
Religion and Partisan Politics in Nigeria: A Challenge to the Committed Christian

Ezichi A. Ituma

Abstract

Religion and partisan politics is a concept that examines the relationship between religion and politics from the perspective of Christian theological ideologies. The problem this research is poised to resolve is captured in the idea that politics in Nigeria is a dirty game and the Christian is a holy person that could be so easily defiled by this dirty game, yet the Christian is praying for good leadership from a corrupt politician. Can committed Christianity go hand in hand with partisan politics in Nigeria? Analytical approach to biblical texts formed the bedrock to determining the Christian political stance. Pragmatic and phenomenological methodology guided the examination of concepts and closely related research works. It was concluded that preaching in the church is not enough to change the society. The Nigerian society needs to be led by good people who have zero tolerance to corruption. It is a share naivety for a Christian to think that he can achieve much in the political community without being a partisan politician.

Introduction

Religion and partisan politics is a concept that examines the relationship between religion and politics from the perspective of Christian theological ideologies. Politics is both an academic discipline and a societal activity. As an academic discipline one examines the ideologies of ideal politics, taking bearing from its hellenistic etymology. In fact, modern word 'politics' comes from 'polis', the Greek for 'city state'. Flourishing in the Archaic Age (c.800BC – 300BC), the city states were founded on the principle of citizenship, with different rights and privileges for male citizens, female citizens, their children, foreign residents and slaves."¹ But the practice is, most times, different from classroom utopian ideologies. Politics is part and parcel of the society just as religion is part and parcel of the society. In the Nigerian social arena politics and religion are very strongly tied without partisans consciously recognising it. Conflicting statements as to the incompatibility of both are clearly stated everywhere, yet the practice is totally different. Christian participation in partisan politics is determined only after one has defined one's understanding of

a Christian. It is not an issue of discussion to ask whether a nominal Christian can participate in partisan politics. It is only a question when it has to do with a committed Christian.

In Nigeria, membership of the Church has come to be divided into committed Christians and nominal Christians. Nominal Christian refers to the Christian who is contented with going to the church without taking the tenets of Christianity seriously while committed Christian is a Christian who takes delight in following the principles and tenets of Christianity. Nominal Christians are Christians who exist “in name only”.² Kent Hunter insists that “Nominal Christians need to be evangelized themselves.”³ Many Christian leaders do not see any contradiction when they condemn the participation of committed Christians in partisan politics while at the same time painstakingly conducting protracted prayer sessions for politicians and political leaders. The pastoral passion for ideal political leadership is sometimes so strong that Church leaders visit political leaders and organise regular prayers at their homes with them. Subsequently the term Christian shall be used to mean committed Christian.

Many committed Christians are hardly encouraged to take part in partisan politics because it has been a convention to regard partisan politics as a dirty game and therefore unfit for a committed Christian. The conflict of prayers for politicians and apolitical practice defines confusion of Christian ideology and praxis. The problems this research is poised to resolve are captured in the following questions. How can the same church leader who has been out there to pray for political leaders condemn Christian participation in partisan politics and still sees no conflict in his Christian experience? If politics is a dirty game and the Christian is a holy person that could be so easily defiled by this dirty game how can one reconcile the concept of looking for good leadership from a corrupt politician? But how can a good and committed Christian remain the same while getting involved in partisan politics that is so dirty in Nigeria? Can committed Christianity go hand in hand with partisan politics in Nigeria? Analytical approach to biblical texts formed the bedrock to determining the Christian political stance. Pragmatic and phenomenological methodology guided the examination of concepts and closely related research works.

Politics as Leadership: Christians and Leadership

Arguments have tilted in favour of those Christians who insist that the world is evil and the things that are in the world, including the political systems of the nations. Both the developing countries like Nigeria and the developed countries like United States of America have faced the same problems of defining the place of the committed Christian in the political dynamics of the society. But in its simplest definition politics is “a process by which groups of people make collective decisions.”⁴ Politics involves citizens who decide how to lead the State. Even in its inclusive meaning it is not possible for individuals to move together without one leading. In fact, where two or three are gathered there is

politics. So, everyone is involved in politics in one way or the other. This statement holds when politics is simply seen as leadership. In this simple definition one hears expressions like “church politics”. In the Christian church and Christian gathering someone must direct the affairs, someone must lead. However, politics in this research examines leadership of the state as an organised way of sharing power and deciding who controls state affairs at a particular time. “Politics is the activity through which people make, preserve and amend the general rules under which they live.”⁵ Interestingly politics draws from people in the state. It is the people that make up their leadership. The type of leaders the people have is determined by the type of people in that state. If the leaders are corrupt it all because the people are corrupt. In that case it is the corrupt citizens that form the corrupt leadership. A society cannot be corrupt and expect a saintly leadership. The leaders of Nigeria have been branded corrupt,⁶ but this is because the people are endemically corrupt. If Nigerian Christians are interested in good politics they must go out there to sponsor good people. Only good people can produce good leadership. If committed Christians are not ready to be involved in Nigerian politics because it is a dirty game then the nominal Christians will get involved and the committed Christian should be ready to pay the costly price of bad leadership. Odo and Ofuebe noted that “Leadership at any level is a serious business, requiring input from all and sundry. Leadership recruitment at the local level is the foundation of community participation in local governance.”⁷ The implication is that the Christian who wants to participate in governance must show some commitment at the local level. Active participation in the societal events makes a Christian a light and therefore visible. Visibility in turn makes one identifiable. Here, the concern of the research is the leadership potentialities in the Christian which are identifiable because the Christian made himself visible. The Christian who cannot participate in the local politics cannot be part of national politics. This in turn is an indirect way of inviting non-Christians with non-Christian ideas to rule the Christian. In such a situation it is difficult to expect a non-Christian to offer leadership that respects God.

Christianity and Partisan Politics

Many Christians will have no problem accepting political office provided it comes by appointment. Political appointees in Nigeria usually serve the interest of the one who made the appointments. Even if appointment becomes necessary for the office of the President of a nation or Governor of a state it is hardly made outside partisan politics. “In politics, a **partisan** is a committed member of a political party.”⁸ Partisan politics require that political parties be formed and political leaders emerge from the political parties. Nigeria adopts partisan style of politics. The implication is that those seeking political positions should register in political parties. If political parties are made of bad and corrupt members it is all because bad and corrupt citizens joined the political parties. But it should be noted that there is freedom of association in Nigeria. Since political parties are not supposed to have religious affinity Christians in Nigeria should not expect a Christian political party. The constitution of the Federal

Republic of Nigeria will not allow that. The implication is that the Christian who desires political position must be ready to join a political party. When political parties are abandoned in the guise that corrupt members have taken over leadership of these parties the Christian should note that there is no other way to gain political power. In the hierarchy of political leadership there are strategic positions that are given out only to party loyalists. Such positions constitute the “first positions.” There are the positions of the national President, State Governor, Local Government Chairman, Party Chairman, etc. These “first positions” in the political leadership are usually taken over by front liners in partisan politics. The Christian must not just register in a political party for the sake of being a member. The Christian must aspire for the front line and first positions. It is in these “first positions” that recognizable impact is made in the society. To aspire for the “first positions” the Christian must serve very faithfully in the second tier posts and positions. It is the second tier positions that make way for the first positions.

Christianity and Electioneering

Democratic form of government as adopted in Nigeria is very much in consonance with the pre-colonial form of traditional communalism. Democracy has been there in the Afro cultural setting though in a different form from the modern democratic government. Nwankwo has given a better understanding of the traditional definition of democracy “government of the people for the people and by the people, thus a system of government in which the will of the majority of qualified citizens prevails.”⁹ Though Nwankwo was defining the modern democracy yet it suits the Afro traditional democracy very well. By this definition, if the will of the majority of the qualified citizens is corruption then one should expect corruption from the government. But the qualified citizens here refer to the electorate. If the Christians distance themselves from electioneering they do not only disenfranchise themselves but also remove their “will” from the “will of the majority of the qualified citizens.” In that case they should expect nothing in their favour from the ruling party. In a democratic government electioneering is a very important integral part of the political process. Electioneering includes all the activities that are put in place to get the vote of the electorate. It is the “persuasion of voters in a political campaign.”¹⁰ It includes political parties’ campaigns and political lobbying. It is the campaign of a candidate to be elected. The candidate must study the Electoral System and Voting in the society and then strategise ways of getting the votes. Christianity in Nigeria operates in a world of democracy and not theocracy. The implication is that a Christian politician must learn the dynamics of electioneering to strategically plan, pray and execute political ideologies. A Christian politician who wants to think the way Jesus thought would consider the way Jesus thought in a Jewish theocratic state to enable him decide the way Jesus would think in a Nigerian democratic state. Jesus was not a political dullard. Whoever thinks Jesus was a political dullard should be reminded that if the political hegemony of the time misunderstood Jesus as a political threat it is all because he posed himself as a political threat. Only a naïve reader of the Gospel of John 11.48 (“If

we let him go on like this, everyone will believe in him, and then the Romans will come and take away both our place¹¹ and our nation”) will think that Jesus was a quiet and political nonentity. If Jesus was that quiet and apolitical no government will see him as a threat. The fact is that his charismatic leadership had changed the hearts of the common people and they had started seeing in him a good political leader.

It is completely absurd for a Christian leader to claim to be patriotic by merely encouraging his members to participate in voting while discouraging them from political party membership. In Nigeria, “Elections serve a significant example where the cooperation of individual citizens and various groups, especially political associations and recognized parties, with relevant government agencies is necessary for success.”¹² Here Ikeanyibe implies that mere going out there to vote contributes very minimal to the success of the election. The citizen must be committed beyond just going to vote. Citizens must watch closely to ensure that their vote is used in the process. In Nigeria, this is more realistic by active participation in political party. The Christian active participation in political party makes parties more responsible to eschew political violence and imbibe the spirit of sportsmanship. Christians must participate actively in political parties to ensure that wrong decisions are not a policy as it appears at the moment and that due process is followed. The foregoing is emphasizing the fact that political parties determine, to a large extent, the success of elections. In Nigeria the Electoral officers are powerless if the political parties are determined to rig elections. This is because they are ready to buy over the law enforcement agents, including the electoral officers who could be killed for refusing to accept inducements.

Challenges of “My Kingdom is not of this world” – John 18.36

One of the most misunderstood dominical sayings in terms of political participation of the Christian is captured in John 18.36, “My kingdom is not of this world.” In this text Jesus implies an eschatological kingdom that ushers in corrupt-free divine rule in a human society. It is eschatological in the sense that it is still expected. This is one of the expectations of the consummation of the “age”. This statement itself expresses the fact that Jesus was conscious of a political sphere where corrupt-free activities prevail over the lives of human beings. This is a kingdom where God has washed the lives of human beings and controls their activities. He did not imply a *laissez-affaire* attitude to partisan politics. In fact, a committed Christian should simulate this eschatological kingdom in his political career. Nigeria belongs to Nigerians and Nigerian Christians are Nigerians. If things go wrong in Nigeria it affects Christians as well. On this note Ikeanyibe cautions, “We as Nigerian citizens must put our priorities right and be interested in what happens in the political process to build a better Nigeria for our children and ourselves.”¹³ Jesus did not come to overthrow the political kingdom of the Jews but was part of the Jewish political kingdom as every other religious leader of the Jews. He could not have been a religious leader of the Jewish theocratic state without being involved in partisan

politics. He recognised the government of the Jews and contributed his quota in the administration of the Temple.

The Temple was a religious institution as well as a political institution of the Jews. One could not be involved in the Temple polity in isolation of *secular* polity. In fact, there was really nothing like *secular* polity since both *secular* and religious were the same institution in the Jewish theocracy. Even the system of government itself, “theocracy”, is indicative of the religious and political nature of the Order. It is completely unbiblical therefore for the Christian to exonerate himself from the political process of the time while claiming to obey the Bible. “My kingdom is not of this world” could be interpreted alongside “Your kingdom come, your will be done on earth as it is in heaven” (Matthew 6.10) to mean that the Christian should simulate heavenly ideals in this world while expecting an eternal Kingdom of Jesus Christ in the near future. When Constantine fought his way through to create a Christian Empire he was seen as a great hero of the Christian faith. Christians achieved so much from that regime. The strength of the present Roman Catholic Church cannot be established without tracing its roots to the foundations laid by Constantine. Critics could condemn the corruption that followed after without noticing the corruption and sacrilegious acts in the churches today. The fact is that human beings are bad and will remain bad until the coming Christ to usher in the eschatological Kingdom that is described in the Bible. Every human government must witness imperfections because human beings are imperfect. Christians are in the world to prepare for the perfect Kingdom that is promised in the Bible. They are not required to abandon the world merely because the world is imperfect. The Christians are expected to shine as light in the world. Yet, they are only passing through the world. The Christian is not supposed to see his political affiliations as the ideal and perfect. He is only expected to show the light and also remain conscious of the eternal Kingdom of God which will soon be ushered in. Jesus was expressing the fact that there is a better realm which will be ushered in to replace this present imperfect realm. The idea of shining as light presupposes darkness. The Christian is enjoined to shine as light in politics and in other affinities.

Politics of the Triumphal Entry – Luke 19.28-40

The Triumphal Entry of Jesus into Jerusalem is seldom seen as a political event in the life of Jesus. Jesus was a Jew. Those who shouted “hosanna” were Jews and shouted with the full implication of the meaning of that term in the socio-political understanding of a typical Jew. The Jewish leaders who requested Jesus to stop the people from the ascription knew the full political implication of the term and were not ready to accept that from Jesus. But Jesus insisted that the stones will rise up to sing the proclamation if the people were prevented from singing. The Hebrew hoshana means “save, please”. It was used in the Jewish Festival of Tabernacles and had a deep root in a petition to God to save the Jew from his enemies through the Messiah. The audience at the Triumphal Entry had a political Messiah in mind and associated Jesus with the fulfilment of this

traditional petition. This is even clearer by their addition of the words, “Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord!” ‘Blessed is the king of Israel!’” (John 12.13). The events recorded in these texts have strong Old Testament background of the Davidic kingship, with very clear political undertone. The response of Jesus to the Jewish leaders as a consequence of this event does not in any way show that Jesus understood this event outside the Jewish political context. Jesus was a Jewish politician and he participated in their political processes with vigour, challenging those who thwarted Jewish political processes. Jesus may have denounced some form of misconstrued political connotation attached to him as the Messiah but he never removed politics from the activities of the Messiah. If he does he will no longer be the fulfiller of the Old Testament Messianic prophecies. Jesus’ messianic claims are established in the Old Testament messianic prophecies. He was a politician in the Jewish context. He had to accept the ascriptions of these religious fans and never told them that they got it wrong.

Corrupt Temple Politics and Jesus

Prior to the coming of Jesus the political arena of the Jews had become so corrupt that some committed Jews had abandoned the Temple. The Temple was the centre of Jewish politics as well as the centre of Jewish religious life. It is so because, to the Jews, politics was religion and religion was politics. Before the revolt of the Maccabees pagan sacrifices were offered in the Temple of Jerusalem as well as many other abominable practices. These led to the revolt. During the period of the Maccabees, after the revolt, the Jews started accepting priests who were not of the Aaronic lineage. In later years the office of the High Priest became a political appointment of the Gentile Roman government. Caiaphas the High Priest, though of Aaronic priesthood, was an appointee of Roman government. He organised the plot to kill Jesus and was also involved in the trial of Jesus. He served the political interest of the Romans that appointed him. He was a politician like other Jewish religious leaders. It should be recalled that it was the abuse of holy things that led to the “cleansing of the Temple” by Jesus. He was so upset by the dubious economic activities in the Temple area that he picked up a whip and began to chase people away, insisting that His Father’s house was a house of prayer but they have turned it into a den of thieves. In spite of the corruption Jesus was still involved in the political leadership of the Temple and resisted the sacrilege successfully. Perhaps the modern Nigerian Christian would have been more Christian than Jesus by resorting to abandonment of the Temple, maybe to form a separate denomination. But The Qumran sects did exactly that. The Qumran sects had abandoned the Temple as sacrilegious and unfit for the worship of God. To them, the endemic corruption among the political leaders of the Jews was not supposed to be part of the Temple. A better option, for them, was to find settlement at the *Khirbet Qumran*. While it is true that some scholars see a remarkable resemblance between the teachings of Jesus and John the Baptist with that of the Qumaran sects it must be clearly understood that Jesus participated fully in the Temple activities while calling the leaders to order for

their political corruption. Jewish politics at the time of Jesus was as much corrupt as that of Nigerian politics, yet Jesus was involved. Withdrawing from the scene like the Essenes of the Qumran sect was not the best, as far as Jesus was concerned. He was there in the Temple to challenge the Pharisees and the Sadducees, as well as the Chief Priests and High Priest. He could not have challenged them from outside. He gave the Christian a good example, for those who care to understand and follow.

Challenges of “They are not of the World” – John 17.16

Jesus was quoted in the Gospel of John as praying for his disciples in the following words, “They are not the world even as I am not of it.” This statement has been misinterpreted severally to create a cleavage between what obtains in the church and what obtains outside the church. It has even been used to create a schism of what Westerners have come to call secularism and religious. The context of that prayer shows what Jesus meant; the Christians are in the world and must be part of the processes but are not of this world. It was in being part of the processes of the world that they will have tribulations and difficulties. If a Christian in Nigeria is not involved in politics how would he experience the difficulties associated with holy Christian lifestyle and corrupt political practices? How then will the prayer apply? That the Christians are not of this world means that there is a better place where they should expect as the goal of life. A blissful state in the presence of God should be the hope of the Christian. The implication is that the Christian should not be despondent at any given point.

Jesus was not saying that the Christian should abandon the world. He never meant the Christian should not interact with any other person that is not a Christian. It never meant the Christians should go and construct their own market, build their road, have a separate stream, etc. There are things that must be shared in common by every human being in the society and Jesus shared such facilities in common with his contemporaries. In the first place the world, however corrupt it may be at the moment, still belongs to God and not to Satan. It is evil men that have introduced evil system. It is also good men that will introduce good system. Jesus never paid aloof to politics. If he did he will not criticise the political leader as a fox, “Go and tell that fox” (Luke 13.32). One should also observe many other places he criticised the religio-political Pharisees, Sadducees and High Priest. If he never expected a better result to be produced by his criticism then he would be hypocritical, far be it. He was a perfect gentle man; the modern Christian must learn from him. The Christian is not of this world means that the Christian should see God in whatever he/she does. Satisfying God should occupy the uppermost in the mind of the Christian. That was what Jesus meant. This is akin to Madu’s description of the pristine Igbo society where traditional religion controlled the affairs of human beings. This is indeed the Igbo where “rituals and religious ceremonies were enough to hold together the peace and harmony of the community since any breach of the

community's solidarity whether in the open or in secret would attract the anger and the punishment of the gods."¹⁴ Imagine a Nigeria where every Christian politician is conscious of the presence and surveillance of God in whatever he/she does? That Christian will surely create an atmosphere of sincerity, honesty and transparency. Of course, Nigeria will become a very good place to live in. It is completely wrong to use this text as a base to define the sacred and the profane in terms of *secular* and religious. While it is important to separate the sacred from the profane it is wrong to put a cleavage between what is now called *secular* and the religious. There is absolutely nothing like that. The term *secular* is now being used in a misleading way. It has come to mean different things to different people, depending on religious and political disposition of the people. To some Christians it is a cleavage between what is done in the Church and what is done outside the church as if the church itself is not in the world. Walls has noted that "It is Enlightenment theology, which drew a firm line between the secular and sacred spheres, and implied a defined frontier between the spiritual and phenomenal worlds. Such a frontier is not widely recognised in Africa."¹⁵ To the African there is nothing like the *secular*, different from the religious. The same applies to the Jewish society where Jesus lived.

Beyond the Iron Curtain: The Challenges

"Iron Curtain" is a term used to describe the boundary that separated the [Warsaw Pact](#) countries from the [NATO](#) countries from about 1945 until the end of the [Cold War](#) in 1991. The Iron Curtain was both a physical and an ideological division that represented the way Europe was viewed after World War II. To the east of the Iron Curtain were the countries that were connected to or influenced by the former Soviet Union.¹⁶

While nations of the East adopted communism and its variants those of the West adopted democracy. Many of the other nations of the world naturally aligned themselves to these world powers. The East was practically anti-Christianity while the West accommodated Christianity. In many of the communist countries Christianity was illegal and the massacre of Christians as well as the destruction of Christian scriptures in these nations was a mark of nationalism. During those days when the acrimony was high many Christian writers wrote *prophetically* on the imminent destruction of the Christian worlds through world government to be set up by Soviet Union.¹⁷ Fear griped many Christians and prayers sessions were never concluded without a word against Russia. But beyond the Iron Curtain Christians do not seem to see the challenges of the competing interests of Western form of *secularism* and Islamic political ideology. The world cannot be left without politics. Since the collapse of communism three forms of socio-cultural lifestyle seem to be leading the world and influencing human beings in political arena; Christianity, Western form of *secularism* and Islamic political

ideology. Islamic theology and practice seem to be well at home with politics and to the Moslem the only approved politics is Islamic, since every human being must be brought to the full submission to the religion of Islam, either by simple coercion or by jihad – force. With the wealth accrued from oil in the Mid East Islamic societies the Moslems have had very good sway of world politics. This is politics by religion. The Western *secularism* emphasizes humanism which sees human beings from a point without God. Aided by science and technology the Western societies also hold very strong grip of politics in the global power play. At the end, Christianity is squeezed in between these contending political powers. Perhaps some Christian theologians do not seem to see the danger in this trend. To worsen the case for the Christian, the Western *secularism* is ready to align with Islam for the sake of oil wealth. A more serious threat is even the unfortunate apolitical theology of some Christian theologians who go any length to condemn Christian participation in politics in the guise for an interpretation of John 17.16 (see above). World politics beyond the Iron Curtain requires that Christians participate effectively in the political dynamics so as to remain a strong variable in the political equation.

When the Righteous are in authority...

Christians are excited and ready to quote from Isaiah 29.2 “When the righteous are in authority the people rejoice: but when the wicked rule, the people mourn.” They hardly see the full political implication of the text. Authority, in this text is political leadership. The righteous, in this text is one who is absolved in Christian piety, from Christian perspective. Originally the text had the Jewish pious leader in mind. The Christians have come to interpret it as the leadership of a committed Christian. So, political leadership is anticipated yet partisan politics is out of the equation in this age of democracy. A proper contextualizing of this text brings a Christian face to face with the realities of partisan politics. The Christian must exercise his God-given wisdom in the realities of modern politics where democracy has been enthroned and the Christian is faced with the opportunities of changing the society and being the light of the world which Jesus commanded the Christians. The Christian must aspire to be in political authority because that is the correct interpretation of this text. It is in this position that the Christian brings the kingdoms of this world to the subject and rulership of Jesus Christ, while still expecting the eschatological Kingdom which will be ushered in without human effort. A Christian is part of this world but does not belong to the world. The Church is also part of this world but does not belong to the world.

Christianity and Democracy

Perhaps the best thing in world politics in modern times is the adoption of democracy in many societies. Democracy is a form of government that encourages freedom of thought and life. The individual is free to think the way he wants, provided he does not infringe on other people’s way of thought. Primarily it allows the individual to participate in governance through

representation. In this regard the Christian is free to elect those to represent him in governance. In this form of government it is the absolute right of the Christian to elect very good and positive persons or bad and corrupt people - from the Christian parlance, agents of Satan – to represent him in governance. Experience in Nigeria has shown that many committed Christians will prefer to vote rather than participate in partisan politics. To such Christians the right candidate becomes any candidate who comes to do political campaign in the church. But in Nigeria politicians go to Mosque, Church and Traditionalists to campaign. Some even promise to rebuild shrines for the traditionalist, buy Church organ and donate in church harvest for the Christian and simply adopt new Islamic names to appeal to the Moslem. This is a typical partisan politician in Nigeria. Even with this multifaceted lifestyle the Christian does not still seem to see the hypocrisy. Democracy offers the Christian a very good opportunity to exert political influence in the society. Judging from the way Jesus participated in the political arena it is very obvious that he will be very much at home with democracy if he was a modern man. The problem with some of the Christians today is the inability to see Jesus as a real Jew in the Jewish theocratic state and their inability to deduce, from there, what he will do with democracy. If Jesus was a good leader in the Jewish theocratic state it is obvious that he will be a good democrat if he was a Nigerian.

Conclusion

From the foregoing, it is necessary for the committed Christian in Nigeria to be involved in partisan politics so as to effect a good change in Nigerian socio-economic life. This is because politics controls economy and even social life in Nigeria. Preaching in the church is not enough to change the society. The Nigerian society needs to be led by good people who have zero tolerance to corruption. It is difficult to appoint the apolitical Christian in positions of political authority. It is in the political appointments that the individual participates in governance and also represents the interest of the people whose behalf the political leader holds office. It is a share naivety for a Christian to think that he can achieve much in the political community without being partisan politician. Ezeani noted that “In Nigeria, for instance, appointments of members of board of directors of parastatals, and councils of universities are based mainly on political considerations. Preference is usually given to party loyalists and supporters.”¹⁸ So, if the Christian wants to represent God and good ideas in the Nigerian society he has good grounds to do that in Nigerian democracy. If he is not interested in partisan politics then he should not expect God to bring positive reforms to the society through corrupt politicians.

Endnotes

- retrieved ¹<http://www.yourdiscovery.com/greece/politics/index.shtml>,
- ²Moris G. Watkins, et el, ed, *The All Nations Christian Home & School Dictionary* (Colorado Springs: All Nations Literature, 1992) p. 513
- ³Kent R. Hunter, *Foundations for Church Growth* (Missouri: Leader Publishing Company, 1983) p. 84
- ⁴<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politics>
- ⁵<http://www.palgrave.com/skills4study/subjectareas/politics/what.asp>
- ⁶Clinton blames Nigeria's woes on corrupt leaders,
<http://thenationonlineng.net/web2/articles/34072/1/Clinton-blames-Nigerias-woes-on-corrupt-leaders/Page1.html>
- ⁷Odo and Ofuebe, Nigerian Journal of Politics and Administration, Vol 2, No. 1 (Awka: The Peace Research Institute of Nigeria, 2009) p. 148
- ⁸[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Partisan_\(political\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Partisan_(political))
- ⁹B.C. Nwankwo, *Authority in Government* in O. N. Njoku ed, *African Journal of American Studies*, University of Nigeria, Nsukk vol 1, no. 1 2004 p. 75
- ¹⁰<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/electioneering>
- ¹¹The proper translation of “our place” here is “our temple” referring to the temple of Jerusalem
- ¹²Okey Marcellus Ikeanyibe, “Political Parties and Electoral Outcomes in Nigeria” *Professor Bassey Andah Journal of Cultural Studies* (Calabar: Professor Basseh Andah Centre for Cultural Studies, 2008) p. 73
- ¹³Ibid. p. 86
- ¹⁴Jude Emeka Madu, “The Philosophico-Religious Foundation of Democratic Leadership in Traditional Igbo Society” *Nigerian Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences* (Nsukka: Centre for Academic Research and Publication Initiative for the Advancement of Human Knowledge, 2008) p.26

¹⁵Andrew F. Walls, “Of Ivory Towers and Ashrams: Some reflections on theological scholarship in Africa” *Journal of African Christian Thought*, Vol 3, No.1 (Akropong-Akuapem: Akrofi-Christaller Memorial Centre for Mission Research and Applied Theology, 2003) p. 2

¹⁶<http://www.wisegeek.com/what-was-the-iron-curtain.htm>

¹⁷Tim LahHaye, *The Beginning of the End* (Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, 1972) pp.62-84

¹⁸Emmanuel O. Ezeani, *Fundamentals of Public Administration* (Enugu: Zik-Chuks Publishers, 2005) p. 16