



RESEARCH ARTICLE **Section:** *Political Theory & Democratic Studies*

Godfatherism, Democracy and Reflective Defensibilism

William Idowu

Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria

Email: idwilly2017@gmail.com

African Journal In Advanced Arts And Humanities

Volume 4, Issue 2, 2026

ISSN: 3005-4540 (Online)

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: 23 February 2026

Accepted: 22 April 2026

Published: 07 My 2026

HOW TO CITE

Idowu, W. (2026).

Godfatherism, Democracy And Reflective Defensibilism. *African Journal of Advanced Arts and Humanities*, 4(2).

Retrieved from <https://journals.evonexpublishers.com/index.php/AJAAH/article/view/74>

Abstract

The connection between Godfatherism and Democracy continues to generate heated debate and conversations in political theory, science, and philosophy. There are the schools of the "Indefensibilists" and "Defensibilists." The basic objective of this paper is the defence of the contention that Godfatherism is needed to promote sustainable democracy when and where Godfatherism exhibits and exudes certain varieties in a democratic order like Nigeria. The methodology adopted consists of critical exposition and argumentation. The findings of the paper are (1) godfatherism remains a significant aspect of any democracy; (2) theoretical and practical arguments against the necessity of godfatherism in a democracy derive from negative perceptions about the utility of godfatherism; (3) however, there are ways and manners in which the necessity of godfatherism to a democratic dispensation, like the Nigerian case, can be defended; (4) the defensibility of godfatherism to the democratic experiment in Nigeria derives from the benefit and advantage provided by the practice and culture of reflectivity; (5) any defensible position inheres in the advantage that the philosophical temperaments provide in the understanding of the politics and practice of democracy and godfatherism. The paper concluded that as long as godfatherism manifests defensible traits in a country like Nigeria, sustainable democracy can be promoted.

Keywords: Keywords: Godfatherism, Democracy, Defensibilism, Reflectivity, Nigeria.



Published in Nairobi by Evonex Global, an imprint of Evonex Publishers Limited

© 2026 The Author(s). This is an open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1. Introduction

It is an admissible fact that if a practice, policy, and program of action and performance are considered defensible or accepted properly as worth defending, necessarily, it could and does mean that such a practice and its defensibility, are product, outcomes and aftermaths of reflectivity and serious thinking because no defensibility exists without or outside reflectivity. Thus, defensibility derives and draws its life from the scientificity, theoreticity, and ideationality from what is inherent in reflectivity. The science of reflectivity is philosophy; the basis of defensibility is philosophy. Thus, philosophy is the foundation of the conceptual reality encoded, embedded, and encapsulated in reflective defensibilism.

In this paper, I wish to engage the concept of reflective defensibilism in relation to two basic orientations in Africa that are considered real and realistic in their own right and which are argued to be connected by political scientists and philosophers. A quantum of these see godfatherism and democracy as necessarily connected, while some see the connection as a contingent one. Again, within the context of democracy in Africa, some scholars see godfatherism as a negative reality, indefensible, and an orientation that ought to be discouraged outright. On the other hand, few scholars have a modicum of hope in Godfatherism as far as sustaining democracy is concerned. The formal school can be tagged as “Indefensibilist” while the latter can be regarded as “Defensibilist”.

In this paper, I wish to take up the defensibilist position by submitting that there are instances and varieties of the practice of Godfatherism that do not pose any threat or dangerous dimension to the consolidation of democracy anywhere democracy is practiced. To give this study empirical direction, I am compelled to focus on the experimentation with democracy in Nigeria. The thesis I wish to pursue is that even if it is agreed that Godfatherism sounds antithetical and inimical to sustainable democracy in Nigeria, there are examples of Godfatherism that can be reflectively defended. To execute this objective, the paper shall adopt the following routine: what is democracy itself? Does democracy accommodate godfatherism? Is democracy not paradoxical in nature? What is Godfatherism? What are the instances of godfatherism that are defensible as far as democracy is concerned in Nigeria?

Nigeria’s attendance at democratic stability, survival and sustenance, support and significance, is at a crossroads. Once singular but most important item, causative agency, concerning this crossroads is the reality of godfatherism. Godfatherism in Nigeria is so authentic, authoritative, and audacious in our democracy journey, in our journey toward democratic consolidation. Godfatherism is not only acceptably wired into Nigeria’s democratic fabric but also has become adventurous, articulate, and awesome in its impart, influence, and implications as far as the democratic experiment is concerned.

There are sketches, sites, and sports of the imprints of godfatherism in Nigerian democratic parties in the ongoing Fourth Republic. Evidently, this reality showcases how serious this feat can be as far as Nigeria’s democratic aims and objectives can be. Sometimes, however, what is practiced in the name of godfatherism legitimizes the concern and conclusion that an atmosphere of unseriousness prevails with respect to Nigeria’s bid, decisions, and desires to have a progressive democratic experience.

By way of interpretation, three positions with likelihood of equal cogency are discernible. One are those who support godfatherism; two are those who oppose godfatherism; three is the camp of those who are indifferent about godfatherism in Nigeria’s political actuality; four is the class of those who constate that while godfatherism suggests a tendency towards trouble, nurture in the nitty-gritty of negativity, movement into moments of madness and manners and mien in minus, orientation in obduracy and obfuscation, and sway into sheer shamefulness, there are senses in which godfatherism can be articulated and analyzed as an acceptable aspect of democratic culture, practice, experience, and experiment.

My objective in this paper is to pursue and promote the thesis that democracy in Nigeria requires a reality of godfatherism, but, that, what is to be allowed are varieties of godfatherism that are defensible. The defensibility of godfatherism is premised on the reasoning that not all kinds of godfatherism are bad; as long as there is good godfatherism, such can be defended as affirmable to the democratic context, conviction, and challenge in Nigeria.

To put things in proper perspective, this paper proposes the following order: one, what is democracy and its decent demands? In other words, what is real, realistic, and respectable about democracy? Two, how should godfatherism be conceptualized? Three, if godfatherism has merit and positive possibilities, what are the possible arguments in its defense of sustainable democracy in Nigeria? Four is the conclusion of the study.

2. What is Real and Respectable About Democracy?

Why is democracy the most cherished, colorful, and celebrated system of government all over the human globe? It is because democracy is conceived as real and classified as the most respectful and respectable idea of governance when it comes to the reality and realization of citizenship rights. According to William Idowu (2024), the respectability that democracy has earned, overtime, inheres in some principles and practices that are considered lofty and laudable as far as organising human society is concerned. These principles and practices are: periodic elections; equality before the law; universal suffrage and franchise; the principle of constitutionalism; individual right, liberty and freedom; the rule of and by the law; the separation of powers, checks and balances; the independence of the judiciary; the rejection of dictatorial tendencies; the freedom of the press.

The sacredness and sanctity of democracy revolve around these salient items and special issues. It is no wonder that Ishaya & Jirapye (2023:51) state that “democracy is that form of political organization in which public opinion has control”. This understanding about democracy is important. In the first instance, democracy represents a variety of human government and organization. In the second instance, democracy relies, respectively, on public opinion. Thirdly, true democracy exists where there is control. In the fourth sense, true democracy is founded on citizenship, which exercises public control over the State and Government in a democracy.

Nevertheless, there are critical observations concerning the idea and principle of democracy. Justus Isaac (2025) raises some challenges as important details worthy of consideration if democracy is to be fully understood and worth consolidating. These are: the problem of illiteracy and poverty; the problem of the Potentiality of Demagogues acting as democrats; the problem of the tyranny of the majority; the problem of war or social crisis; the inability of democracy to solve all social and political problems. In another light, Godfrey Onah (2003) opined that whereas democracy is celebrated as a serious and significant system of government, the illusions accommodated within the idea of democracy make it encapsulated in plight and predicament that perplexes its positive possibilities. Larry Diamond (1990) persuasively presented the platform of democracy as a parade and paradigm that is pathetically paradoxical. What is more, William Idowu (2024) argued that democratic system of government leaves much to be desired in as much as many questions remain unanswered, affecting, as it were, its general prospect for sustenance, consolidation, and development.

From these critical observations, it is not an item in preposterous imagination nor an interest in patronising nonsense to contend that there are both the good and bad, beautiful and ugly, positive and negative dimensions to the democratic idea. One example of the possible paradoxes that democracy accommodates and which continues to have a reverberating influence on its pursuit and promotion is godfatherism. Is godfatherism one of the paradoxes of democracy? Does godfatherism contradict democratic principle, practice, and performance? If godfatherism contradicts democracy, could this be the basis for its outright rejection and indefensibility? Although, I wish to paint pictures and present plausible portraits of instances where godfatherism is defensible, reflectively, however, it is incumbent and important to comprehend what godfatherism is.

3. Godfatherism: Constructing a Viable Theory

Any theoretical paradigm is fundamentally connected with and functionally tied to issues, ideas, and imprint in sagacity and conceptuality. Both theory and concept are products and properties of pure political and philosophical thinking, political theorization and thought, their advancing adventure in political science. Political science is not bereft of political philosophy. All these disciplines show and share their critical insight concerning the nature, seriousness, and significance of politics. Simply stated, what these disciplines itemize as important is the involvement of critical thinking in understanding the basis, body, boundary, and bad side of politics.

Politics, like law, represents a fundamental consciousness and functional awareness that readily exists, in expressive manners and experiential moments, within human community and society. It is in this sense that critical thinking and logical reasoning, concerning any subject matter whose substance shares the need for seriousness and necessitates a share in significance, do not accommodate, nor do they regard and respect rhetorics. What is respected is the rule of rationality, whereby constructive meanings are gathered and generated as guidelines in the understanding of the subject matter under investigation. Contemporary politics in the African continent continue to be challenged and confronted by culture, politics, and practice of godfatherism. What is worrisome, in the analysis, expressive elucidatory exegesis, and descriptive studies, is the absence of a modicum of critical thinking, contemplative argumentation without compromising detail and data in empiricism. The question is if godfatherism has become a household name, entity, and reality in the politics of Africa, Nigeria inclusive, what does godfatherism mean?

Godfatherism remains one of the political realities, practices, and performances that ensure that political doors, openings, and opportunities, when they are available, are decided by choosing who gets what in the political arena and atmosphere. Ordinarily, Godfathers are men; they are not women. What kind of men are godfathers? Why are godfathers men? Are there godmothers at all? If there are, why are they not frequently spoken of and functionally seen, cited, and situated within the available socio-political space on system? These sets of questions add to thickness of the terrain, territory, and template within which constructions about godfatherism are to be actualized. So, if the ordinariness of construction about godfatherism is to be continued, it means that godfathers are men who have control, influence, and power to decide both who gets nominated to contest elections and who wins an election. Audu (2006:8) conceives Godfathers are people of questionable wealth and influences who robbed political parties of their conventional and legitimate functions of presenting clear and coherent programmes on the basis of which the candidates presented by them are chosen by the voters. This definition is creative enough but not sufficiently critical. Although the definition speaks about its worth and weight, it portrays and pictures godfatherism in absolute negativity. In fact, this definition utilizes the reality and phenomena of godfatherism in castigating human nature as endemically and excessively negative and problematic.

Akpan (2004) sees Godfathers as people that finance political parties' activities and individual electoral campaigns as actively throughout investment outlets to be recorded through frivolous and bloated government contracts, appointment of cronies into choice public offices, and other prebendal returns by the beneficiaries. Again, this construction is limiting; its conception of godfatherism is cast in negative, constructive terms and expressions. Its weight and worth are based on and dependent on public consciousness, not critical consciousness. In a similar sense with earlier constructions, Ibrahim (2006) sees Godfathers as individuals who have the ability to deliver the desired outcome in an electoral contest. Godfatherism, as an influence, does not seem to be tied around moment of election alone even when it is true that even democracy is not decent and sensible without elections. Within the temperament and taxonomy of expressive sagacity, expensive significance, and expedient seriousness, a godfather is he that dictates, by dint of determined deeds, decisive dexterity, and dutiful decorum, how the systematic order, structures, and sentiment about political realities, activities, and assignments are to be arranged, administered, conducted, and distributed for effective political purposes and social objectives.

This definition makes it possible to view a godfatherism syndrome, saga, and story from a balanced point of view and perspective that is not negative nor positive. Going by this construction, certain themes of interest can be itemized for wuloful (useful) consideration. In the first sense, a godfather is a "he", not a "she"; godfathers are men, not women. The implications of this terse, but, profound statement are far reaching, serious, and salient for the understanding of politics in the African setting, and, particularly, the Nigerian case and condition. In the second sense, godfatherism is about dictation. The dictation in question is not necessarily malignant, but could be, and, is indeed, benign. A godfather, being a dictator, could be conceived in the benevolent sense and not necessarily malevolent manipulator. Thirdly, if godfatherism is conceived the way it is above, then, it could mean that determine deed at possible variables and indices to consider in understanding the weight and worth of godfatherism. The deeds of a godfather are set within determined contexts that are conceived to be clear, distinct, and certain. Those determined deeds create and construct an image and identity of performance for such godfathers. As a matter of fact, it is both the "identity" and "performance" that makes a godfather to be qualified to be called a godfather. Indeed, it is a sagacious expression and a sensitively expensive postulation and proposition that is beyond contestation if it is submitted that the identity of a godfather, in the most thorough sense, is performance.

A godfather is a performer. In fact, if performance is excluded in the expressive estimation of godfatherism, this is nothing but a myopic attempt and mundane approach at constructing godfatherism from the weakest angle alone. Performance is key, crucial, and critical in having a robust and defensible comprehension of godfatherism. What qualifies a godfather as one is not on account of the capacity for dictation nor is it the competence for control and influence; rather, it is what that capacity does. What the dictating capacity does is what is meant by determined "deeds". Determined deeds represent a sense of merit and advantage in the overall assessment of godfatherism and the defensibilist dimension it draws on and derives through methodic reflectivity. Fourthly, godfatherism makes sense and glows by the quality of decisive acumen, skillfulness, and tactfulness. Those who are genuinely motivated to be godfathers are generally skillful in political contest, context, competition, and control. Simply stated, they are experts' in matters of political expedience, exchanges, experiences, and exercises. The assumption of the status, state, and setting of a godfather stem from this fundamental premise. What premise? It is the premise of being dexterous in the decisive sense that results in political gains, riches, rewards, and resources. Undoubtedly, godfathers are the deciders within the political enclave within which they are entrenched, enshrined, and established.

In this sense, it is obvious that no godfather is a demagogue; any deflection from the presence, essence, and sense of dexterous decisiveness, on the part of a so-called godfather, makes such nothing but a demagogue. Demagogues are essentially entrenched in political emptiness, absence of political expertism, their political monument is momentarily and meaninglessly maintained and mentioned in myopic momentum. Again, another decisive variable that suggests an appropriate understanding of godfatherism is what is tagged “dutiful decorum”. A godfather, in the proper sense, is a “dutifully decorous politician”. I beg to differ from existing notion, nuanced and nurtured in the literature on the politics of godfatherism, that all godfathers are criminals.

The latter part of this paper, where defensible instances and varieties shall be articulated concerning godfatherism, is designed disprove and debunk the pessimism and the aura of criminality cast around godfatherism and godfathers. There is a sense in which godfatherism is positive; godfatherism is not always a negative engagement. In the history of Nigeria, there have been godfathers, in the political sense, who were decently, decisively and dutifully decorous. Their visions and dreams about politics are ethically sound, strong, and serious. The legacy bequeathed by such is impressive, innovating and important imperatives. Such were men of decorum. The political behaviors, conduct, and characters of such godfathers represent pretty and plenty of good things to talk about. Such political characters create the impression that godfatherism is not a bad thing as it is often viewed and perceived.

In thematic terms, a godfather dictates how systematic order, structures, and sentiments of political realities, activities and assignments, are to be arranged, administered, conducted, and distributed for effective political purposes and social objectives. Given this, it is obvious that my brand of a godfather is a political goal-getter. This could sound more like advocacy and not critical thinking nor consequence of instantiated empiricism and practical physicalism. But, then, theory does produce practice; when theories are created, certain forms of practices are produced. Critical thinking does not exist in emptiness or in a vacuum; it is always creative. Effective political purposes and the realization of social objectives constitute the driving force behind the acts, attitudes, and attributes of realistic godfatherism and real godfathers.

The political context and atmosphere appear crucial and central to what a godfather does and does not do. Nevertheless, what is fundamental to the status of a godfather is what he does with orders, structures, and sentiments that are defined as constituting political realities, activities, and assignments. In this sense, the godfather is an assignment giver and distributor within the concept of effectiveness. Both efficiency and effectiveness within every polity are some of the important values that a godfather aspires to implement. Again, since efficiency and effectiveness represent political values and have a sacrosanct sense of seriousness for the polity, a godfather is worth his mettle in terms of how he allows the arrangement, administration, and distribution of political values of efficiency and effectiveness towards actualizing political purposes and social objectives. What is real is the reality that a godfather brings into the political scene, setting and stage. What is brought is nothing but turning political purposes and social objectives into political reality and socialization. Every political system is defined along the lines of certain political goals, targets, and objectives. Being a political actor in their own right, a godfather is a utility tool deployed by political parties to actualize both political and party goals.

One of the most likely objections to this constructive conception of who a godfather is and what godfatherism means is the view that this conception talks more of a charismatic and benevolent political leader rather than a godfather. Again, it could be objected that what has being articulated so far deflects from the normal practice and usual experience of Godfathers and Godfatherism in everyday politics in Nigeria. There is no doubt that the political space and system in Nigeria is rocked, ruled, and ravaged by the recrudescence of the politics of godfatherism. What the second objection is oblivious about is that, because a practice is common place and that a particular behavior is popular, doesn't make the practice or behavior the most rational and reasonable thing to do. If godfatherism is expressed in the most abnormal way, the abnormality or aberration, does not make it normal, correct, or the right thing to do. Second objection is a fallacious appeal to popular attitude. An attitude may be popular in society, but, the popularity does not make it logical, rational, or defensible. For example, the political space in Nigeria is ravaged by political corruption. Almost all politicians are given to corrupt practices. But, does this legalise or legitimate corruption? There is the bad as well as the good side of godfatherism for democracy to thrive in Nigeria. Bad godfatherism is indefensible; only good godfatherism will help democracy in Nigeria.

Concerning the first objection, where there is good godfatherism, there is good and charismatic leadership. The distinction between both is a very slim one. Linguistically, those who are godfathers, play the role of a god and a father together. This is crucial and critical. In like manner, a charismatic leader, in any nation, is like a godfather who watches over that nation. Normally and naturally, a charismatic leader serves as a godfather who watches over the home or country so that things do not degenerate, so that progress is enhanced. Progress, development, transformation, the promotion of the common good, and the pursuit of

welfarist concern, becomes the lot of such society. Democracy is empty in itself; it is the practitioners and political actors and actresses that makes practice wholesome and worthwhile. Good godfatherism represent that paradigm of performance and potency that every democratic order requires and deserves. One of the problems of democracy in Nigeria is the instantiation and exemplification of bad godfatherism. Good godfatherism is what is needed in the ongoing democratic experimentation in Nigeria. Godfatherism, when it is good, can be defended. What, then, is defensible godfatherism? This is the next item of interest worthy of intellectual iteration and reiteration.

4. Defensible Godfatherism and The Prospect of Democratic Sustenance in Nigeria

In recent times, the incursion and invasion of Godfatherism into the social-political atmosphere in African countries, especially Nigeria, is phenomenal. In fact, the influence that Godfatherism generates in the political atmosphere in Nigeria is becoming uncontrollable, unquestionable, and unwholesome. As a matter of fact, the popularity of this political orientation in Nigeria is gaining currency more than the culture of democracy. Indeed, Godfatherism has become an orientation that is more like or more than a political movement. A plethora of those who call themselves Democrats are beginning to have the feeling that being a Godfather is better than being a Democrat, if, indeed, they are truly so. In a lively sense, therefore, Godfatherism and democracy are transforming and translating themselves into some sort of sweet bird fellows. But, then, is it every form of godfatherism that the democratic experiment in Nigeria needs? Is it not possible to initiate new sets of ideas about the kind of godfatherism that Nigeria's democracy requires?

Undoubtedly, the literature on Godfatherism and democracy in Nigeria is legion and reflects a legendary landmark and legacy. Therefore, the contention is true if it is said that both Godfatherism and democracy are topical and thematic issues as far as politics in Nigeria is concerned. The timeliness of both political realities in Nigeria is refreshing, respectable, and recognizable. It could mean that nothing new can be said about Godfatherism and democracy in Nigeria. Again, it does mean that only negative pictures can be painted and portrayed about the connection between godfatherism and its regulating influence on democracy. For example, John Asogwa (2017) wrote on the politics of Godfatherism constating that this phenomenon represents an abysmal political orientation in Nigeria. Also, Edigin (2010) provided careful and conscious illuminations on the connection between godfatherism and political conflict.

Ordinarily, political conflict suggests the state of crises, which means that Godfatherism is a precursor to political crises. Nothing can be negative than this. From these perspectives, Godfatherism could be conceived as indefensible in the march towards sustainable democracy. In addition, Otite and Umukoro (2010) paraded a plethora of genuine concerns and gainful, concentrated analysis on the impact of godfatherism on the origin of money politics in Nigeria. It follows that Godfatherism cannot be divorced from money politics, such as vote buying, prebendal practices, corruption, and primordial political practices, which reduces democracy to a consequential course in calamity, catastrophe, and pandemonium. Similarly, Sunday Ameh et al. (2025) reflectively registered and successfully suggested an account concerning the influence of godfatherism in the political arrangement and activities in Nigeria.

Furthermore, William Idowu (2004) advanced a narrative concerning the connection between godfatherism, democracy, citizenship, within the socio-political context allowed in Nigeria. And, what is more, Adebisi (2022) captivated political scholarship by accounting for the serious nexus between godfatherism, political patronage, and the problem of corruption in Nigeria. If Godfatherism is associated with corruption, what argument do we need to supply sufficiently showing that Godfatherism is indefensible when it comes to democratic sustainability? Without any doubt, godfatherism possesses a powerful political economy as far as democratic governance in Nigeria is concerned. This constructive, contemplative connotation concerning godfatherism can be deciphered and distilled from the submissions of Oni and Joshua (2020).

What these studies expressively emphasize about godfatherism in Nigeria is the dictating and commanding impact that this socio-cultural and political practice carries and commands in the political ecology of Nigeria. This understanding about godfatherism accounts for why it is believed that democracy in Nigeria is endangered and threatened by the presence of Godfatherism. But my case with Godfatherism and democracy in Nigeria takes the position, perspective and perception, that assumes, advances and articulate the paradigm of reflective defensibilism. Indeed, there are instances where Godfatherism is defensible, depending on varieties of Godfatherism that are manifested; if followed and freely framed into functional forms, it is believed that democracy in such a context becomes a sustainable affair and consolidated in Nigeria's political and cultural scene and system. Previous studies have only demonstrated why aura of indefensibilism percolates Godfatherism and democracy in Nigeria. By dint of deep reflective deeds and demonstrative details, Godfatherism can be defended when and where it manifests the following examples.

This is why the title of this paper is: “Godfatherism, Democracy, and Reflective Defensibilism”. Any activity that pursues and promotes the status of defensibilism concerning any practice, policy, and performing orientation ought to necessarily proceed from, be the product of, and must have resulted from the process, procedure, and practice of reflection. I have reflectively pondered on godfatherism in Nigeria, and I consider godfatherism defensible with respect to democracy if it is instantiated and exemplified in ways to be discussed below. If godfatherism bears any of these traits, characters, and features, these are ways by which godfatherism seems important and seriously needed to makes sense of Nigeria's democratic ambitions and aspiration. Godfatherism, for one thing, is not and never demonic, nor is it a farce, a verdict and voice in Satanism. It is not every act and pact proceeding from humans that can be declared and disclosed as entailed in notoriety nor conceded as nefarious and nightmarish. There is a semblance of hope and height of health for Nigeria’s democracy, in the habit of godfatherism, when understood in its proper and appropriate senses.

Unarguably, there is no merit in the argument that banishes and places a denial on the significant seriousness of Godfatherism in any democratic setting or setup. However, what is worth defending concerning the connection between Godfatherism and democracy is the kind of Godfatherism to be defended. Henceforth, what appears below are the constituents of reflective defensibilism when and where it revolves around godfatherism and democracy in Nigeria. I shall now proceed to present and parade those paradigms of Godfatherism that are worth defending.

4.1. Progressive Godfatherism

Perspicaciously, the plan and purpose of every political system is progress, nothing more, nothing less. In like manner, the plan and purpose of godfatherism in every political system, is nothing short of progress. Progress reflects and reminisce the performing pedigree that godfatherism possesses and parades. If the paradigm of progress is central to every political system, this paradigm is critical to godfatherism as well. Progress is the statement, sentiment, and semantics embedded, encoded, and encapsulated in the true meaning of godfatherism – someone who acts like God as well as a father. God exudes paradigm of progress; in like manner, fathers are epitomes and embodiments of progress in and for the home.

Godfathers, in Nigeria’s politics, who are je gudu je ira (symbols of corruption), are, simply stated and defined, representations of linguistic and political aberrations. In the political sense, such godfathers reflect deflective contours and connotations concerning what true godfatherism is. Who can make a case against progressive godfatherism within a democratic setting like the present fourth republic in Nigeria? If a case is worth making against godfatherism in a democratic setting, such as the example in Nigeria, I could think that the variety of godfatherism that comes to mind is the regressive or retrogressive brand, not the progressive variety. Plainly and clearly, there is regressive Godfatherism and progressive Godfatherism. If Godfatherism has to be defended with respect to democracy in Nigeria, it is important to understand this basic distinction since such a distinction assists in framing and forming content of what is to be defended. No growing democracy requires the presence and existence of a regressive practice in the performing capacity of Godfatherism. It is important to look for the nuanced, nurtured as well as the nitty-gritty of what is substantially substantiated in a progressive mindset.

4.2. Welfarist Godfatherism

Welfarism is one of the most important, but, isolated items of interest inherent, ingrained, and interred in the political ecology, character, and culture of the advanced and developed countries in the world. Welfarism is that philosophical and political ideology that separates Third World countries from those designated as Advanced and Developed. Political leaders found in those developed communities are commonly captured as “welfarist”. Indeed, it is political welfarism, when and where implemented, that has contributed to democratic advancement and development. Godfatherism that orientate towards welfarism in Nigeria, in certain terms, is what is needed to advance and sustain democracy in Nigeria. Welfarist Godfatherism speaks of the necessity of welfarism. A Godfather is progressively minded and contributes greatly to democracy and developmental governance when such a Godfather harnesses the practice of Godfatherism towards actualizing welfarism. The welfare of the people ought to be the major main stay and practice of a Godfather.

4.3. Ideological Godfatherism

Ideological Godfatherism is different from revolutionary Godfatherism. It only states that for good governance to be promoted and pursued, there is the need for an ideology which is principled, rigid, and rightly and correctly conceived in order to ensure dividends, blessings, and goodness of a democratic order. When and where ideological godfatherism is in place, democracy is enhanced, and such an example of godfatherism is most defensible.

4.4 Radical Godfatherism

Radical Godfatherism refers to impeccable instantiations of a radical but positive approach in political behavior, social conduct, and cultural commitment in a given society where that which is radical is implemented in the bid to promote good governance. Indeed, the political landscape and social-terrain in Nigeria is in need of radical godfathers who are radically actuated by ideologies that promotes the common good. Democracy is pursuit of the common good; radical means are sometimes needed to promote the common good. If godfatherism is important for democracy to thrive, then the radical verities is suggested.

4.5. Utilitarian Godfatherism

Utilitarian godfatherism Speaks of the promotion, pursuit, and maximization of the greatest number of happiness and pleasure for the greatest number of people in a given political society. When this is in place, it is referred to as utilitarian Godfatherism. Democracy in Nigeria requires the expressive existence of this kind of Godfatherism. This is what is worth defending.

4.6. Conscientious Godfatherism

Conscientious godfatherism reflects the conscience of a nation. It mirrors the conscience of a nation. This brand of Godfatherism feeds this conscience with the truth that assists and promotes development of the nation along democratic lines. It is the ethical side, the moral standpoint that the nation utilizes, in ascending towards the pathway of fulfillment.

5. Constructive Godfatherism

Constructive godfatherism prioritizes constructive criticism that promote development in the pathway to nation building by suggesting sound policies, serious practices and significant processes for developmental reason. In this sense, a Godfather is a constructivist, re-constructivist as well as a de-constructivist.

5.1. Sagacious Godfatherism

Sagacious Godfatherism is that bank of wisdom, knowledge and understanding, that a nation relies on for the promotion and pursuit of ideas that enhance good governance and best democratic practices that are second to none. Wisdom, in this practical sense, is what dictates, determines, decides, and defines the course of action to be pursued, promoted, and put into practice. Obafemi Awolowo was an example of sagacious godfather that Nigeria's political history has ever produced. Undoubtedly, democracy in Nigeria got boosted, bettered, and blessed on account of the sagacious input, impacts, and influences of Obafemi Awolowo and the "philosophy of Awoism" that he brandished and bandied about in Nigeria's political matters.

5.2. Transformational Godfatherism

Transformational godfatherism is the initiation of the processes that leads to change and transformation in a nation. The transformational agenda is what forms the subject matter of the substance of pursuit. Democracy is synonymous with development. Development means transformation, growth, and change. Where godfatherism encourages and enhances these substantive details, in any political society, it is sure, serious, and significant. Democratic hopelessness is avoided; democratic fulfilment is enhanced and elevated, experienced, and expressed.

5.3. Political Godfatherism

Political godfatherism is the most memorable vehicle that initiates political wisdom and ideas that promote good governance and democratic stability. Growth in democracy consists in the application of political principles. Political godfatherism is what makes this a reality. Politics is nothing more, nothing less, and nothing else; there is a particular sense that goes with politics. Political maturity, experience, wisdom, knowledge, and understanding are requirements of politics. It is the business and basic duty of a political godfather to ensure, exalt, and enhance these expectations in a nation that is serious about political development and democracy.

5.4. Developmental Godfatherism

Developmental godfatherism is development oriented godfatherism. Development of the nation is what characterizes these brand of godfatherism. A godfather, in this sense, is a developer; development constitutes the heartbeats of his action and inaction. A godfather who promotes developmental agenda is a promoter of good governance and democracy.

5.5. Pragmatic Godfatherism

Pragmatism is an engagement in attitude and attribute that are patterned, processed, and practiced on the platform of workability, result oriented activities, functioning, and fulfilling ideas and ideals that have pragmatic effect. Indeed, a godfather is a pragmatist as far as democracy is concerned, as long as he has good governance to contribute to building a nation and the political society where he is domiciled. In this sense, it could mean that both democracy and pragmatism are sweet bird fellows; democracy is inseparable from pragmatism. Godfatherism makes sense, in a democracy, when it is practiced from the pragmatic point of view. This represents one of the varieties of godfatherism that is defensible and that a democratic nation, like Nigeria, requires and deserves. This brand of godfatherism is generally tagged as progressive godfatherism. The argument is that no democracy can flourish nor be accounted as fulfilling without elements and modicum of godfatherism that is embedded, entailed, and encapsulated in doses and deeds of progressivism.

5.6. Professional-Competence Godfatherism

Professional competence and godfatherism indicate that a godfather has a sense of value, virtue, and a sense of valid judgment that is significant and relevant to any political system as far as he possesses a sense of competence and professional accomplishment. Democracy in Nigeria is constantly problematized because those who claim to be practicing politics and desire the status of a godfather are bereft of competence in a recognized profession that registers a sense of expressive expertism and epistemological excellence, exceptionality, and extraordinariness. Professional competence assigns an exemplary personality trait to someone who desires the status of a godfather. This quality separates one godfather from another in the march towards democratic progress. Plenty of politicians in Nigeria are not competent professionally; they see politics as a fulltime business where personal profit can be pursued, promoted, and practiced. In a way, these are enemies of developmental democracy. Obafemi Awolowo, Nnamdi Azikiwe, and Samuel Akintola were all Nigerian nationalists.

Awolowo and Azikiwe were first and second republic politicians and godfathers. Akintola was a first republic politician and godfather. The point, however, is that these trio had professional competence: Awolowo and Akintola were seasoned lawyers, while Azikiwe was a political scientist and a journalist in his own right. Their participation in politics brought tremendous and phenomenal gains to democratic practice, performance, and possibilities in Nigeria. Their competence and professional correctness gave them comparative advantage over those who had none. They represent the paradigm of correctness as far as godfatherism and democracy are concerned. Anyone can claim to be a godfather, but, the question to such a person: what do you have to offer? Politics exercised by those who have no professional competence, especially in the present Fourth Republic, becomes an exercise in emptiness, enterprise in futility, and engagement in fallacious fatality. Politics is serious business for serious minded people who understand democracy as a people-centric system of government.

6. Conclusion

Undoubtedly, if Godfatherism is considered an advantageous approach, acceptable adventure, and adorable attribute that sustainable democracy accordingly accommodates, it could be on account of the element, emblems, and expressive entitlement in reflective defensibility. Again, the riches and resourcefulness of every democratic order are based on and built around its reflective riches and resourcefulness concerning citizenship, respect for rights, freedom and liberties of citizens. If, symbolically, seriously, and specially understood, godfatherism is present and parades a paradigm of correctness and expresses reflective defensibility on account of ways it successfully, substantively, and succinctly exemplifies itself as a watershed in every democratic dispensation.

Reflective defensibility and correctness necessarily and naturally attenuate Godfatherism as long as and as much as it typifies its seriousness and significance in a way it has been subjected to critical discussion in this attempt. It could not be true that Godfatherism wastes democracy, withers the face of democracy, and waters down its true temperament. Rather, what is defensible about godfatherism, as far as democracy is concerned, is the position that the indefensibility of godfatherism goes with manifestation of negativities. The question is, "What if Godfatherism presents and parades paradigms of correct temperament and critical thinking in the elevation of the political culture exercised and entertained within a given political space, like Nigeria? It could not follow that godfatherism is naturally ensconced in evil and abysmal connotations; what is implied and insinuated is the fact that the defensibility of godfatherism is established where and when it manifests and expresses itself in the aura of positivity, performing plausibility, and applauding pedigree that is second to none.

If godfatherism promotes and connotes itself as a positive phenomenon for Nigeria's democracy, then it could only mean that superior and defensible argument ought to be created, constructed, and cast in ways that are beyond reasonable doubt and rational skepticism. Evidently, those ways have been the substance and subject matter of discussions all along. What is left is to show how those ways are open to being faulted; the faultlessness of these perspectives does not seem to be a natural construct. The power of logical thinking and critical argumentation carries the capacity and contemplative competence to do justice to the subject matter.

References

- Adebisi, T. (2022). 'Power, patronage, and political corruption in Nigeria: The role of godfatherism in governance failure.' *African Journal of Political Economy*, 18(1): 21-38.
- Akpan, B. (2004). 'Political Godfatherism in Nigeria' www.thisdavonline.com
- Ameh, S. O. (2021). "Deviance in the Power Sector: A Zemiological Discourse." *Deviant Behaviour: A Social Institution Perspective* (ed.) Aganwo, D. E. Pearl Publishers International Ltd. : 224-234.
- Asogwa, J. O. (2017). *Politics of Godfatherism in Nigeria*. *Online Journal of Arts, Management and Social Sciences (OJAMSS)*, 2(1):261 – 272.
- Audu, N. G. (2006). "Godfatherism and Electoral Politics in Nigeria" Election Support 2007 IFES - Nigeria.
- Diamond, L. (1990). "The Three Paradoxes of Democracy" *Journal of Democracy*, Summer, Vol. 1, No. 3: 48-60.
- Edigin, L.U. (2010). "Political Conflicts and Godfatherism in Nigeria: A Focus on the Fourth Republic." *African Research Review: An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal*, 4(4): 174-186.
- Ibrahim, B. (2006). "The Rise of Nigeria Godfathers" www.hewslbc.com
- Idowu, W. (2004). "Citizenship, Democracy, Godfatherism." *Essence Journal*, (1) 1: 158-182.S
- Idowu, W. (2024). "The Universality-Particularity Debate Concerning Democracy Question in Africa: A Philosophical Reflection." *International Journal of African Studies*, 4 (1): 42-53.
- Idowu, W. (2024). "Debating the Democracy Dilemma, Question and Prospects in Africa: A Statement in Theoretical Hermeneutics." *International Journal of African Studies*, 4(2), 79-90.
- Isaac, J. (2025). "Democracy as a system of government in Nigeria: A critical analysis." *Aquino Journal of Philosophy*, 5(2):66-74.
- Ishaya, J. and Jirapye, M. I. (2023). "The ramifications of democracy and the politics of a nation". Onwochei, P. (ed), *Moral issues in the practice of modern democracy, human rights and personhood*. New York : Exodus Publishers.
- Onah, G.I. (2003). "Africa and the Illusion of Democracy". *Philosophy, Democracy and Responsible Governance in Africa*. Vol. Oguejiofor, Ramose and Onah (Eds.) Munster: Lit Verlag : 276-308.
- Oni, S. & Joshua, S. (2020). "The political economy of godfatherism in Nigeria: Implications for democratic governance." *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 14(1): 45-60.
- Otite, A. and Umukoro, N. (2010). "Money Politics, Political Culture of Godfatherism and the Future of Democracy in Nigeria: Lessons from the 2007 Gubernatorial Election in Edo State." *Africana*, 4(2):65-79.