneous groups with diverse orientations, values and interests, some of which are competing and conflicting. It is a realm of diverse social forces, some primordial, national, progressive, conservative, retrogressive, populist and elitist. It is thus a site of diverse and sometimes intense and conflict prone struggles and contentions. This is why civil society is somewhat a "complex balance" between difference, diversity and conflicts, and agreements and consensus (Hall 1995:6). It is a "terrain of contests" between conflicting interests for dominance (Narsoo 1993:6-7). It is a divided terrain, which may at some points be united for certain joint endeavours. These interests and tendencies are at once progressive and retrogressive, radical and conservative, populist and elitist, social movements and private groups, civil and uncivil. Civil Society is thus a diverse constellation in terms of the diversity of objectives, interests, relations with others and the state, the degrees of civility, democratic-ness, range of organization, socio-political character and activities, rather than a *homogenous, coherent*, unidirectional, *purposeful* and

mutually supportive (Chabal 1992:84). Some CSOs are atomized, unorganized and self help based, while others are broad in membership and interests, organized and professional based.

As for the exact specification of what constitutes CS, the Africanist conception of CS removes it from the dynamics and realities of African conditions and circumstances. CS then is civic secondary associations; middle level, non primordial and professional, that are national, autonomous, that engage the state in the public realm, promote civil values or norms, and seek the common good or purposes. This conception is quite exclusive, as it deletes primary associations that are communal, ethnic, regional and religious, being parochial and particularistic. It also excludes the local and grass-root self help or survival associations from the content of CS.

African scholars conceive CS more broadly to include every organized social life of communities, groups and individuals and all forms by which citizens organize themselves and relate to their necessities, needs, existence and survival. Thus the informal, primordial, clandestine, cultural and even recreation becomes inclusive. These groups are crucial to citizens in the context of poverty, precarious existence, insecurity, lack, disease, social decay, lack of social services and opportunities amidst the repression, partiality, insensitivity, corruption, partisanship and ineptitude of the post colonial states Viewed thus, CS organizations include trade unions, professional associations,

student organizations, socio-cultural organizations, development and welfare organizations, citizen movements, cooperatives, consumer associations, new social movements (Giner 1995:321), constituency related organizations as those of traders, farmers, women, elders or the aged and physically challenged. There are also clubs, community based organizations, and mutual self development associations, which collectively Narsoo (1991:26-27) regards as organizations of survival. There are also research, capacity building, training and service organizations.

If we are to unbundle the CSO, there are two broad elements, civil groups and non-governmental organizations. The NGOs can be regarded as:
a) Organized voluntary actions and activities of persons
b) Involved in developmental, social welfare and humanitarian activities
c) Seeks to influence public policy and government actions through advocacy or
d) Engage in direct actions and assistance activities
e) Often revolve around single issues in which they build strength and networks such as gender, poverty alleviation, human rights
f) Involves a small number of people, often operating in small geographical areas and usually urban based
g) The income or funds of the organization are not shared among members or boards of trustees,

except as compensation for specified works done.

The core attributes of the NGO is private ownership and socio-political purposes. NGOs do not have profit orientation and do not distribute profits or dividends. Membership is voluntary and members make voluntary contributions of resources, time and energy. The nature of private ownership could be sets of individuals, organized as board of trustees and officials or groups based on certain identities as churches, professionals, activists, corporate organizations. NGOs provide services to members, clients and public. The NGO segment is regarded as altruistic and third sector of the economy (Giner 1995:319). NGOs could be charitable organizations, non profit foundations, private voluntary and non-profit organizations.

The NGO sector has grown tremendously since the 1970s, and is now a dominant feature of consultations, conferences and activities around development and social progress. In the South, the NGO sector has tended to acquire some other characteristics. It is dominated by urban based elites, dependent on and tied to foreign donor funds, with agenda and activities dictated by donor priorities, are strongly connected and networks, collaborates and partners with Northern NGOs and CSOs.

Table 1
CHARACTERISTICS OF SOME CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS

Type	Leadership	Support	Dominant Activities	Dominant Orientations	Territorial Base	Example
Trade Unions	Representative	Mass Based	Workers welfare, socio political	Radical/Progressive	Urban/major cities	
Civic Associations	Representation	Mass Based	Socio-political		Urban/major cities	
Gender Groups	Limited Representation/ Sometimes leadership perpetuation	Limited mobilization of special groups	Gender issues, socio-economic empowerment poverty alleviation civil/human rights	Rights and claims	Urban	
Non-Governmental Organizations	Founders/Board of Trustees	Special groups	Social Services Technical support Advocacy development activities	Rights and claims. Development orientation Radical	Urban/major cities	
Faith Based Organizations	Religious leaders often founders	Religious based	Social welfare human capital Humanitarian assistance	Parochial		
Media	Owners of Media House	Readership/ Broad based	Information, enlightenment, outlet for diverse views, public scrutiny of governments	Governance and development	Urban based	
Professional Associations	Representatives	Members, sympathizers supporters	Protection and projection of professional interests, public advocacy	Professional, Governance	Urban based	
Students and Youth Groups	Representatives	Support Youth, sympathizers	Protects against misrule, advocacy, mobilizational	Mobilizational, radical, contentious politics	Urban and Community based, Educational institutions	
Business Groups	Representatives	Business Sector, Corporate bodies	Economic governance issues, policy advocacy	Collaborations with government, Remedial actions	Urban based	Farmers Association Chambers
Socio-Cultural Associations	Representatives Founders	Identity groups, Communities kinship groups	Articulation of socio-political and cultural interests, contentious politics, public scrutiny policy advocacy	Parochial, Conservative	Community based	Ethnic, Regions, Communities, Clan associations
Uncivil Groups	Representative Founders	Members Socio-Cultural leaders	Militant resistance violent engagements	Militant, Aggressive, Radical	Urban based	Militias, Cult Groups, Vigilants
Clubs/Development Associations	Representatives	Members, Opinion leaders and	Socio-economic interests of members	Social and Economic empowerment	Rural and Urban	

		Kins		and support		
Constituency Groups	Representatives	Members, families, interested others	Concerns of Constituents	Mutual and Welfare	Urban, Semi Urban and Rural	Associations of Women traders, farmers, artisans, the elders etc.
Organizations of Survival	Representatives	Members, families, interested others	Socio-economic welfare interest of members	Welfare and Support	Urban Semi Urban and Rural	Mutual Savings Groups

Author: Derived from the literature.

Civic associations are a diversity of groups that mobilize their constituencies in pursuance of specific demands, interests and claims. They may be cultural associations, socio-political movements and special interest groups. The beauty of civil society is that though it does not represent the society as a whole, its diversity, plurality, overlapping nature and complexity of orientations and tendencies means that it reflects the perspectives and voices of a considerable active portion of the population.

In plural societies, associational pluralism or pluralist CS is necessary for peaceful, civil and citizen engagements. Pluralist CS requires the following attributes

1) Pan-identify character, cross cutting ethnicity, religion, region and community;
2) Mutual respect and tolerance among primordial and identity based groupings;
3) Substantial autonomy from primordial and identity leaderships, patrons, the state and political interests;
4) Democratic internal structures, processes and expression;
5) Capability of balancing specific, specialized and parochial interests against broad socio-political interests.

There is no doubt that some CS seeks improvements in political life, governance, inclusiveness, welfare and social services. In these ways, there may be constructive engagements and virtuous operations with huge potentials for overall social progress. But there are others who by their activities and objectives limit tolerance, pluralism, or accommodate state abuses and repression, reject the status quo and seek to overthrow it, that reject the legal framework of rule of law and operate outside it.

In a sense therefore, CSO can further be unbundled into civic or civil and non civil or uncivil CSOs. The goals and manners of engagement are central in the differentiation here as the civic or civil utilizes legal, acceptable and non-violent methods in engaging other groups and the state in civil contestations, debates, advocacy, criticisms, and litigations and operates

in the public realm through public communication, discourse and civic activism.

The uncivil or non civic NSA are characterized by the following;

(a) militant, aggressive and violent engagements over claims and grievances

(b) Products of deep governance grievances such as marginality, exclusion etc.

(c) Products of existing conflicts of which they are protagonists and vanguards;

(d) Operate outside state and international laws and state control;

(e) Social base in aggrieved or discontented groups usually identity related

(f) Provide protection, defense, social safety nets and security

(g) Foot soldiers are often youth and children

(h) Often infringe on or violate the human rights of those within but particularly outside within or in-group through killings, destruction of property, kidnapping,

(i) Often produced by poor state governance systems as abuse of group and human rights, repression, exclusion.

2:3 THEORETICAL ISSUES IN STATE AND CIVIL SOCIETY RELATIONS

There are certain debates in the literature that we need to address. These pertain to the roles of civil society, the nature of relations between the state and civil society, the boundaries that exist and the emerging roles that the CS should or ought to be performing in the new democracies.

Civil Society as Countervailing Force

As dominantly and initially conceptualized and appropriated in African political analysis, civil society was regarded with unqualified innate goodness and as put by Fatton Jr. (1999), as a virtuous civil liberating force of collective goodness, welfare and civil rights. It has been romantically and euphorically linked to much of the positive changes and reforms (Ikelegbe 2003:38) and associated with the benign, progressive, developmental, and democratic (Adejumobi 2001:19). Civil society then is a virtuous, harmonious, progressive and conflict free sector that the state is not and therefore could be the alternative to the rapacious, repressive, corrupt, unaccountable, crises ridden and failing state.

While the post colonial state has been so authoritarian and intensely hegemonical, prone to abuse, lawlessness and predation; appropriated on behalf of office holders, clients, sectional and ethnic constituents (Ake 1996:7-8), constrictive of socio-economic and political space, and restrictive of rights (Chabal 1998), the civil society formation is seen as opposite. It possesses elements that are absent or hollow in the state as accountability, collective action, voluntary support and service orientation, people centred and grass root orientation and participation. Thus civil society has to be strengthened, supported and funded to perform roles

that the state is failing, has failed and is proving incapable of performing effectively and efficiently.

However, civil society is not exactly the harmonious, virtuous, participative, civil, plural and accountable formation that is converse to the state. Ikelegbe (2001a:5) has noted that the euphoria and romanticism with civil society has beclouded the organizational, material and ideological weaknesses, and perverse manifestations. Thus civil society is characterized with parochial and inward looking agenda (Azarya 1992:83-91), particularism, incoherence and conflicts (Abutudu 1992:5), illiberalism and willingness to be coopted, lack of autonomous existence and self sustaining capabilities, opportunism, corruption, absence of democratic values and tenets as participation, consensus and competition (Diamond 1997:24-25; Makunbe 1998: 309-11), non inclusiveness, unaccountable decision making (Paterson 1998:423-41), patriarchal domination, irrendentist identities (Fatton 1995: 67-99), and lack of the peaceful harmony of associational pluralism (Lemarchand 1992). These undermine the capacity, effectiveness and operations of civil society and threaten its potential for democratic consolidation, economic management and reform, and sustainable development.

The second thesis, which is quite a follow up to the first, is that the state is a leviathanic demon whose excesses are to be contained and combated by civil society. The thesis that CS exists as a

challenge to, watch dog over and counter- vailing and oppositional force dominated the literature until the 1990s. Thus civil society is viewed as *self organization of strong and autonomous groups, that balance the state*, or are in *opposition to the state* (Hall 1995:15; 2); *society in confrontation with the state*, existing only in so far as there is a *self consciousness of its opposition to the state* (Baryart 1986: 111-17); organization of citizens for the moderation of bourgeois and state hegemony (Azarya 1992: 83-91), a pressure on the state from without and a social base for pressures or controls on state institutions (Keane 1988:5; Bratton 1992:57; Makumbe 1998:305). According to Bayart (1986:111-117), civil society represents society as it struggles to limit state domination, abuses and malpractices while Gellner (1995: 34-42) sees civil society as being able to *prevent the state from dominating and atomizing the rest of society.* To Ekeh (1994:198), civil society serves to engage and limit the state, such that its claims of total ownership and hegemony of the political space and public realm are lessened.

Civil Society was at the vanguard of the pro-democracy struggles of the late 1980s and 1990s in Africa. It emerged to challenge repressive regimes, rights violations and economic hardships attendant to adjustment policies. Civil society thus fostered group influence and participation, strengthened citizen engagements and challenge of the state and political process, and galvanized

resistance against state excesses and mis-governance (Ikelegbe 2001a:439).

The emergence of democratic rule and the challenges of its sustenance and overall development that facilitates its stability have foisted new perceptions on civil society. The dominant view is that CSO should now focus on social action, advocacy, development issues and governance. This perception shifts CSOs from a dominantly adversarial, confrontational, combative and oppositional formation to a more dynamic, creative and constructive one which embraces dialogue, cooperation, collaboration, mutual support and consultation. The new perspective removes CSO from a one mould to a dual mould pattern of relationship, which could integrate disagreements and confrontation with dialogue; challenge and opposition with consultation; and competition and contentions with cooperation and collaboration.

The Boundaries of State and Civil Society

Civil society is regarded as the third among two other sectors; state and business. It is also regarded as the intermediate sphere between the state, business and family.

Though ordinarily CS is regarded as separate from the state, political society and the processes of production (Narsoo 1991:21), it engages and relates to them. Thus it is not entirely separate from the political process, public and political realms and institutions (Narsoo 1993:6-7).

However, the problem here is that business and market associations within economic sector or sphere, and groups with political colourations and that are part of political society though dominantly outside state power, can operate as part of civil society particularly where they relate to the state on behalf of their interests. Thus the demarcations are not clear cut.

Further, some segments of CS could possibly be extensions or adjuncts of the state, integrated into state and political processes and operating within and outside it. Segments of the CS formation could be penetrated and incorporated, and become an arena of state activity even in formation, funding and control. It is possible then that some CSOs seek state influence and resources, operate in the state realm for self and primordial interests, and serve to legitimize state actions and interests.

This means that there are no fixed and rigid boundaries between the state, civil society and the private realm. The levels of separation, autonomy, voluntariness, participation in the public realm and the existence of the normative framework are fairly elastic, and may differ among groups. That some groups have less autonomy, voluntary participation and civic participation in the public realm or that some groups may depend on or are influenced by the state, may not necessarily exclude them from the formation even though they may be less constitutive of civil society.

The Nature of Relations

There are different perceptions of civil society – state relations; autonomy or independence and separation or integration.

Autonomy is seen as crucial to CS power and roles, particularly in terms of asserting self, ensuring autonomous engagements, preventing penetration and domination by the state and political society and ensuring some progressiveness, radicalism, change orientation, popular rooting and vanguard roles of societal interests. The need to maintain autonomy is itself related to the perception of the state, which is rapaciously hegemonic, and tended towards dictatorship, abuse, misrule and excesses. Autonomy is expected to strengthen the CS formation for debates, contests and challenges.

The question of the ideal, expected and historical nature of relations between the state and CS has dominated the literature.

The earlier version in the contemporary conception and deployment of CS, sees the relations as continually or at least periodically and potentially antagonistic, adversarial, oppositional and confrontational. Ikelegbe (2005: 244) states that the relations is said to be under-girt by challenge, contestation, opposition, counteraction, revolt, mass action and protests. This relation is constructed in the structural and process differences in the goals, methods, and dynamics of both sectors which are at several points at cross purposes, in disagreement and contending.

For example, civil society by its site, situation and constitution is necessarily the realm of the popular classes and autonomous social forces, and movement from below of a participant citizenry, and the social and ideological base of independent organizations of protest (Cox 1999:10). Civil society is therefore by implication, a radical, progressive, popular and independent society. As a popular formation then, it is the site for the articulation and mobilization of ideas, contestations and struggles in the public realm and the organization of protests movement and mass actions against anti-people policies (Ikelegbe 2005:243).

The other perception which has emerged more recently tends to see the relations as more constructive, involving consultation, dialogue, cooperation and agreements. This perception argues that there is a range of issues in which cooperation rather than confrontation is required, and thus cooperation and agreements between the two sectors is more creative and functional.

What should be noted is that it is the nature of the state, its operations, weaknesses and failings that necessarily conduces and may continue to generate oppositional relations. Thus it may seem that even if the relations is broadly positive and functional, certain circumstances rooted in the character and operations of the state may provoke and warrant challenges, contestations and counteractions. In the circumstance, while the relations could be *complementary, supportive ad collaborative in specific instances,* civil society must possess *the potential of contending with and opposing the state when the need arises* (Ikelegbe 2005: 244). Thus

as Harbeson (1992:287) notes, civil society has to define, redefine and shape its power relations and its balance between society and the state.

There is no doubt that both the state and civil society need to continuously interact and that such interaction facilitates and provides a better environment for better performance of roles. Thus an *active*, self conscious and variegated civil society *provides the support on which the state rests* (Cox 1999: 6-7). The state then has responsibility to provide the enabling conditions and environment, and support that enables the development and vibrancy of civil society.

There is also the question of what governmental arrangement is best suited for CS to thrive and specifically the nature of CS forms and engagements under dictatorship and democracy.

Because CS is a space, sphere and site of diverse voluntary and autonomous collective actions of citizens, the nature of the state and governmental arrangements determines its freedom, autonomy, actions and effectiveness. Dictatorships, authoritarian military and one party system, personal rule and centralization of power constrict the space of CS activities and restrict its autonomy. Democratic government by its nature of representation, participation and freedoms provides a more conducive environment for CS to thrive.

Generally however, the state constrains and weakens civil society or seeks to penetrate and compromise it so as to modify its functioning, activity and latitude (Ikelegbe 2007:51). Given the authoritarian, absolutist, intensely hegemonic and comprehensively intrusive and totalizing character of the post colonial state (Young 1992:39), it seeks total domination and control of the socio-economic and political space (Harbeson 1992:287), and public realm and is unwilling to share the space with any competing social force as civil society. Thus the state, even if democratic still potentially constitutes a threat to civil society's autonomy, vibrancy and roles.

There are questions too about the relevance and roles of CS in the post authoritarian transitions to democracy and particularly with the achievement of democracy. The belief is that with the attainment of democracy in which CS fought and won decisive victories in the struggles in Eastern Europe, Africa and Latin America, the actual historic roles in heralding change has been fulfilled. Rather than sustain the partnership of international organizations with CS in the third world, the shift to democratic governments as partners in addressing development and governance challenges is proper. Thus the CS ought to have limited roles and redirection of efforts in the new era.

The general consensus in the literature is that civil society has huge roles to play in the consolidation of the existing democracies. Civil society was the organizational base of the mobilisation of the popular classes and the social movements of protests and strikes that

challenged the authoritarian states, opened up the public space, and compelled negotiation and reforms. Having been at the vanguard role in the struggle for democratization, it is only expected that it should also lead in the struggle for its stability, consolidation and durability.

Civil society is seen as remaining central to the political participation and empowerment of the citizenry, the protection of rights and freedoms, the maintenance of stake in the way society is run, the sharing of the public domain, sustaining pressures for accountable and good governance, and collective decision making and providing platform for making collective demands, publicising grievances and raising governance questions (Keane 1988:61; Ekeh 1998; Bratton 1992:63). Thus civil society remains the key to democratic consolidation and stability, hence Giner (1995:301) states that liberal democracy in terms of what it encompasses has been closely tied to civil society just as Benhard (1993:307, 306) states that modern democracy has only existed in conjunction with civil society.

Beyond democratization, the CS formation has sustained relevance, because its goals were diverse including environmental management, citizen health and welfare, social services, human capital development, economic empowerment and poverty alleviation. That the CS formation would lose funding to democratic governments did not exactly happen, as funding from the international organizations, development partners and donors have

continued to support the CS and governments. However, the international organizations now seek to foster funded programmes of partnership between CSOs and governments, and CSOs and corporate organizations.

2:4 THE CONCEPT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED, 1987) defines sustainable development as a:

> *process of change in which exploitation of resources, the direction of investments, the orientation of technological development, and institutional change are in harmony and enhance both current and future potential to meet human needs and aspirations (Mabagunje 1996: 30 – 31)*

In simple terms, sustainable development (SD) is a development that *is likely to achieve lasting satisfaction of human needs and improvement of the quality of human life* (Allen 1980). This means the management of development in which there is continuous and sustained growth in improved livelihoods and per capital income both now and in the future, *without depleting the national capital asset stock or the natural environmental asset stock* (Turner 1988).

According to the World Commission on the Environment and Development (1987), the pursuit of SD requires;

i) A political system that secures effective citizen participation in decision making
ii) An economic system that provides for solutions for the tensions arising from disharmonious development
iii) A production system that respects the obligations to preserve the ecological base for development
iv) A technological system that fosters sustainable patterns of trade and finance
v) An administrative system that is flexible and has the capacity for self correction.

In more specific and action terms, SD according to Tolba (1987) encompasses the following;
i) Help for the very poor because they are left with no option other than to destroy their environment
ii) Self reliant development within natural resource constraints
iii) Development that does not degrade environmental quality nor reduce productivity in the long run
iv) The great issues of health control, appropriate technologies, food self reliance, clean water and shelter for all
v) People centred initiatives as people are the resources in sustainable development.

In the context of deteriorating environments underlined by massive environmental degradation; deteriorating standards of living, rising poverty, increasing difficulties with meeting basic needs and intensifying struggles for survival, rising unemployment and underemployment, the questions of providing development today and guaranteeing development for the future are critical.

Sustainable development has three dimensions; economic, environment and social. In a sense, these dimensions refer to sustainable qualitative improvements and integrated sustainable growth in the quality of life, the economy, society and environment. Thus economic growth for example is not at the expense of society or the environment. According to Natufe (2001), the scale should significantly tilt *in favour of the environment*.

The Millennium Development Goals, declared by the largest ever gathering of heads of state in September 2000, is based on sustainable development. The MDG commits states to eradicate poverty, promote human dignity and equality, achieve peace, environmental sustainability and democracy (Ghaus-Pasha, 2004:1).

Table 2: Millennium Development Goals

S/N	Goals	Targets
1.	Eradicate extreme Poverty and Hunger	Halve between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar a day; Halve, between 1990 and 2015 the proportion of people who suffer from hunger
2.	Achieve Universal Primary Education	Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling.
3.	Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women	Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2015 and to all levels of education not later than 2012.
4.	Reduce Child Mortality	Reduce by two-quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the under-5 mortality ratio
5.	Improve Maternal Health	Reduce by three quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio
6.	Combat HIV/AIDs, Malaria and other Diseases	Have halted by 2015, and began to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDs; Have halted by 2015, and began to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases.
7.	Ensure Environmental Sustainability	Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources; Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water; By 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers
8.	Develop a Global Partnership for Development	

Source: Millennium Development Goals, 2000 as cited in Ghaus-Pasha, 2004:35).

CHAPTER 3

THE POST COLONIAL STATE, CIVIL SOCIETY AND THE CHALLENGE OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The post colonial state has had primary responsibility for sustainable development. The nature of execution of this responsibility has not had excellent results. Civil society is now playing increasing roles in executing sustainable development. In this section, we interrogate how the state and civil society have confronted the challenge of sustainable development.

3:1 THE STATE AND THE CHALLENGE OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Africa is the most underdeveloped continent, marked by its bottom placement in the indicators of social and economic development such as domestic gross product, per capital income, level of foreign exchange reserves, foreign debts, balance of payment status, volume of exports, share of world trade, literacy rate, school enrolment levels, life expectancy, child and maternal mortality rates and per capital health provisions (UNDP 1994; Olukoshi, 1998:6). Sub-Saharan African countries dominate the lowest rungs of the United Nations Development Index, the Transparency international Corruption Index and the Foreign Policy Failed State Index ranking (Ayangafac 2008:46).

Nigeria has one of the largest populations of the poor, being ranked 158th out of 177 countries in the 2007/2008 Human Development Index. About 70.8% of the population have a purchasing power parity (PPP) of $1 per day (UNDP, 2007; UNDP, MDG Monitor 2008). The population growth rate of 3.2% per annum is quite high but youth unemployment of the 15-29 age group is as high as 60% (Kwakwa et.al. 2008: 13-33). Instead of being a prosperous nation as the 7th largest world producer of crude oil, it is immersed in poverty, disease, illiteracy, malnutrition and huge income disparities.

At issue in the crises of the state and governance was first, the nature of the constitution of the colonial states in Africa which were alien, imposed, predatory, plundering, authoritarian, exploitative, rapacious, unaccountable, coercive and violent. The colonial states were arbitrary constructions that did not respect histories, cultures and wishes of Africans.

The post independence era were characterized by certain tendencies. The first was the emergence of the developmental state. The pressures and aspirations for independence centred on rapid development directed by indigenous people. The second tendency was the compulsive drive for power consolidation at the state and personal levels. The nature of post independence struggles for power and consolidation of power placed power, politics and political domination over the people and development. The third,

and arising from the previous, was the emergence of a centralized, command, top down, uniform development built on the values and goals of unity, integration, oneness and stability. Strong personal and concentrated rule was regarded as facilitative of unity, integration and stability which further facilitates rapid development. The nature of consolidation meant that development was necessarily centralized, command based, uniform, top down, poorly participative, and intolerant of decentralization, local initiatives, dissent and other social forces as CSOs and opposition.

There was a post independent preoccupation with economic development. The political leaders had no option as the independence pact with citizens was hinged on economic progress and social welfare. Thus efforts were early on a state driven development and modernization project. Though some initial progress was recorded indicated by economic growth in the 1960s and 1970s, this began to fail in the late 1970s and 1980s as economic decline set in, that wiped off initial progress. The African states began to suffer poor economic performance, indebtedness, collapsing industrial capacity utilization, deterioration in infrastructure, collapsing social services and decline in social welfare.

The state driven development project was thus faulted, and immersed in the crises of inefficiency, failed delivery, abandoned projects and huge costs. The states were held responsible for failing economies and unsustainable development. The states were demonized on account of corruption, mismanagement, ineffective administration and control, poor accountability and transparency, poor natural resource management, poor system of oversight and public scrutiny, high cost of governance, poor citizen participation, inefficient bureaucracies, poor un-credible elections and leadership perpetuation.

The attempts to resolve the economic crisis, which was externally induced, brought in the Bretton Woods Institutions of IMF and the World Bank as dominant actors, with policies and conditionalities that altered the face of the developmental, welfare and extensive state in Africa. Structural Adjustment Programme, the main programmatic anchor of economic reforms, brought the (i) the contraction or retrenchment of the welfare, social service and developmental state; ii) erosion or elimination of subsidies and social welfare; iii) massive loss of jobs through retrenchment or rationalization.

These economic and material setbacks, losses, misery and uncertainties created a regime of citizen frustration, disenchantment and discontent, which began to manifest in exiting of vulnerable citizens into the informal sector and underground economy, outward migration to the western world and a resort to non-state identity and social groupings for social protection. The economic crisis and the repressive, authoritarian and dictatorial military

and civil rule, created an environment in which ordinary people, and their groupings began to question, challenge, oppose and protest their conditions and began to mobilize for change. Thus began the new flowering of citizen groups that became the arrowhead of the struggle for change – political liberalization and economic reforms.

The state was a major victim of the economic and development crises. Apart from being plagued by contraction and roll back, there was rupture of the state-citizens compact, declining legitimacy and relevance. The vacuum created by the retrenched state was thus somewhat occupied by the emergence of diverse groups, some identity based, partisan, welfare, developmental and cultist, and others militant and armed groups.

Overall and flowing from the afore-mentioned, the planning, implementation and delivery of development projects, infrastructures, social services, human progress and welfare by governments in Nigeria have been terribly poor and failing. Many reasons have been adduced including the following:

i) Poor concerns, responsiveness, sensitivity and commitment to citizen needs and problems.

ii) Weak efforts in social service and infrastructure provision that lag behind population growth and urbanization.

iii) Inefficient, shoddy and erratic social services and substandard infrastructures

iv) High cost of governance, infrastructure provision and social service delivery

v) Inequality, unfairness and discriminations in the distribution of public goods and services

vi) Poor social worth for public expenditures and programmes and negligible impact of investments

vii) Poor contract management and poor project implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

viii) Weak systems of accountability and transparency, extensive corruption and poor integrity of state officials

ix) Weak technical, executive and administrative capacity to design and implement projects

x) Weak, non standardized and non formalized administrative processes, rules, regulations and guidelines

xi) Politicisation of governance apparatus, and privatization and personalization of public institutions, resources, goods and services

xii) Lack of information and poor communication between governments and citizens

xiii) Lack of consultation and participation of citizens and lack of opportunities for citizen influence on projects

xiv) Absence of effective machinery to hold state officials accountable to citizens

In Table 3 below, we evaluate weak and fragile states on the basis of certain variables related to sustainable

development. Weak and fragile states have certain structural and functional attributes when related to the variables and tend to produce certain manifestations and consequences. What is interesting is that the consequences of the nature of state response and attitudes to the variables always tend towards human insecurity, non participatory development, economic crises and under-development and low human development.

Table 3: Relationship of Weak and Fragile States to Sustainable Development

Variables	Functional and Structural Attributes	Manifestations	Consequences
Capacity	Inability or poor capacity of state institutions to perform critical functions	Scarcity/inadequacy of social services and infrastructures. Poor development interventions	Low human development index. Under-development
Strategy of Penetration and Control	Excessive dependence on coercive force as opposed to accommodation, influence and participation	State repression, Excessive force	Abuse of rights and freedoms, human insecurity, Violent politics.
Level of institutional building and integrity	High levels of personalization, informalization and politicization of public institutions.	Poor executive and administrative capacity for managing development	Poor execution and enforcement of policy, Pervading indiscipline and corruption
Degree of centralization and concentration of powers	High levels of centralization and concentration of powers in central governments and chief executives. Monopolization of state authority.	Overbearing powers of central governments. Lack of decentralized platforms for decision making and implementation	Absence of local initiatives in development. Neglect of peripheral areas and hinterlands in development.
Level of personalization and privatization of power	Personalization and privatization of state power and resources	Corruption, Abuse of powers. Indiscipline. Weak institutions. Poor performance of state functions.	Discriminatory development. Underdevelopment. Conflict ridden governance systems.
Attainment of aspirations of control and development	Poor discipline, commitment and capacity.	Poor implementation. Policy failures.	Governance, economic and development crises.
Legitimacy	Weak performance, Poor mobilization and accommodation of citizens. State actions alienates citizens and weakens citizen support.	Poor legitimacy, Citizen loss of confidence and poor support for governments.	Lack of citizen mobilization for development, Poor development, economic progress and social welfare. Political conflicts and instability.
Level of Penetration of parts of the State	Weak public institutions.	Scanty presence of government and governmental goods and services. Weak public	Existence of ungoverned spaces. Weak national security and stability.

		authority control over people, territory and borders.	
Emphasis on Development and economic progress	Weak institutional capacity for development	Primacy of politics and power over development and welfare	Underdevelopment, low human development index.
Level of Good Governance	Poor compact between state institutions and citizens	Poor participatory governance and development	Poor levels of political and economic development.
Attitude to Civil Society	Poor openness and communication between state and with citizens,	Constriction of space for civil society	Lack of participatory governance and development

Source: Author 2012 as adapted from diverse literature sources.

3:2 CIVIL SOCIETY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The roles of CS are so diverse, complex and contentious that it is regarded very popularly as the solution to all social, economic and political problems (Paffenhonz & Spark 2006). The World Bank (2003:3) highlights three functions advocacy, monitoring and service delivery.

The development role of CS gained international recognition from the 1980s, with the emergent dominance of neo-liberalism, which emphasized the market, private sector driven development and the contraction of the state, particularly in social service and welfare. As the state crisis, with inefficiency and failure raised doubts about the postcolonial state, the CSOs became a new alternative. Thus CSOs emerged as alternative providers of social services, "implementers of development assistance" (Paffenholz & Spark, 2006:9-10), partners of international development agencies and major recipients of development and aid funds.

The CSOs, particularly the NGO sector was seen as more politically *independent and flexible*, a more *efficient alternative in service delivery*, more *effective in reaching beneficiaries*, capable of setting the pace in good governance, democratization, respect for rule of law and human rights and in pushing for social, economic and political change (Paffenholz & Spark 2006: 9-10). More specifically, the heightened interests, recognition and support for CSOs in sustainable development are rooted in certain advantages inherent in CSOs. These include:

i) Greater flexibility in methods, approaches and strategies;

ii) Greater participatory content of projects and project strategies

iii) Greater responsiveness to the local people, community and the poor

iv Greater contacts or linkages with grass-root people and associations

v) More bottom up strategies as dependence on local people and communities to identify needs, problems and projects.

In line with these advantages and strengths, the CSOs were pushed beyond the traditional areas of relief support and human rights activism into critical roles in social infrastructure provision and contributions to economic growth (Ghans-Pasha, 2004). The roles of civil society in sustainable development can be categorized into political development and socio-economic development.

3:2:1 The Roles of Civil Society in Political Development -Governance

The CS role is mainly seen by western scholars within the mould of governance, democracy and democratic consolidation. Thus Chazan (1996:288) identifies the roles of "controlling state abuses, holding rulers accountable to citizens and consolidating and maintaining democracy. Diamond (1994) identifies the roles of checking abuses and violations, instituting public scrutiny and fostering the development of democratic culture and political participation.

Citizen Efficacy and Empowerment

The CSOs seek a citizenry that is informed, knowledgeable, aware, conscious and participating in societal life and the public realm. Civil society provides avenues for initiatives and efforts that raise confidence, self esteem, capacity and sense of efficacy of citizens to intervene and change their circumstances or those of others. Such citizen mobilization and engagements raise their interests in public affairs and the public realm. Several NGOs have been engaged in enlightening, training and sensitizing citizens in different

sectors and empowering citizens for actions and engagements in the public realm.

Citizen Initiatives for Collective Actions

CSOs have been at the vanguard of building citizen initiatives for collective actions on social and existential challenges. CSOs identify issues and initiatives related to special and basic needs and problems and construct advocacy and mobilization around them such that state attention is obtained.

Rights and Freedoms

The CS formation has been quite active in the protection of citizen and group rights and freedoms as provided in the constitution and laws. Some CSOs have mounted programmes of training and awareness on understanding and exercising rights and freedoms. The CSOs have also created or provided access to justice, or litigated and prosecuted cases on behalf of vulnerable and disadvantaged citizens. The CSOs particularly seek to ensure government adherence to the constitution and guarantees of citizen rights, freedoms and welfare.

Building National Platforms for Popular Actions

CSOs are able to build vast networks, national platforms and concerts for action, where critical issues on which they are agreed arise. CSOs can periodically construct platforms for mobilization for concerted popular actions, among disparate elements of

the CS formation as well as the ordinary youth, women, artisans, workers and traders. They also build alliances among diverse stakeholders for responding to issues of national interest or specific challenges of governance. CS has constructed concerts and platforms of national action in the areas of minimum wage and petroleum products subsidies.

Building Good Governance
The CS formation has been active in the struggle for good governance. The CSOs have been in the forefront of the struggle for accountability, transparency and the campaigns against funds mismanagement, corruption and financial recklessness. The CSOs agitate for openness and information on governmental affairs. The CSOs also seek dialogue on governance issues and agitate for governance systems to address citizen needs, aspirations and challenges. The CSOs have monitored governance issues and brought excesses to public scrutiny. CSOs are also a major platform for oversight and checks and balances. More specifically, some CSOs have monitored the conduct of public officials, and public agencies and exposed misconduct, abuses, excesses and improprieties. They have sought sanctions and even supported court litigation against exposed or implicated public officials.

CSOs impacts vital competence, experience and learning to members and society at large. These relate to the need for joint cooperative efforts, the primacy of group and national interests, the issue basis of activism, and the need

for compromise and consensus on national issues.
CS may set examples of conduct, governance, social service delivery, citizen participation and participatory development which become the ideal, worthy of emulation by governments and other groups. Thus CS may demonstrate good and participatory governance, that citizens and governments may respect and copy.

Leadership Training
A recent phenomenon is the emergence of CSO leaders, who have either by appointments or electoral contests become part of political society and state officials. Some of these CSO leaders became popular or came into national limelight because of their CS activism and leadership of national platforms of CS engagements in the public realm. Thus in a sense, the CSO formation is producing a crop of leaders with opportunity to translate their ideals and goals and agenda into socio-political realities in the governance sphere. How effective these leaders are in the political and governance realm and the precise impact both on the state and the CSO formation remains to be seen. Thus CSO leaders are moving beyond ideals and goals into the realm of practice and deployment of politics to achieve their policy and governance agenda.

Building Governance Data and Knowledge
CSOs have through interactions with citizen challenges, development problems and social realities, built up a huge reservoir of knowledge and data

on the state of development. CSOs/NGOs have through networks with international CSOs and organizations gained huge access to social realities and knowledge for development. As community based, grass root and people centred organizations, CSOs receive and generate information which could make valuable contributions to development and governance.

Special Representations and Voice: Supplementing Electoral and Partisan Representations

The CSO sector has positioned itself as the representatives, advocates, defenders and protectors of the weak, vulnerable, marginalized, voiceless, suppressed, and excluded. The CSOs have thus being the voice of these groups in terms of articulating their interests, creating awareness and raising concerns, seeking action and support for these groups. Particularly, the CSOs have agitated against the abuse of groups, protected those abused by agents of the state and provided legal support to the disadvantaged.

The CSOs provide a more broad representation of society well beyond political society and representatives in government. CSOs particularly represent the weak, disadvantaged, the minorities, and the poor, who have so little influence and representation in the state and governance systems even in issues that concerns them. The CS then is a space that citizens can easily key into such that their concerns, interests and aspirations are brought into the limelight in the socio-political process and the policy agenda.

Social Cohesion and Integration

CS enables virtues, values and roles that build bridges across class, social, cultural and identity divides. It facilitates the development of common sentiments, bonds and attachments and foster social cohesion and national integration. CSOs also build solidarity among citizens that weaken identity limitations.

Participatory Governance

CSOs strengthen participatory governance by empowering citizens to participate in the political sphere and public decision making. Through CSO activities, citizens learn the how and why of participation in public affairs and acquire confidence that they can influence public affairs. CSOs help to build social capital, by the cultivation of civic norms that build cooperation for community problem solving. CSOs build a network of associations which foster cooperation for the common good. Further the norms of trust, tolerance, pluralism, neighbourliness, reciprocity and inclusion help to strengthen cohesion and nation-building (Ghaus-Pasha 2004:3,5).

Public Communication

A core instrument of CS activities is the use of public communication in the public realm. CS articulates citizen interests, problems and concerns and place them in the public realm. It thus constructs or strengthens the culture of debate, public discourse, criticism and consultation. In doing this, it

strengthens citizen input and participation and the platform of interaction, exchanges and transactions between the private and political and public spheres. Thus CSOs foster interactions in the public sphere around issues of common interest. CSOs identify unaddressed problems and bring them to public attention, just as they provide expression to sentiments that may be "artistic, spiritual, cultural, occupational, social and recreational" (Ghaus-Pasha, 2004:5).

Constructing Social Linkages

The CSOs have constituted the linkage between the grass-root and community and the national governments and between the communities and the international organizations. The CSOs thus mediate between the local, regional, national and the international in terms of bringing specific and local existential challenges to national and international attention and reach and bringing support from the national and international to the local.

Programme Formulation and Implementation

CSOs engage governments in the design of programmes, programme strategies, implementation methods and outcome. CSOs have also protested against proposed or existing policies by highlighting and educating citizens on potential policy externalities. Some engagements against policies have involved protests such as the recent fuel de-subsidization. CSO engagements have also pertained to who benefits and should benefit from public policy and advocacy for proper and comprehensive

implementation of certain policies regarded as positive. CSOs may also pressure governments to release and implement the findings of commissions and inquiries. Public policies that depredate or undermine citizen interests and welfare, or that favour privileged groups at the expense of disadvantaged and vulnerable groups, whose costs are too high or those not seen to be in the national interests, have come under the criticisms of CSOs.

Particularly CSOs seek to influence public policy that relate to special groups and may mount pressures for the implementation or better implementation of neglected dimensions of existing policies. CSOs may monitor or assist concerned citizens in the monitoring of the formulation and implementation of public policy.

The CSO formation has been very active in suggesting and recommendation policy and programmatic change and rationalizing why such changes could better address societal programmes. CSOs have advocated policies, methods of conducting governance, implementation strategies and goal changes.

The Reform Agenda

CSOs have been a vital part of the political and economic reform agenda. CSOs were at the vanguard of the political liberalization and democratization struggles of the 1990s and the resistance to economic reforms engineered by the Bretton Woods

Institutions, under which structural adjustment programmes were implemented.

Since democratization, the reform agenda has continued to be at the centre of CS activities. CSOs have been strong advocates and supporters of reforms of governance institutions, existing laws and processes of governance. Electoral and governance reforms have been of critical interests in CS engagements.

Conflict Transformation, Peace Building and Security Management
The CSOs have been active in deescalating conflicts, reducing violence, facilitating peace building, facilitating changes that transform conflicts, and working with communities, CBOs, women, youth and local elites to prevent and contain violent conflicts and build peace initiatives. The CSOs have particularly participated in training and education projects, facilitated service delivery, advocated peaceful strategies, monitored conflicts, rights violations and peace efforts and agreements, assisted in re-socialization and re-orientation processes, and facilitated dialogue and inter group social cohesion (Daffenholz, 2009: 1-29).

Civil society roles in violent and armed conflicts and conflict environments include:
1) Protection of victims
2) Advocacy and public communication
3) Monitoring
4) Socialization into culture of peace

5) Building conflict sensitive social cohesion
6) Intermediation and facilitation
7) Service delivery (Paffenholz and Spark, 2006).

Some CSOs operate in the areas of crime control and security of lives and property. There are numerous vigilante and neighbourhood security associations which patrol, maintain security and contain criminality in communities and neighbourhoods.

3:2:2 The Roles of Civil Society in Socio-Economic Development
Roles Vacated by the State
There are neglected roles in social services, social welfare and economic empowerment sector that the state has been unable to provide. The state is actually limited in terms of resources and capacity to meet all citizen needs. Thus there are gaps that are not filled and spaces not occupied in government outlay and actions. Inadequacies in government deliveries of goods and services, inadequate attention to particular needs and neglect of particular citizen challenges characterize government work. These spaces and gaps are sometimes filled by CSOs through interventions and advocacy. Thus CSOs have become alternative institutions outside the state that address unfulfilled aspirations and needs and public problems.

Social Services and Welfare
CSOs are directly providing certain social services or supporting state provision in diverse areas ranging from

education, gender (girl empowerment, protection against sexual violence) to micro-credit, economic empowerment, employment services and social welfare for the aged, prisoners, physically challenged and other vulnerable citizens. The CSOs advocate for the provision of basic needs, the affordability of social services and public subsidization of social services at least for the poor and vulnerable.

There are numerous self help and self development associations that provide socio-economic relief and support services to members. The CSOs have been active in the efforts at providing safety nets.

Poverty Alleviation, Economic Empowerment and Human Capital Development

The CSOs have been agitating, advocating and active in seeking access to finance, job opportunities and employment. CSOs have become active participants in the micro-credit finance sector through accessing and managing micro credits and supervising funded projects. Because of their grass root and community locations, they have been more successful in loans retrieval and funds management and have thus become trusted agents and consultants to state governments, corporate organizations and international organizations. CSOs have also been active in the areas of skills, entrepreneurship and business development for youth and women.

Relief, Rehabilitation and Humanitarian Assistance

The CSOs have taken on expansive roles in this sector in the last 20 years or so. The roles have expanded beyond the traditional actors as Red Cross/Red Crescent to NGOs that source resources and partner with international organizations, corporate bodies and government agencies, in the conduct and operations of relief, rehabilitation, and humanitarian support or assistance. The CSO sector is usually a ready support in the event of occurrence of natural disasters, epidemics, accidents, violent conflicts and related situations. Support has often entailed the distribution of food, basic toiletries, water and basic medicines

Campaigns for Control of Diseases and Related Conditions

The CSO have also been in the forefront of the campaign for control of HIV AIDs, cancer, malaria and other health challenges. The CSOs in this sector have deployed information dissemination, grass root contacts, support for victims, and support for the development of medical cures. There are numerous health related NGOs working in the area of awareness, care and related support to victims of specific diseases and health challenges.

Natural Resource Governance

CSOs have been actively engaged in the struggles for equity, fairness and justice in the distribution of natural resources, the social responsibility of international and local oil companies to communities, the protection of the

rights of citizens and communities and the rightful conduct of security agencies involved in the communities of the Niger Delta.

CSOs in the area of resource governance have focused attention on the openness, transparency and accountability of oil revenues by governments and the oil companies. A major area of activity here is the Nigerian Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative. Besides, several local and international CSOs are involved in monitoring the budgets and expenditures of the oil producing states.

Environmental Governance

CSOs have raised awareness about the need to protect the environment from progressive degradation, industrial pollution and deforestation. The central objectives have been environmental issues awareness, sustainability of the environment for development, compliance of industrial organizations with environmental policies and regulations, the identification of environmental pollution sites and remediation. The NGOs/CBOs are agitating and working for a green economy.

Table 4
Selected Roles of Civil Society in Sustainable Development

S/N	ROLES	ENGAGEMENTS
1.	Governance	Advocacy for policy improvements, accountability, transparency, openness; challenge of poor policies, inefficiency
2.	Infrastructure Provision	Implementing small-scale community infrastructures, implementing infrastructure contracts for international and corporate organizations. Advocacy for infrastructure improvements.
3.	Economic Empowerment Projects and Enterprises	Assisting and implementing small-scale livelihood improvement projects. Giving credits and loans to individuals and groups through managing micro-credit programmes; Assisting communities and local groups in establishing and managing cooperatives
4.	Social Services	Conduct literacy programmes, health awareness programmes, welfare programmes for the physically challenged, orphans and elderly; campaigns against human trafficking, implementing projects of HIV/AIDs, malaria rollback, maternal mortality, campaigns of immunization
5.	Human Capital Development	Entrepreneurial training, skills training and business development
6.	Poverty Alleviation	Enhancing access to credit, self employment, skills development, job placement, equipment support programmes

7.	Relief and Humanitarian Services	Emergency support services as relief for displaced persons, safety needs for the vulnerable, strengthening community organizations for emergency preparedness and rehabilitation
8.	Conflict Management	Emerging relief for displaced, peace negotiation, agreements monitoring, mediation, protection of vulnerable, human rights monitoring, securing hostages peace building, citizen awareness, enlightenment and mobilization for peace

Adapted from Ghaus-Pasha (2004:10). Op cit.

CHAPTER 4

STATE AND CIVIL SOCIETY RELATIONS IN NIGERIA

The growth of civil society and the challenges that the formation has faced are crucial issues in the capacity, roles and contributions as well as the potential for partnerships with the state and business.

4:1 CIVIL SOCIETY IN NIGERIA
The Development of Civil Society

Civil society existed in pre-colonial traditional states in Nigeria as associational forms that enabled participation, communication, information flow and influence between the citizens and the state, as well as means of social economic assistance, control of social existence and survival to citizens (Chazan 1996: 74-77; Ikelegbe 2003: 49). With colonialism, new social exchanges, modernism and attendant social dislocations provided a new platform of consciousness and agitation which catalyzed the formation of communal, traditional, cultural and other groups. The nationalist movement and decolonization also provided the stimulants for associational flowering. Thus the decolonization period is regarded as the initial golden age of civil society (Young 1992:37).

Ikelegbe (2003:49) claims that this associational effervescence was carried into the post independence era. CSOs particularly the trade unions, students groups, professional associations and media associations played active roles in governance while farmers associations, self help community associations, cooperative movements and women groups began to play some roles in socio-economic engagements (Lee 2009:5). However the governments became suspicious, intolerant and began to infiltrate, politicize, compromise, circumscribe and harass civil society.

The socio-political environment of military dictatorship between 1966 and 1979 and December 1983 and May 1999, which was rapacious, authoritarian, repressive, intolerant of dissent, and characterized with the dominance of the public realm, limited citizen participation and engagement, constricted civil and human rights and freedoms and did not allow the blossoming and activism of CS and their engagements with the state. CS therefore was constrained and were either forced to withdraw or compelled to resist.

The 1980s witnessed the proliferation of NGOs and the emergence of greater activism by the CSO sector. The late 1980s was actually the beginning point of the current golden era or flowering of CSOs. This was actually a result of and reaction to the accentuation of the state, governance and development crises, which deepened poverty, unemployment, misery, economic decline, social ferment, job losses, corruption, human rights abuses, repression and deterioration of social services. Civil society emerged from the public disenchantment, frustration and discontent and became a new societal force of popular striving for change.

Civil society emerged as a platform for the mobilization of mass protests, riots and strikes as part of resistance to state abuses, excesses, mis-governance and structural adjustment conditionalities. It also became a formation of dynamic arrangements of safety nets, welfare and survival options for the poor, vulnerable, excluded, marginalized, disadvantaged and weak.

The emergent civil society formation has been characterized with civic activism, vibrancy, mobilization, contestation, criticism and opposition in the civic engagements in the public realm. The CSOs made huge progress as vanguards in the struggle for democratization, revisions of certain economic policies, government concessions of some subsidies and cost reductions of some social services. However, the CSO suffered from banning, repressions, arrests and detentions. But the experience under the military dictatorships left the CSOs battle hardened, mobilized, vibrant and confident (Lee 2007:6).

Civil society has continued to flower since the inception of democratic rule. Apart from the rights, advocacy and environmentalist groups, civil and primary groups that articulate and express primordial and particularistic interests have blossomed. Further, non-governmental organizations that address diverse issues ranging from human capital development, economic empowerment, natural resource governance and conflict and peace building have proliferated. As at 2009, it was estimated that there were about 46,000 registered non state actors, particularly NGOs in Nigeria. The relevance and in fact vibrancy of the sector necessitated the appointment of a Special Adviser to the President on Civil Society during the Obasanjo presidency.

Dominant Types of Civil Society Organizations (CSO)
The CSOs in Nigeria are quite diverse and numerous but some order can be put in by categorization on the basis of some criteria (Ikelegbe 2003:44). First, there are formal and informal groups, civil and uncivil groups, autonomous and non autonomous groups, single groups and network or linkage groups, local or national groups, and traditional based or modern groups. We have identified the characteristics of uncivil groups earlier. Militant and aggressive identity based groups and cult groups fall into this category and they are quite numerous in Nigeria. Though most groups are autonomous, non autonomous groups have existed such as WAI Brigade, Better Life and Family Support groups, and the defunct Association for Better Nigeria and the Youth Ernestly Ask for Abacha. There are linkage and network groups in several areas such as HIV/AIDS, humanitarian services, rights advocacy and good governance. Linkage groups coordinate efforts of related groups. An example of a network group is the Nigeria NGO Consultative Forum, NINCOF (James 2003: 270). There are also networks of action that mobilize groups for specific actions such as protests against government policies.

More specifically, we can categorize primary/primordial groups, secondary associations, grass-root organizations, issue based groups and voluntary non profit organizations or NGOs.

Primary or primordial groups are socio-cultural, parochial, particularistic and identity based. Many of the groups here are communal, ethnic, religious and regional. Primary groups utilize their affinities and primordial networks to constitute social and collective struggles and actions in relation to other groups and the state. Following the social discontent and frustration attendant to the politics of domination and marginality during the military era, these groups witnessed a tremendous growth not only in number but in their mobilization for expression of identity based interests and challenges. Foremost in this category are apex cultural, youth and gender associations of ethnic, religious and regional groups. These include Afenifere, Ohanaeze Ndigbo, Arewa Consultative Forum, Ijaw National Congress, Christian Association of Nigeria and others.

Secondary or middle level associations are socio-economically, professionally and labour based. These include trade union and labour associations, professional associations, and business groups. The business groups include the organized private sector organizations, informal private sector associations, farmers and peasant associations. There are numerous associations comprised in this category and they include National Association of Nigerian Students (NANS), Manufacturers Association of Nigeria (MAN), Women in Nigeria (WIN), Community Women and Development (COWAD), Market Women Association of Nigeria (MWAN), Federation of Business and Professional Women(BPW), Women in Law and Development in Africa (WILDAF), Women Advancement Forum (WAF), There are numerous professional associations such as the Nigerian Medical Association and Nigerian Bar Association, and trade union and labour associations such as Nigerian Labour Congress, Trade Union Congress, Academic Staff Union of Universities, Nigerian Union of Journalists (NUJ) and numerous others. Grass-root organizations comprise community based organizations, community development associations, age grade associations. They also include diverse local associations of survival, recreation, development support and mutual welfare support. The Issue based groups comprise advocacy groups, gender and youth groups, environmental groups and rights groups. These usually relate to certain problems, circumstances, needs and interests. There are numerous associations working on HIV/AIDS such as Society for Women and AIDS in Africa (SWAAN), Journalists against AIDS (JAAIDS).

The non- governmental organization sector has emerged as the largest segment. As at the 1990s, the sector was conservatively estimated at about 10,000 (Akinyele 1995:5). The sector has witnessed extensive proliferation and some regard it as the new industry for unemployed or underemployed, and

retired public and private sector top officials. The NGOs can be categorized into advocacy organizations, public awareness and communication organizations, social service and welfare organizations, human capital development organizations, economic empowerment organizations, action research organizations, humanitarian assistance organizations and peace building groups.

Many of the NGOs however work in several areas and only a few are strictly specialized in specific areas. We can cite few examples of peace building groups such as Academic Associates Peace Works (AAPW), Peace, Reconciliation and Development Association (PREDA), Peace and Development Organization (PEDO). Examples of Action research NGOs include the Centre for Population and Environmental Development (CPED) and the Women Health and Action Research Centre. Advocacy and Rights groups include Environmental Rights Action (ERA), Girls Power Initiative (GPI), Constitutional Rights Project (CRP) and Campaign for Democracy and Human Rights (CDHR).

The Roles of Civil Society
Civil Society has made contributions to Nigeria's development. Apart from being the vanguard of the struggle against military dictatorships and for democratization, CSOs have made some contributions to the protection of liberty, freedom and rights, socio-economic progress, particularly at local and community levels, ethnic accommodation and mediation

(Vickers, 2006:187), conflict management and peace building and humanitarian and relief services.

As a formation, the CS has been able to construct concerts, broad platforms and fora for the coordination, cooperation, mobilization and action on public issues of interest. These platforms have tended to be led by few associations; trade unions particularly Nigeria Labour Congress, Trade Union Congress; professional associations as Nigeria Medical Association, student organizations, the Academic Staff Union of Universities and human rights advocacy groups (Lee 2007:7). The CSO formation has periodically successfully constructed national platforms for popular actions and mobilized citizen protests around such issues as fuel subsidy and minimum wage.

The CSOs have made much progress in the aspects of advocacy, assistance and support in the areas of social welfare, poverty alleviation, human capital development, diseases control, and humanitarian assistance. In these areas, with support from international organizations, the CSOs have contributed trainings and delivered support. The CSOs have also been fairly effective in initiating citizen based initiatives, strengthening citizen efficacy and participation, generating data and scrutiny of governance, environmental issues, elections and accountability. Even in the pervasive and critically unsettling areas of religious and resource conflicts, CSOs have begun to emerge that focus on and attempt

resolutions and conflict transformation. The Interfaith Mediation Centre and Muslim-Christian Dialogue Forum (IMC – MCDF), the Nigeria Inter-Religious Council (NIREC) are emergent CSOs concerned with peaceful coexistence of religious groups (Okpanachi, 2009).

CSOs activism have facilitated the placement of such issues of electoral reform, corruption and accountability, the conduct of public officials and citizen rights and freedoms on the national and public policy agenda of discourse and debates. Civil society has championed consultations with citizens which some governments have adopted such as the town hall meetings. Research and advocacy CSOs are generating data, analysis and knowledge on societal problems and public policy programmes.

Thus the CS formation is making steady but slow progress in many areas of interest and focus. Their presence, activism, struggles and potentials have tended to remind governments about roles, conduct and propriety of actions. The CS formation is acquiring more knowledge and experience in governance, social services, social assistance, conflict management, green politics and human capital development.

More importantly, the sustained confidence of the international community and international organizations have manifested in their urging and insisting on state consultation and partnership with CSOs

or of CSOs with corporate bodies, in several funded or supported projects. The space encouraged by the international organizations continues to be large and expectations remain high.

However the effectiveness, actual performance and contributions to sustainable development of the CSOs have raised concerns. It has been argued that the efforts of the CSOs many times tend to meet with disappointing results and have not resulted in the promotion of substantive changes in governance systems and governance, just as achievements are mainly modest, temporary and un-sustained in the areas of policy reform, governance and environment.

Strategies and Methodologies of Civil Society Engagements
CSOs have tended to deploy the under-listed strategies and methods in the engagements with the state and society in Nigeria:
i)   Building public awareness on specified problems or challenges and cultivating public opinion on issues
ii)   Advocacy and agitation for desired policies and state actions
iii)   Campaigns and mobilization of citizens in support of specified demands
iv)   Creating attention about existing problems, setbacks, abuses and deplorable conditions.
v)   Building grassroots involvement
vi)   Monitoring practices, conduct and actions in specified areas of interest to expose challenges

vii) Building pressures on state and corporate bodies for desired change

viii) Demanding redress of neglect, marginality and abuse

ix) Seeking access, dialogue and influence with government agencies on the resolutions of public problems and changes desired

x) Providing assistance, services and support to target groups such as women, the poor, unemployed and youth

The NGOs have been engaged in advocacy though information, sensitization and enlightenment of alternatives in programmes, actions and interventions to existing policy and practices. The CSOs have been able to build some platforms for discussing, clarifying and recommending solutions to existing problems. The CSOs particularly inform and mobilize citizens along the lines of what should be done or ought to be done. The CSOs have also constructed networks within sectors to harness and coordinate efforts, build synergies and generate greater impact. Thus concerts and coordinating organs of CSOs, in similar sectors of work, have emerged, in ad hoc and more permanent forms. In some instances, different CSOs, including trade unions, the media, professional associations and the rights groups, have coordinated the mobilization of nationwide protests against issues of common interest. In recent times, there have been the minimum wage and fuel subsidy protests coordinated by CSOs.

A major strategy of the CSOs has also been to construct linkages and networks with international civil society, international organizations and development, aid and donor agencies. These networks have been dictated by the struggle for funds and support for CSO activities and projects. This has meant that the CSOs have been compelled to key into the agenda and interests of the international organizations.

The Challenges of Civil Society in Nigeria

An active, virile, capable, resource endowed, well manned and vibrant civil society is imperative for addressing critical societal problems as governance, environmental management, human and civil rights and poverty. However, such CSOs are in short supply in Nigeria. While the CS formation is growing particularly in terms of interests, numbers, roles and capacity, there have been clear problems that hamstrung and undermine its roles and capability to perform sustainable development roles.

The membership of some CSOs has tended to be exclusive to certain classes and spatial locations. Civil Society is still a terrain of the privileged middle class and elite (Lee 2007:4). It is thus not inclusive of the poor or popular classes. Particularly, the CSOs being more of professionals and middle class associations have been delinked from localities and the grassroots. Thus spatially, CSOs have been urban based, though few are active in the rural areas. There are few local or grass-root based

CSOs other than community based local governance associations, welfare and existential associations.

CS still reflects the nations' divisiveness, divergent interests and particularistic sentiments. There are divisions along partisan, ideological, regional, religious and related lines. These have threatened the peaceful, harmonious and integrative engagements of CSOs and weakened associational pluralism. The CS formation is in fact quite fragmented as the preponderance of parochial, primordial and cultural associations and professional associations have tended to create divisions that are particularistic and uncivil.

Some of the CSOs are plagued by internal struggles and squabbles along social tendencies and ideological orientations which undermine cooperation and partnerships in activities and processes. There are emergent populist tendencies and forces that challenge the domination of the formation by the wealthy, business, aristocratic and related interests. There are diverse contests, contentious and unhealthy competitions for development resources.

There are management and leadership problems manifested in leadership perpetuation and struggles, which has sometimes underpinned the proliferations in the sector, and the apparent un-sustainability of CSO platforms and networks. There are deficits in management capacity and skills, organizational structures and procedures for managing members, programmes and activities. Systems of accounting and auditing as well management accountability to members and constituencies are weak.

The CSOs have also tended to create or exaggerate problems and needs, and prolong or perpetuate them in order to justify their existence, roles, and prolong or perpetuate relevance. Sometimes, this has involved the use of dubious and un-altrustic strategies. Quite related is that the NGOs tend to create their own spaces or territories and compete sometimes unhealthily to sustain privileged access to donor funds. Many of the CSOs have been unable to operate at state and national levels, neither have they been able to link up in umbrella associations and networks at these levels. As Aiyede (2003:21-22) notes, though the CSO that are national organizations are clearly more effective in overall roles and impact, few have the capacity for structuring in corresponding form to state institutions, and the replicated offices at local, state and federal government levels. The grassroots associations though few have lacked networks and platforms at state, regional and national levels, that aggregate their strengths, resources and contributions. These inabilities and therefore the dominant localization of the CSOs in states and regions have diminished the *policy input, influence and checks* of the CSOs (Aiyede, 2003:21).

CSOs are handicapped by poor knowledge of the workings of government and the corporate or business sector. Many of the personnel

lack the experience, competence, contacts and confidence to liaise and work with the ministries, departments and agencies of government at the state and federal levels.

The NGO sector by virtue of engagements in consulting, economic interests, direct provision of services and semi-commercial activities has become a lucrative commercial and dominant arm of CSO (Paffenholz & Spark 2006). The NGOs act as subcontractors and agents to international NGOs and corporate organizations, and have been recipients of large funding support. NGO work is now lucrative, thriving and profitable. The emergent business, commercial and consultancy orientation is weakening the voluntary, selfless and sacrificial orientation and the focus on social assistance, welfare and support to the weak, vulnerable and less advantaged groups. There are now many self interested, profit making, exploitative and un-altruistic organizations that are operating and masquerading as NGOs. The legitimacy of the CSO and particularly the NGO sector is weak. First the NGOs receive large funds but are not accountable or held accountable except to external supporters and management. Thus accountability to local constituencies and members and the public is weak.

The autonomy of the CSOs in the context of funds inflow and the competition and struggle for such funds is in doubt. The external funds are tied to certain agenda and goals, which are dictated by the interests and ideology of

the patrons, sponsors and home governments of the international organizations and donor agencies. Therefore beneficiary CSOs may actually be agents, surrogates and hand maidens of foreign interests, albeit surreptitiously.

The CSO sector has suffered from leadership losses to politics and civilian administrations since the advent of democratic rule. Some of the influential leaders have joined political society, contested elections and hold appointive and elected positions. In some ways, the CSO leadership capacity particularly the potential network and concert leadership is being weakened (Lee 2007:6).

4:2 THE NATURE OF STATE-CIVIL SOCIETY RELATIONS IN NIGERIA

The nature of relations between CS and the state is diverse, complex and dynamic. The relations is dependent on the nature of the CSOs, the issues involved, the sector involved and the governments involved.

The relations could be adversarial, characterized with struggles for domination and control, opposition and competition. This was historically the relations until the advent of democracy. The relations could also be constructive, in which case there is mutual support, cooperation, dialogue, consultation and partnership.

There are emerging more varied types and density of relations between state and civil society. From the resistance,

hostile, antagonistic and oppositional relations of the military and transitional period, there are emerging increasing engagements that can be categorized as collaborative, cooperative, integrative but sometimes conflict ridden. The current attitudes of government to CSOs vary from passivity, interventions, cooptation to accommodation and partnership.

Most often, government know that certain CSOs exist, but are passive and unconcerned until other conditions warrant some concern and intervention. When government interests are aroused however, governments intervene by way of influence to promote desired objectives. The intervention may be to co-opt certain of the leaders, or penetrate them to ensure divide and rule, control and domination. Cooptation and penetration may take the forms of appointments, contracts, largess and other forms of patronage. The intensely hegemonic agenda of the post-colonial state has meant that most governments seek to dominate all non state forces. This means that governments may harass and intimidate uncompromising CSO leaders and may deny some CSOs of recognition and support.

Other than these strategies, the government has tended to be suspicious of the intentions of the sponsors and membership of CSOs and their activities. Thus the governments either disregards, distrusts or subvert the CSOs. This is not surprising because the historical roots of the advocacy, rights and environmental groups tended

towards criticism and mobilized resistance against governments. The military governments were more oriented toward repressing CSOs.

The governments are particularly suspicious and distrustful of CSOs with foreign support, funding and collaborations. Governments are suspicious of the real intentions of international CSOs, the dictation of agenda, the foreign influence and controls over the CSOs and the potential use which local CSOs can be put by the international CSOs and organizations. The later is seen as possibly less altruistic and could subvert national interests and sovereignty.

Democratic rule has however broadened the contact and cooperation points between CSOs, governments and political institutions such as opposition political parties. CSOs have tended to construct broad platforms that include parties in the Conference of Nigerian Political Parties. Government have also become more receptive and engaging of CSOs particularly of the social services, economic empowerment, social welfare and humanitarian bent. Thus governments have tended to work with CSOs in the areas of healthcare, micro credit, human capital development and social welfare.

However, there are still problems of persisting hang-overs in orientations and roles. The State-CSOs level of relations which was traditionally and still is mired in mutual suspicious and distrust, is partly a heritage of the pro-democracy struggle against military

dictatorship. The flowering of CS at certain levels as some rights, advocacy and pro-democracy NGOs during the period of military dictatorship was rooted in discontent, retreat from the state and disengagement. Aiyede (2003) has noted that alienated and disengaged CSOs cannot engage the state in favour of democracy and governance. Therefore, the tradition of participation in government institutions and work and in the delivery of social services has been poor (Aiyede, 2003::21).

The CSOs have majorly not re-defined their visions and orientations, or restructured their organizations and operations to strengthen relevance and effectiveness within the democratic dispensation (Aiyede, 2003:23). Therefore the level of interactions and the linkage of vast segment of CS formation to the state, political sphere and public realm are limited, just as the level and density of civic engagements. The poor level of civic engagements and popular participation in the public realm and political process has been a major limitation of CS (Mboge & Doe 2004).

There is still poor relations and trust between CSOs and political society, state and bureaucratic officials. The later are still wary, suspicious and distrustful of CSOs. First CSOs are seen as anti-government and personal aspirations, interests and conduct which tends towards private accumulation as opposed to the progress of their constituents. In the circumstance, CSOs are seen more as a *nuisance to be accommodated*, than as a partner in

sustainable development, an attitude that is manifested in the denial of access to government information and activities (Kew 2004; Chukwuma 2005). The emergence of more dense relations between the democratic governments and civil society since 1999, has been in part externally induced by international organizations, bilateral, development, donor and aid organizations and international civil society, which demand government and civil society consultation, dialogue and popular participation in the public policy process. Even then, certain CSOs seen to be radical and independent have been excluded by governments in civic engagements in favour of loyal, compromised and non autonomous groups (Lee 2007:13).

Policy influence in the circumstance has been generally weak. Some CSOs like trade unions and professional associations that have nationwide spread, committed members and capacity to deploy strikes and protests have won some influence (USAID, 2004). There has been more relative success in access and influence with legislators, opposition political parties and opposition politicians (Lee 2007:13-14). CS influence has also tended to exist when concerts of popular mobilization and collective action have been constructed. These have successfully occurred with some success in policy change over issues of fuel subsidy and minimum wage.

The mutual perceptions by the state and civil society have contributed to the poor state of substantive relations.

Governments tend to see CSOs as unelected, unrepresentative and privatized realm of few individuals that are not accountable to anyone. Their internal operations, finances and decisions are not open or subject to public scrutiny. They are agents or operating at the behest of and funded by predominantly Northern international CSOs and international organizations whose medium term and ultimate goals may not be congruent with national interests. There are also suspicions about the ulterior motives, leanings, interests and grievances of founders and trustees of CSOs. CSOs are seen to be arrogant and lay claim to superior knowledge, ideas, policy and methods of conducting public affairs and governance. Governments also tend to see CSOs' operations and activities as intrusive in the traditional preserves of state roles and authority. Particularly,

CSO activities that are related to public scrutiny, oversight and overall questioning and the quest for change tend to be detested. The CSOs are also perceived as having a dominantly negative perception of governments. Further detested is the tendency of CSOs to seek privileged treatment and support.

The CS sector also tends to see governments as failing in sensitivity, responsiveness and actions in respect of critical citizen needs and aspirations. They are not significantly pro people and pro poor. They are immersed in corruption, abuse of state powers, self interests and disregard for rules and procedures.

Besides these, there are differences in the ideology, orientations, styles, strategies and operations between the governments and CSOs which further account for poor relations (Table 5).

Table 5

Essential Differences between State and Civil Society

Variables	State	Civil Society
Goals	Overall socioeconomic development and progress.	Overall progress with focus on marginal groups, specific needs, and gaps in governance.
Terms of Goals	Short term, immediate results	Long term progress and change
Social Base	Broad social base of integrating communities, region and nation	International donors and collaborative international and local CSOs, marginalized and aggrieved groups
Resources	Citizens taxes and natural resources	Rarely dependent on members but on international CSOs and donors, transnational businesses

Size or Activities	Overall policy and regulatory setting, governance and development of society	Localities, specific issue interest communities
Levels of operations	Nation, region, urban sector, more macro level	Community, specific geographical areas, grass-root
Styles of Operation	Centralized, top down, command	Bottom-up, participative personal contacts
Actions		Advocacy, public scrutiny, dialogue, small scale service delivery

Source: Adapted from literature survey and empirical observations.

CHAPTER 5

EMERGENT STATE AND CIVIL SOCIETY PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

5:1 THE NEED FOR PARTNERSHIP

What we need to realize is that the state alone cannot provide the services, empowerment, self realization and welfare that Nigerians need and demand for. The state alone cannot realize national goals and aspirations. No matter the agenda that is on offer, whether it is MDG, Vision 2020, transformation, seven point or related agenda, the governments alone cannot carry them through. The state is limited in terms of its specific experience, personnel, spatial reach such as in remote rural areas, resources, and mobilizational capacity. In some areas, the legitimacy of the state is weak in terms of confidence, trust and support. There is the problem of poor perception of the integrity and inclusiveness of governments.

There are clearly areas where CSOs are more strategically located, have specialized skills and experience and have comparative advantage over government. There are also areas where government has lacked capacity and interest, and have thus vacated spaces. Civil Society is today a major social force in many countries. As a formation, it has attracted considerable recognition as a core element in development, social service, social welfare and peace building efforts. It is recognized as a desirable if not core partner in the projects of international and regional organizations. Most international organizations, including the UN, AU and ECOWAS recognize and support the development of a virile CS formation, able to partner with states and international organization efforts.

In Africa, the CSO sector has greater relevance because of the peculiar intensity of socio-economic and humanitarian crises and the incidence of violent conflicts, poverty, insecurity and civil strife. The diversity and size of the weak and vulnerable victims of poverty, disease, famine, rights abuse and social service decay are enormous.

The CSOs have certain strengths as compared to the state. First the CSOs provide voluntary services, with low costs and often with little or no pecuniary gains. CSO members and staff are guided by a humanitarian assistance and support philosophy, which tends to heighten commitment, attachment and sacrifices in the course of the work. The CSOs have tended to deliver goods and services at lower cost. They are thus more efficient because as Karla (1999) states, they pay less, depend on volunteers and have less bureaucracy. Being smaller, less structured, less routinized and less bureaucratic, the CSOs are more adaptive and flexible in managing social conditions.

Some of the CSOs are strategically located to address local needs and challenges, being nearer to the people

by virtue of their work. This location provides knowledge, experience, contacts and attachments that place the CSOs in better stead in terms of interventions. The CSOs as autonomous organizations has tended to be less partisan and more neutral in its operations and activities particularly in relation to governance. It is therefore more potent as a meditational force.

Governance is well beyond governments alone. Non state actors have expertise, knowledge, capacity and interests that potentially impacts governance positively. What is required then is that the non state sector is mobilized to key into and align with these goals, such that the knowledge, creativity, capacity, experience and energy of this sector are mobilized.

The huge and arduous task of development and governance requires the joint attention, energy, creativity and thought of all individuals, groups, businesses and governments. Though there are diversity of goals and interests, all sectors may have to align with and key into national goals.

As a matter of fact, the emergent partnership is imperative. Partnership can be perhaps reasoned as an innovative way of rethinking governance and developmental tasks, as it brings in the non-state sector and strengthens the state in its roles. Thus partnership can be regarded as a paradigm shift from a sole state status to a cooperative and collaborative status between state and the third sector and even between state and business.

5:2 BASES, PLATFORMS AND METHODOLOGIES OF PARTNERSHIPS

The basis of partnership has to be constructed. This would require the following:

i) Recognition of common interests and goals, particularly in the socio-economic progress of society.

ii) Creating acceptable areas of common interest and activities.

iii) Mutual respect and accommodation of different strengths, capacity and orientations.

iv) strengthening interactions, exchanges and access.

v) Building agreements, consensus and coalitions through inclusive public policy making and programming

To achieve greater effectiveness in sustainable development, CSOs and government would have to embrace coalitions to address specific issues. Such inclusive coalitions would involve governments, business, organized labour, churches, and diverse associations within CS (Ghaus-Pashan 2004:33).

The effectiveness of CSOs in playing their roles depends on certain conducive conditions, strengths and the nature of the state. For example, the information available to CSOs would depend on the openness of government.

Platforms for Partnership have to be constructed. These could be through

structured avenues for state and civil society exchanges, structured avenues for the solicitation of CSO contributions and for inputs into policy making and implementation, the creation of joint working groups, the establishment of arrangements for joint actions and the arrangements for funding, counterpart funding and other support services.

The state and CSOs would have to agree on participative governance and development. This would require the following:

i)   Putting the people at the centre (pro people planning and implementation
ii)   Refining policy and democracy through contestation
iii)   Engaging the people
iv)   Accepting and accommodating challenges and struggle (constructive opposition)
v)   Strengthening Governance through citizen organizations, mobilizations and solidarity
vi)   Building non primordial platforms for action
vii)   Providing for interactions on policy and programmes such as community/town hall meetings

5:3 TYPES OF PARTNERSHIP

Broadly, three types of state and civil society partnerships can be identified. These are state and civil society; state, international organizations and civil society; state, business and civil society. A fourth category business and civil society which excludes the state is only discussed here to denote the level of thriving partnerships that already exist in the sector and as a counterpoint to

stimulate the three types of partnership earlier identified.

State and Civil Society

There are few and disparate cases of partnerships thus far between the state and civil society. However some NGOs have operated with funding support from governments and collaborative arrangements relating to social services, micro-credit, humanitarian assistance, health care and conservation programmes.

LAPO Development Foundation has had support from some state governments in the management of micro-credit. The Niger Delta Wetland Centre has had support from state governments in the Natural Park and Forest Reserves and training programmes. The Mangrove Forest Conservation Society of Nigeria has had the support of the Rivers State government in the establishment of conservation centres while the Community Partners for Development had partnered with some state governments and National Commission for Refugees, on humanitarian assistance and relief for displaced persons (Ikelegbe 2009). The Mangrove Forest Conservation Society has also contributed to the Rivers State Government Mangrove Integrity masterplan.

Through the advocacy of Pro-Natura International, Nigeria (PNI), its community development foundation model has been adopted and their establishment is supported across the 9 states of the Niger Delta by the Niger

Delta Development Commission (NDDC), (PNI 2007). The Centre for Population and Environmental Development (CPED) undertook a demographic and baseline survey of the 9 Niger Delta states for the NDDC, which was integrated into the Niger Delta Master Plan (CPED n.d: 16-17).

State, International Organizations and CSOs

Two broad types can be delineated here. The first is some collaboration between international organizations, NGOs and federal and state governments. The second is collaborations between international organizations and NGOs but the later obtain support from state and local governments in the course of execution of projects.

There have been some projects in which governments, international organizations and CSOs have partnered. Some NGOs have been involved in the implementation of the DFID Local Governance and Participatory Development Pilot Programme, coordinated by the National Orientation Agency. The Global Funds Orphan and Vulnerable Children Project with some counterpart funding from the Federal Ministry of Women Affairs' Child Development Unit, work through some state ministries which coordinate local NGOs working on the project. Community Partners for Development has worked with the Akwa Ibom State Ministry of Education, in the Malaria in Pregnancy Project, sponsored by Exxon Mobil and Jhpiego (CPD 2008). With

support of the UNCHR and the National Commission for Refugees, the Community Partners for Development (CDP) has been involved in humanitarian services (CDP 2008).

NGOs have been working with the World Bank assisted state governments programme on AIDS through the State Action Committees against AIDS. CPED has been involved in capacity building of community based organizations in Uhunmode, Esan Central and Etsako Central under World Bank Assisted Project and the Edo State Action Committee on AIDS (CPED n.d:24-25). The LAPO Development Fund's LAPO Health received funds from the Edo State Government and SACA/World Bank and delivered micro-credit to persons living with HIV/AIDS and persons affected by AIDS (LDF 2006:34).

LAPO LDF in 2004 participated in the implementation of five (5) projects in Orhiomwon, Ikpoba Okha, Owan West and Ovia South west local governments areas under the European Union's MPP6 programme supported by the Federal Government's National Planning Commission (LDF 2007:43). The Community Partners for Development (CDP) also participated in constructing and supervising six (6) projects under the EU's MPP6 in Akwa Ibom State (CPD 2008).

Some State and local governments have supported NGO programmes as part of their implementation of projects funded by international organizations. Instances in which NGOs supported

and funded by international organizations obtain support from state and local governments include those of the Women Health and Economic Development Association (WHEDA) Men's Health Sensitization workshop in Akwa Ibom state with support from BBT and the government of Akwa Ibom State. WHEDA was also supported by local governments and the state government in the implementation of Breast and Cervical Cancer Awareness Campaign in Akwa Ibom state in December 1999, with funding support from the World Bank Resident Mission in Nigeria (WHEDA 1999:1).

State, Business and Civil Society
There are situations where NGOS have been involved in partnerships with business organizations which are facilitated, superintended or supervised by state governments.

Some NGOs have been involved in the facilitation and implementation of NNPC/Chevron-Texaco Grand Memoranda of Understanding (GMoU) community development projects, with the involvement of the Delta State Government, the Warri North, Warri South and Warri Southwest local government councils and the Delta State Oil Producing Areas Development Commission (DESOPADEC). The management of the Itsekiri Regional Development Council, the Ijaw Regional Development Council and the Ilaje Regional Development Council have involved NGOs such as the New Nigerian Foundation particularly in the Community Engagement Board and

Project Review sub-Committee. The representatives of the state government are also involved as members of the Project Review Committees in facilitating, design and monitoring of projects.

Business and CSOs
In the Niger Delta, transnational oil companies have evolved partnerships with bilateral organisations, international organisations, non-governmental organisation, governments, research institutes and universities. The TNOCs have tapped into the existence, popular support and advocacies of the NGOs as allies, partners and agents in their management of relations with communities and corporate social responsibility projects. The NGOs have been particularly involved in conducting needs assessments, baseline studies and participatory rural appraisals, the designing and monitoring of project progress, milestones and completion of community development projects for the TNOCs. Partnerships and contracts with NGOs have also involved poverty alleviation and skills development.

Many of the TNOCs such as Shell, Agip, Chevron Texaco, Exxon-Mobil, Nigerian Liquefied Natural Gas (NLNG) and Brass LNG work through several NGOs in Rivers, Delta and Bayelsa states in the areas of youth and women empowerment, skills development, micro-credit management, business development, health care and community development projects.

The Niger Delta Wetland Centre has had partnerships with Brass LNG, and Chevron-Texaco. WHEDA between 2000 and 2007 managed a Shell funded Micro credit programme For Shell's Host Communities in Delta, Bayelsa, Rivers and Aqua Ibom. The Niger Delta Professionals for Development (NIPRODEC) has conducted sustainable livelihood assessment reports for different communities in Delta and Bayelsa States funded by Shell and Chevron. The reports were followed by Community Development Plans (CDP) in some communities funded by Shell and Chevron (Ikelegbe 2009). Several NGOs facilitate the design, implementation, coordination, monitoring and evaluation of Grand Memoranda of Understanding (GMoU) between Transnational oil companies and host communities. For example, PNI Nigeria facilitated the SPDC GMoU with Andoni communities (PNI 2007:13;16).

The Centre for Population and Environmental Development (CPED) has been involved in projects financed by Shell Foundation, London and Shell Petroleum Development Company (SPDC). These have involved an economic empowerment project in Jesse, action research relating to impact of non formal education systems on youth employment in the Niger Delta, and monitoring and evaluation of SPDC infrastructure projects in Delta State (CPED n.d 27-34).

The Community Development Partners has been involved in numerous partnerships with the oil companies as Table 6 indicates.

Table 6

Business and CSO Partnerships: The Case of Community Development Partners

S/N	Projects	Project Status	Beneficiaries	Funding/sponsoring Business Organization
1	Human capital development/ Technical & Vocational Skills	1996-2003	Youth in Rivers state	Shell Petroleum Development Co. (SPDC)
2	Youth skills acquisition & micro enterprise development	2003	Selected Communities in Bayelsa, Delta & Rivers	Nigerian Agip Oil Co. Ltd (NAOC)
3	Youth skills acquisition & micro enterprise development	2005/2006	Rivers & Delta	NAOC
4	Community based needs assessment	1993-1996	Niger Delta	SPDC, NAOC
5	Baseline study of social projects	2001	Agip host communities in Bayelsa & Rivers	NAOC
6	Baseline study	2002	Agip host communities in Rivers/Delta	NAOC

7	Micro credit and business development	2004	SPDC host communities	SPDC
8	Participatory Rural Appraisal	2005	Host Communities in Bayelsa & Delta	NAOC
9	Micro credit and enterprise development	2005	Host communities	NAOC, SPDC
10	Participatory Rural Appraisal	Ongoing	Host communities	NAOC
11	Community development project implementation, monitoring and evaluation	Ongoing	Host communities	NAOC
12	Youth Empowerment Scheme/Technical & Vocational skills/Micro-business development	Ongoing	Host communities	NAOC
13	Youth Empowerment Scheme	Ongoing	Youth in host communities of Rivers state	NAOC
14	Youth technical/vocational skills acquisition & Micro credit development	2007	Youth of host communities in Rivers	Nigerian Liquefied Natural Gas Ltd (NLNG)
15	Youth technical/vocational skills acquisition & Micro credit development	Ongoing	Youth of host communities in Rivers	NLNG
16	Micro credit & enterprise development for rural women	Ongoing	Women of host communities	Brass LNG

Source: CODEP Profile, 2008.

Mobil Producing Nigeria, (MPN) has a Malaria prevention and treatment project since 2007, in partnership with Citizens International of Boston's affiliate NNF. MPN provides the funds, while NNF assisted by selected local NGOs and Community Health Committees implements the project. Elf Producing Nigeria Ltd (EPNL), which is part of Total, has a partnership with Pro-Natura International, Nigeria (PNIM) and Volunteer Service Organisation in the establishment of community foundation to manage CSD investments in its Eastern Obolo Communities, which are hosts to its offshore operation in the Amenam/Kpono oil field. EPNL provides funding while the NGOs facilitate and equip Community Development Foundations that select, design and implement projects as social infrastructure and microcredit on behalf of the communities (Idemudia 2007:15). What is clear from the foregoing analysis is that state-civil society

partnerships are quite few and cases are difficult to identify. It is also clear that there are more cases of international and bilateral organizations and donor agencies' stimulation or requirements that have fostered collaborations and joint working arrangements between governments and CSO. There are also few cases of government, business and CSO partnerships and those that exist are more of government facilitation of arrangements of community development programmes of transnational corporations in the Niger Delta in which NGOs participate as consultants, project managers and facilitators. It seems that the more numerous instances are of collaborations between business and NGOs. State officials need to take notice of this in terms of acknowledging the capacity and potential contributions of CSOs to the development process.

5:4 SITES OF PARTNERSHIPS
Drawing on the MDG goals and the core sectors of sustainable development, some sites or areas of partnership, collaboration and mutual support could be identified. These include the following:
i)   Human Capital Development- Skills development, training programmes, capacity building,
ii) Economic Empowerment Programmes- Poverty alleviation programmes, micro credit programmes, training in agriculture, business development, entrepreneurial programmes.
iii) Social Service Delivery-Health care, special education, social welfare, old peoples' homes, orphanages, prison care.
iv) Awareness and Communication Programmes- health advocacy, public health communication, awareness campaigns, gender equality,
v)   Research and Consultancy-action researches, training programmes, baseline studies, needs assessments, participatory rural appraisals,
vi) Infrastructure provision and Project Management-Project designs, execution, supervision, monitoring and evaluations
vii) Security Management-Security information, local intelligence, community security groups.
viii) Peace Building and Conflict transformation-Conflict management, peace building, resettlement programmes under Amnesty, non violent training programmes
ix) Humanitarian Assistance-Emergency relief services for internally displaced persons (IDPs), support for vulnerable groups.
x)   Environmental sustainability-Green programmes, forest conservation, pollution monitoring
ix) Governance programmes-natural resource governance, participatory governance, citizen civic empowerment, rights protection, accountability and transparency programmes, budget monitoring.

Within these areas, there could be specific arrangements of financing, administration, care and delivery between governments and CSOs, such that there is maximization of efforts. Particularly, areas of understanding and collaborations could be worked out, while specific arrangements for monitoring and quality control are instituted. The greater synergy obtained would definitely grow the overall performance of specific social service performance.

5:5 THE BENEFITS OF PARTNERSHIP

The full participation of CSOs through social partnership, mutual support, and collaborations with governments and even business, may contribute to overall development in the following areas.

i) Building public confidence and competence in governmental intentions, programmes and activities.

ii) Strengthening public accountability, transparency and openness

iii) Restraining and checking governmental unilateral actions

iv) Building public scrutiny and oversight of the development process.

v) Strengthening public participation and engagements in the social service and development processes.

vi) Facilitating decentralization of development, through devolution of certain development activities and services to CSOs, where they have comparative advantage.

Partnership enables the Integrating of all energies, resources, capacities and efforts into the goals and tasks of national development. It also creates the integration and greater linkages of the local, the grass-root, community and primordial groups into governance at national, regional and local government levels.

The state can extend its reach and penetration of even distant geographical and social spaces through partnership, thus strengthening its access and impact. Governments can improve the performance and quality of services through relationship with CSOs that draws on specific advantages of specialized knowledge, expertise, contacts, clientele and experience.

The state can strengthen its legitimacy through the overall enhancement of social services, economic empowerment and human capital development services. With better delivery and with state cooperation with the CSOs to enhance welfare, citizens would have better confidence in the governments and state institutions.

5:6 CASE ANALYSES OF STATE AND CIVIL SOCIETY PARTNERSHIPS FOR DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA

Case Analysis 1 Civil Society and the Management of the Niger Delta Conflict

The diverse environmental, developmental and resource distribution challenges of the Niger Delta region

precipitated a blossoming of civil society groups. A rich, variegated and diverse formation of groups emerged, that mobilized the citizenry, monitored environmental and rights abuses, articulated the region's problems, advocated solutions, agitated against marginality and repression, sought negotiation and dialogue. These groups include communal, ethnic and regional civil groups, environmental groups, rights groups, youth groups, women groups and community based organizations. A youth movement emerged by the 1990s, spanning across different communities and ethnic groups that became a broad platform of mobilization against the excesses of the traditional governance systems, oil companies and governments. The mobilization of women led to a proliferation of gender groups concerned with self help, women empowerment and peace building.

NGOs have particularly blossomed. Many relate to skills development, community development projects, peace building, economic empowerment and microcredit projects, health support, accountability, transparency and local governance issues. The NGOs have linked up with international organizations, development and donor agencies and international civil society organizations for funding and capacity. They have also constructed partnerships with corporate organizations and state governments as the table below reveals.

Table 7: Selected CSOs and NGOs Engaged in the Management of the Niger Delta Conflict

Name	Activities	Projects	Funding Support	Partnerships /collaborations
Social Action/ Social Development Integrated Centre	Advocacy on environment and democracy issues. Organization of citizen/representative interactive sessions. Building solidarity among groups on governance, democracy, environment etc	Transparency/ Accountability project/ Town hall meetings	Revenue Watch, Global Green Funds, Ford Foundation, Rosa Luxemburg Foundation	Other NGOs/CSOs such as Kebetkache, Our Niger Delta
Ogoni Solidarity Forum	Enlightenment programmes, facilitation of economic empowerment through agricultural production	Enlightenment programmes on Aids/Malaria. Town hall meetings	-	CBOs in Ogoniland
Niger Delta Wetland Centre	Economic empowerment through IT, agricultural production training.	Natural park and forest reserves. Training	MacArthur Foundation, EU, USAID, National	State Governments, Brass LNG,

		programmes on economic empowerment.	Conservation Foundation etc	Chevron Texaco etc
Mangrove Forest Conservation Society of Nigeria	Environmental protection awareness, conservation of mangrove forests, environmental impact assessment and awareness	Establishment of conservation centre. Agricultural programmes.	Cordaid, International Conservation Union of Netherlands, Fian (Germany), Friends of the Earth, International Union of Nature Conservation, Rides Foundation, Mangrove Action Plan (USA).	SPDC, NLNG, Rivers State Government
LAPO Development Foundation	Socio-economic empowerment, Health care support, Governance issues	Micro-credit projects, project executions, health programmes	World Bank, EU MPP6, Ford Foundation, Oxfam Novib, Cordaid, EED (Germany), Development and Peace (Canada).	State governments,
Community Partners for Development	Poverty eradication/economic empowerment, Health care, Humanitarian assistance, community development	Community Development Projects, Relief for Displaced persons, Malaria/HIV AIDS/STIs programmes	EU, Actionaid, World Bank, Global Rights, UNIFEM, UNDEV, OSIWA,	State governments, Exxon- Mobil. National Commission for Refugees.
African Network for Environment and Economic Justice	Poverty alleviation/economic empowerment, Revenue transparency and budget monitoring	Public eye on oil revenue, Publish what you pay campaign, Budget monitoring and Transparency Network	Envoys/ Embassies	Other CSO/NGOs
Community Development Partners	Capacity building of NGO/CBOs, Economic empowerment	Needs assessments, community	-	TNOCs, NLNG, CBOs

		development projects, Youth skills development		
Kebetkache Women Development and Resource Centre	Sensitization Programmes on Health care, Peace programmes, economic empowerment.	Mothers Waging Peace programme, Economic empowerment programmes for vulnerable groups/widows	Actionaid	NGO/CBOs
Institute for Human Rights and Humanitarian Law	Research/documentation, Legal services/access to justice, Economic empowerment, governance, democracy and human rights etc	Councillors for Peace programme, para-legal rights groups in communities.	Oxfam GB, DFID, TMG, British Council, MacArthur Foundation, National Endowment for Democracy	NGO/CBOs
Niger Delta Citizens and Budget Platform	Participation and dialogue in governance, Promoting transparency and accountability in governance	Training of community activists on budget execution and control, Town hall meetings	Revenue Watch, DFID, USAID, National Democratic Institute	Other NGO/CBOs
Women Health and Economic Development Association	Economic empowerment, women empowerment, Health care sensitization/awareness.	Baseline studies, health care awareness/support campaigns, Women empowerment programmes, micro credit schemes	Global Funds, Ford Foundation, EZE (Germany)	State governments, TNOCs, other NGO/CBOs

Source: Fieldwork 2009

Case Analysis 2 Government and Civil Society Partnership in the Nigeria Extractive Industries Transparency Initiatives (NEITI)

NEITI emerged from Extractive Industries Transparency International Initiatives, an international effort to ensure accountability, transparency and openness in the extractive industries sector, particularly in the payments of extractive industry companies and the revenues received and reported by governments.

NEITI is an autonomous self accounting body, with a mandate to monitor and ensure due process, accountability and transparency in the payments, receipts, and posting of oil companies to the federal government, the application of oil revenues by government, and oil and gas investments. NEITI monitors, audits, evaluates and disseminates its work through reports. NEITI is managed by a National Stakeholders Working Group (NSWG), which is constituted by the president. The NSWG has one representative each from civil society and labour unions in the extractive industry. The act was promulgated in 2007.

NEITI has produced the 1994-2004, and 2005 Oil and Gas audit reports. The reports have identified huge problems in the management of the Oil and Gas sector such as discrepancies in the information and figures of oil companies and government agencies (CISLAC, 2010). NEITI has been uncovering malfeasances perpetrated by oil companies and recommending remedial measures (Joab-Peterside, Bassey & Goyo, 2010:7).

NEITI requires active CSO participation in the design, monitoring and evaluation of the process, particularly in the areas of stirring public interests and understanding, public discourse, awareness, participation, and public oversight and scrutiny. Civil Society organizations have also been involved in conducting validation workshops on the reports and assessment of the reports. Notable

national CSOs involved have been among others, the Centre for Advanced Social Studies, Civil Society Legislative Advocacy and Public What You Pay (Nigeria).

5:7 CHALLENGES TO STATE-CIVIL SOCIETY PARTNERSHIP

The major challenges to partnership are the character of the state and the weaknesses of civil society.

The Nigerian state has tended to operate as a closed system with little access to the public. Bureaucrats and state officials have tended to operate as masters with an arrogant, condescending and tutelage attitude. Representatives and state officials are disconnected from the citizens. There is a tendency for unilateral actions, dictation and command rather than consultation. State officials tend to be authoritarian, absolutist, suppressive and operate as imperial majesties. There is little room for consultation and debates. Dialogue is seen as weakness. Criticism, dissenting opinion and opposition are resisted and suppressed. State officials would not subject themselves to any oversight and public scrutiny. There is the tendency to concentrate and centralize powers rather than disperse, decentralize and even delegate.

Governments are slow in processing, responding and acting in partnership situations. Often times, governments delay or even default in counterpart funding. Where funds pass through governments or governments give out funds, the recipients are often some

obscure NGOs. Governments are also suspicious of partnerships because they are afraid that the CSOs, international organizations and business organization partners would know too much, probe too much or expose their weaknesses.

These characteristics do not tolerate and accommodate the non state sector and CSO partnerships.

Civil society is also plagued with numerous weaknesses that have to be addressed if they are to participate as effective partners. To summarize our earlier submission on this, These include among others identified earlier, poor internal democracy; narrow agenda and external dictation; fragmentation, proliferation, internal struggles and divisions; lack of stable constituencies; middle class and elite domination; skills and capacity deficits; absence of strong organizational infrastructure; poor accountability and transparency; emerging self and business interests and profit making tendencies; poor knowledge of governments and governmental workings, and the poor tradition of working with governments and corporate organizations.

The tendency for economic gains and profit, and to operate as corporate business entities weakens the sector. Where CSOs become alternative businesses and consultancies carrying out the contracts of international organizations, there cannot be maximum benefits to citizens served, which ultimately would weaken legitimacy. The nature of relations with international NGOs, international organizations and development agencies which currently dictate agenda, focus and action paths cannot enable strong partnerships.

Partnership could possibly threaten the independence of the CSOs, and their neutrality in certain sectors. It could also divert them from their goals and missions, and even weaken their accountability to members and society. In fact partnership could transfer accountability and loyalty of CSOs from members and society to governments. Thus the path of partnership has to be tread cautiously such that CSOs do not lose themselves; identity, autonomy and social accountability.

At the general level, the environment of insecurity, violent conflicts, identity conflicts, economic crisis, deepening poverty and growing discontent, is not conducive for CSO activities, and state-CS partnership. For one thing, these conditions create a certain preoccupation of the state with security and a tendency towards excesses and abuses.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

6:1 CONCLUSION

The challenge of sustainable development-continuous and sustained growth in livelihoods, incomes, welfare, socio-economic development, society and environment, remains immense as poverty, low human development, inadequate and deteriorating infrastructure and social services, and economic and socio-political crises are extensive.

Though the state emerged early as a dominant social force, intensely hegemonical, comprehensively intrusive and dominant in the development process, it's weaknesses indicated quite early the need of a space for the non-state sector. The growing crises of the state, governance and development since the 1980s clearly paved the way for significant roles and interventions of the non-state sector. More significantly, the failure of governments in the socio-economic and social service sectors have led to pressures and efforts for integrating private business and CSOs into the provision and delivery of critical services. These pressures have manifested in the public private partnerships (PPP) and partnership arrangements with CSOs.

The Nigerian State has not proven to significantly drive sustainable development alone. In fact, one of the major weaknesses of Nigerian governments and indeed African governments has been the inability to substantially mobilize citizens, groups and business for sustainable development. What has been lacking in our development lexicon, methods and agenda has been participative development.

Governance is well beyond governments and the non state sector could play more critical roles, if its creativity, capacity, experience and energy are mobilized. Similarly, the arduous task of development requires the joint efforts of individuals, business, governments and CSO. Particularly critical to the development and socio-economic progress of developing countries, is partnerships that can be forged between state and civil society, state and business, business and civil society, and state, business and civil society, international organizations, state and civil society, international organizations, business and civil society, and international organizations and civil society. Partnership then is perhaps the innovative way of rethinking governance and development against the backdrop of prevailing crises of the state, governance and development.

Since the late 1980s, there has been a groundswell of recognition and support for a flowering civil society in development discourse, agenda and practice. Driven by international organizations, development and donor agencies, state engagements with civil

society and the opening up of spaces for CSOs in socio-economic development became a condition for international support and recognition since the late 1990s. Civil society has in response proliferated and has emerged as an important force in socio-economic development.

The study examined the prospects, utility, sectors of activity, challenges and practice of state-civil society partnerships in Nigeria. It has identified state weaknesses that warrant the reach out to non-state actors, the advantages that civil society can bring into sustainable development practice and the advantages that emerges from partnership efforts. The work demonstrated the utility of partnerships through certain existing cases.

It is clear from the analysis that state and civil society partnerships are extremely few and strong working partnerships are fewer. What currently exists relate mainly to funding assistance, moral support and collaborative arrangements in the areas of social services, humanitarian assistance, human capital development, poverty alleviation and economic empowerment, micro-credit, health care, planning activities and conservation programmes. Some of the existing partnerships have been warranted by the conditions required by international organizations, and bilateral, donor and development agencies relating to government consultation with CSOs as stakeholders and collaborations between governments and CSOs in project implementation. CSOs that are funded by international organizations have tended to win better support from governments. The more extensive partnerships have been between international organizations and CSOs, and business and CSOs.

The CS formation in Nigeria, though weak in several respects, is fairly vibrant, active and engaging. It holds out great promise if properly mobilized, oriented, and strengthened to make contributions to Nigeria's socio-economic progress and sustainable development. As the nation seeks participative governance, people oriented and sustainable development, the CS formation is strategically located by its work, experience, connections and orientation to make contributions.

It was identified that CSOs are associated with humanitarian philosophy and sacrifice, more commitment and attachment to the cause and vision of sustainable development, lower costs, more efficiency, less bureaucracy and less routine in operations, more adaptive and flexible management, neutral attitudes and grass-root location. Further, CSO are more considerate to human rights and governance values, and tend to possess more participatory content, and contacts and linkages with the citizenry and beneficiaries. These place CSOs at advantage in working with the people, managing pro-people and pro-poor programmes and programmes for the vulnerable, weak and disadvantaged groups.

The study recommends the construction and strengthening of partnerships through structured arrangements in different sectors. Partnership requires certain changes in attitudes, orientations and structuring by both the state and civil society. Civil society would need to address current weaknesses and strengthen its capacity to formidably participate in partnerships with the state. The state on the other hand would need to provide the enabling conditions for partnership.

6:2 POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRENGTHENING STATE-CIVIL SOCIETY PARTNERSHIPS

Both the state and civil society need to recognize the others roles, obligations and responsibilities. Government has primary responsibility for governance and the formulation and implementation of public policy. The CSOs have responsibility to scrutinize the works of government, make inputs and advocate change, alternatives, remedies and progress. Governments need the local and peculiar expertise and knowledge of the CSOs just as the CSOs need the openness, accommodation, access, recognition and support of the state. Thus both governments and the CS formation have their mandates, constituencies, values, goals, roles, responsibilities and obligations.

The Roles of Governments

It is the responsibility of government to mobilize citizens and resources for development. The mobilization of the non state sector's energy, resources and efforts for development is crucial. Partnership with the CSO sector is in fact, a crucial aspect of government mobilization for development.

The linkages and communication between governments and CSOs and indeed the citizenry need to be strengthened. Government should encourage CSO activities and provide space and autonomy for their actions. Government has to be open in the processes of policy making and implementation, programming, monitoring, impact assessments and expenditures. Governments need to strengthen openness and accountability to citizens and CSOs, so that the later can key in terms of input, debates and scrutiny. The rules, operating procedures and operations of public programmes have to be made known. The Public Information Act has to be effectively implemented so that information and data is available on government operations and activities. Governments have to accept constructive engagement, show understanding, build tolerance and accommodation and raise the level of communication.

Governments may have to create conducive conditions that encourages more participation of the CSOs in the governance and development process. Governments have reach out to CSOs for understanding or even agreements on the methods and platforms for partnership or joint actions between it and CSOs. CSOs have to be accommodated in public policy

formulation, implementation and performance management. This is critical for bringing in, the sector's capacity and skills particularly in pro poor and pro-people policies.

With the record of failure in government social service delivery and sustainable development programmes (SDP), it is imperative that governments seek the support, collaboration and input of the CSO sector. There are areas such as orphanages, old peoples' homes and welfare homes which are clearly failing and in decay. Government may need to consider collaborative arrangements with CSOs, particularly in the areas of emergency relief, support for displaced persons, and vulnerable groups, poverty alleviation, economic empowerment, micro-credit financing and management, social work, information dissemination, awareness campaigns, health care sensitization and enlightenment programmes, skills development and business development.

Governments should solicit the support and complementary participation of the support and business in sustainable development. The roles currently played by several NGOs and foundations, in assisting schools, hospitals, prisons and other state services with funds, equipment, welfare and related support should be encouraged. Governments should not just solicit but commend and institute measures that encourage non state support for public sector services and facilities.

Governments need to bring the CSO sector more into its conflict management and peace building projects. CSOs being more grass-root, people oriented and passionate about special concerns, are required as neutral parties to build confidence and communication among conflict actors. CSOs need to be deployed by government in the resolution of conflicts and conflict resolution, particularly in mediation, securing hostages and protecting the vulnerable. Governments need to empower CSOs for sustainable development programme (SDP) roles. Several CSOs have with self help efforts made contributions to sustainable development. CSO SDP projects should be supported by governments. The capacity of CSO to contribute to SDP needs to be strengthened by governments through patronage and sponsorship for trainings.

Certain patterns of state support can be recommended. These include financial support and counterpart funding arrangements to CSOs engaged in service provisions, humanitarian assistance, economic empowerment and business development, government financing of certain CSO activities that are of interest to its SDP programming, and material and administrative support to CSOs involved in enlightenment, awareness and sensitization programmes. Governments may need to support CSOs by providing equipment and related support or by complementing CSO programmes such as employment, equipment and funds for products of CSO economic

empowerment, skills development and business development programmes. Governments may have to consider the award of contracts to NGOs in the areas of specialized services, planning and development based data, assessments and reports, monitoring and evaluation and consultancies. Such contracting would be cheaper as NGOs are non profit and have good potentials for integrity.

There is need for actions that strengthen the CSOs in the areas of stringent but speedy registration, encouragement of internal democracy within CSOs and associational pluralism among groups. Governments can provide laws, rules and regulations that can strengthen the internal workings, accountability, transparency, competition, influence peddling, operations and funds management. In some ways, the government has to introduce some rules and regulations that could curtail existing excesses and ensure better representation and accountability. Such laws should also protect CSOs, prevent their abuse by state agencies and create an enabling environment for CSOs.

The Roles of Civil Society Organizations

The CSOs would have to adopt a complementing, collaborative and cooperative attitude to government. While autonomy is desirable, there is need for more constructive relations that are malleable and contingent on the joint desires for good governance and development. The perception that the distance of CSOs from the government is necessary for their autonomy and

integrity, has informed the tendency to regard those dealing with governments and corporate bodies particularly the international oil companies as having sold out or betrayed the CS formation. It is true that CSOs dealing with the state and corporate organizations contain the risks of cooptation, compromises and dilution of activities, activism and goals. The CSOs with such dealings must be cautious enough to maintain autonomy and integrity.

Civil society needs to move more aggressively in seeking involvement in government sustainable development programmes. CSOs have to mainstream SDPs as central to their agenda, programming and activities, and acquire expertise, data and experience such that their input are sought in SDP designs and implementation.

CSOs have to be better acquainted with the workings, operations and activities of government and SDPs. They have to be abreast with the dominant attitudes, behaviours, dispositions and challenges of state officials in the planning and management of public programmes. Furthermore, CSOs need to build contacts and liaison with ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs) in their areas of work.

The CSO sector needs to build legitimacy by enthroning greater accountability, transparency and openness. CSOs should be made to conform to national and international accounting reporting standards and should be made to declare their annual accounts and audit reports and publish

same. Members and supporting groups and communities should hold officials accountable for funds management and be more active in regulatory and approval functions.

The representativeness of CSOs has to be strengthened. Leadership should be broadened beyond a few members of the Boards of Trustees and officials. Membership has to be broadened to include diverse socio-economic groups and geographical areas. In fact, the CSOs have to shift from an elite to a more broad and popular base. The representation of the rural areas and semi-urban areas has to be strengthened, just as an improved gender distribution of the overall leadership and membership of the CSOs. Broadened leadership and membership would strengthen representation of society's diverse interests and the social movement dimension of the CS formation. Besides representation, the CSOs need to be better rooted in their core constituencies. This implies that rather than sitting atop specified constituencies, the constituencies should be actively and adequately represented in the leadership, membership and work of the CSOs.

The capacity of the CSOs in supporting the development and governance process has to be strengthened. The complexities and intricacies of contemporary development challenges require greater manpower and organizational abilities, knowledge and capacity than many CSOs have. There is need for greater capacity in research,

data gathering, information, communication, monitoring, advocacy and mobilization skills. The CSOs would have to effectively disseminate results, reports and findings of their researches, investigations, activities and projects to governments and the citizenry.

The CSO sector may need some self regulation, oversight and self cleansing through ad hoc agencies set up by concerts and networks within relevant sectors. There is need to weed out self interested, profiteering, corrupt and non altruistic persons and organizations that masquerade as CSOs. This is necessary to build a sector whose integrity, legitimacy, accountability and management attracts confidence and support. The proliferation of NGOs often warranted by selfish motives, need to give way for the consolidation of CSOs, who are able to operate at state, regional and national levels and that emerge as strong and stable organizations that are effective in partnering with the state, business and the international community in building sustainable development.

REFERENCES

Abutudu, M.I.M. (1995), The State, Civil Society and the Democratization Process in Nigeria. Dakar: CODESRIA.

Adejumobi, S. (2001) The Civil Society in Conflict Management and Peace

Building in Africa. *Development Policy Management Bulletin*. July 2001

Ake, C. (1996), Is Africa Democratizing? Port Harcourt: Centre for Advanced Social Science, Monogragh No. 5.

Akinyele, I.O. (1995) Nigerian NGOs: Working Together for Effective National Development. Paper presented at Pre-Launch Workshop of the Nigerian Consultative Forum. Cited in James (2003) op cit.

Aiyede R. E. (2003), The Dynamics of Civil Society and the Democratization Process in Nigeria, *Canadian Journal of African Studies*, 39 (1).

Azarya, V. (1992), Civil Society and Disengagement in Africa, In J. Harbeson, D. Rothchild & N. Chazan (eds) *Civil Society and the State in Africa*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Bayart, J.F. (1986), Civil Society in Africa, in Chabal, P. (ed) *Political Domination in Africa: Reflections on the Limits of Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Benhard, M. (1993), Civil Society and Democratic Transition in Eastern Europe. *Political Science Quarterly*, 108 (2).

Bratton, M. (1992), Civil Society and Political Transitions in Africa, In J.Harbeson, D. Rothchild & N. Chazan (eds) *Civil Society and the State in Africa*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Centre for Population and Environmental Development (n.d) Corporate Profile

Chabal, P. (1998), A Few Considerations on Democracy in Africa. *International Affairs,* 74 (2).

Chukwuma Innocent (2005), "Government-Civil Society Partnership in Nigeria: Problems and Prospects." *Presented at Special Retreat on Government-Civil Society Partnership,* Kaduna, September 12-15.

Community Partners for Development (2008), CDP News-Partnership for Sustainable Development, Uyo.

Cox, R.W. (1999), Civil Society at the Turn of the Millennium: Prospects for an Alternative World Order. *Review of International Studies*, 25 (3).

Diamond, L. (1997),Prospects for Democratic Development in Africa. Presented at the Democratic Governance Project, Dept. of Political and Administrative Studies, University of Zimbabwe, Harare.

Ekeh, P.P. (1994), Historical and Cross-Cultural Contexts of Civil Society in Africa, *Presented at USAID Workshop on Civil Society, Democracy and Development in* Africa, Washington D.C. June.

Ekeh, P. (1998), Civil Society and the Construction of Freedom in African History, In Onwudiwe (ed) *African*

Perspectives on Civil Society, New York: Tri-Atlantic Books.

Fatton, R. Jr. C. (1995), "Africa in the Age of Democratization: The Civic Limitations of Civil Society," *African Studies Review* 38 (2)

Fatton, R. (1999), Civil Society Revisited: Africa in the Millennium. *West Africa Review* 1 (1).

Gellner, E. (1995) The Importance of Being Modular, In John Hall (ed) *Civil Society: Theory, History, Comparison.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giner S. (1995), "Civil Society and Its Future" in John A. Hall (ed.) *Civil Society: Theory, History and Comparison,* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Ghaus-Pasha A. (2004), Role of Civil Society Organizations in Governance," *Presented at 6th Global Forum on Reinventing Government Towards Participatory and Transparent Governance,* Seoul, 24-27, May.

Grindle, M.S. (1996), Challenging the State: Crisis and Innovation in Latin America and Africa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, A. J. (1995), In Search of Civil Society in John A. Hall (ed.) *Civil Society: Theory, History and Comparison*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Harbeson, J.W.(1992), Civil Society and the Study of African Politics: A Prelimnary Assessment. In J. Harbeson,

D. Rothchild & N.Chazan (eds) *Civil Society and the State in Africa.* Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

James, I. (2003) Organizing Civil Society for Ethnic Conflict Management in Nigeria, in T.A. Imobighe (ed) *Civil Society and Ethnic Conflict Management in Nigeria.* Ibadan: Spectrum.

Idemudia, U. (2007) Corporate Partnerships and Community Development in the Nigerian Oil Industry: Strengths and Limitations. *United Nations Research Institute for Social Development: Markets, Business and Regulation Programme Paper Number 2,* March.

Ikelegbe, A.O. (2001a), The Perverse Manifestation of Civil Society: Evidence from Nigeria. *Journal of Modern African Studies*, Cambridge University Press. 39(1), 1-24.

Ikelegbe, A.O. (2001b), Civil Society, Oil and Conflict in Nigeria: Ramifications of Civil Society for a Regional Resource Struggle. *The Journal of Modern African Studies,* Cambridge University Press, 39(3). Pp 437 – 469.

Ikelegbe, A.O. (2003), Civil Society and Alternative Approaches to Conflict Management, In T.A. Imobighe (ed) *Civil Society and Ethnic Conflict Management in Nigeria.* Ibadan: Spectrum.

Ikelegbe, A.O. (2005), Engendering Civil Society: Oil, Women Groups and

the Resource Conflict in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. *Journal of Modern African Studies,* 43 (2) 241-270.

Ikelegbe, A.O.(2005), Encounters of Insurgent Youth Associations With the State in the Oil Rich Niger Delta Region of Nigeria *Journal of Third World Studies,* Vol XXII, No 1, Pp 151-181. Spring.

Ikelegbe, A.O. (2007),Civil Society and Democratic Consolidation in Africa: Issues, Problems and Prospects. *Nigerian Journal of Policy and Development,* 6.

Ikelegbe, A.O. (2009), Study Report on Special Oxfam Novib Intervention Strategy for the Niger Delta Region, Nigeria. Oxfam Novib 2009.

Ikelegbe, A.O. & Opukri, C. (2010), Managing Violent Conflicts over Marginality from Below; The Role of Non-State Actors in the Management of the Niger Delta Conflicts in Nigeria. Presented at *International Conference on Territorial Origins of African Civil Conflicts,* at University of Kwazulu Natal, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa, 29-30 January

Ikelegbe, A.O. (2010), Armed Non State Entities and the Crises of the State and Governance in Africa. In W. Okumu & A. Ikelegbe (Eds) (2010) *Militias, Rebels and Islamist Militants: Human Insecurity and State Crises in Africa.* Pretoria: Institute of Security Studies.

Ikelegbe, A.O. & Opukri. C. (2011), Confronting the Development Challenge in Conflict Regions: The Role of the Non State Sector in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria, in F. Okafor (ed) *Critical Issues on Nigeria's Development: Environment, Economy and Social Justice; Essays in Honour of Professor Emeritus Andrew G. Onokerhoraye,* Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited, pp 425-463

Ikelegbe, A.O. (2012), The Civil Challenge: A Profile of Civil Society in the Resource Control Struggles in the Niger Delta. *Affrika: Journal of Politics, Economics and Society*, University of Kwazulu Natal**.**

Kwakwa, V. A., A., Monsley P. & Owusu-Gyanfi M. (2008), "Binding Constraints to Growth in Nigeria," in Collier, P., Soludo, C., and Pattilb, C. (eds.), *Economic Policy Options for a Prosperous Nigeria*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Keane, J. (1988), Introduction, In J. Keane (ed) *Civil Society and the State: New European Perspectives.* London: Verso

Kew D. (2004), "Nigerian Civil Society in the 1990s; Democratic Political Structures and Political Cultures," *Working Paper, Programme on Ethnic and Federal Studies* (PEFS), Ibadan.

LAPO Development Foundation (2006), 2006 Annual Report. Benin City

LAPO Development Foundation (2007), 2007 Annual Report. Benin City

Lee J. (2007), Civil Society in Nigeria: An Overview, Geneva: Centre for Applied Studies in International (CASIN) Negotiations; Programme on NGOs and Civil Society.

Lemarchand, R, (1992), Uncivil States and Civil Societies: How illusion Became Reality. *Journal of Modern African Studies,* 30 (2).

Makumbe, J.(1998), Is there a Civil Society in Africa. *International Affairs*, 74 (2).

Miller F.D.J. (2002), "Natural Law, Civil Society and Government," in Rosenblum Nancy L. & Robert C. Post (eds.), *Civil Society and Government*, Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press.

M'boge, F. & Sam. Gbaydee Doe (2004), "African Commitments to Civil Society Engagement: A Review of Eight NEPAD Countries," *African Human Security Initiative* Paper 6, August.

Natufe, I.(2001) The Problematic of Sustainable Development and Corporate Social Responsibility: A Policy Implications for the Niger Delta. Presented at the *Second Annual Conference and General Meeting of Urhobo Historical Society*, Denvile, New Jersey, Nov. 2-4th.

Narsoo, M. (1991), Civil Society: A Contest Terrain. *Work in Progress* 76.

Okpanachu E. (2009), "Building Peace in a Divided Society: The Role of Civil Society in Muslim-Christian Relations in Nigeria," *Presented at SHUR International Conference on Human Rights in Conflict; The Role of Civil Society,* LUISS University, Rome, June 4-6.

Olukoshi, A.(1998), Economic Crisis, Multipartyism and Opposition Politics in Contemporary Africa. In Adebayo Olukoshi (ed) *The Politics of Opposition in Contemporary Africa*. Uppsala: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet

Osaghae, E.E. (2007), Fragile States. *Development in Practice*, 17(4-5)

Paffenholz T. (2009), Civil Society and Peace Building. Geneva: Centre on Conflict, Development and Peace Building (CCDP) *Working Paper*.

Paffenholz T. & Spurk, C. (2006), Civil Society, Civic Engagemnet and Peace Building, *Social Development Papers, Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction*, No. 36, October, The World Bank, Washington.

Paterson, A.S. (1998), A Reappraisal of Democracy in Civil Society: Evidence from Rural Senegal. *Journal of Modern African Studies* 36, (2).

Pro-Natural International, Nigeria (2007), Annual Report 2007

ThisDay(2009), Nigeria: Over 46,000 NGOs Registered in Nigeria," 29/09/09) September, 29,http://allafrica.com/stories/200909240191.html, accessed 13/08/12.

UNDP (2007), Human Development Report 2007/2008

USAID (2004), Nigeria Civil Society Assessment, March
Vickers M. (2006), Review of Civil Society and Ethnic Conflict Management in Nigeria, *African Studies Review* 49 (1).

Women's Health and Economic Development Association (1999), WHEDA Breast and Cervical Cancer Alert. Uyo.

World Bank (2003), Enabling Environments for Civic Engagement in PRSP Countries, Washington

World Bank (2003), Enabling Environments for Civic Engagement in PRSP Countries, Washington.

Young, C.(1992), In Search of Civil Society, In In J. Harbeson, D. Rothchild & N.Chazan (eds) *Civil Society and the State in Africa*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.