AFRICAN SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL JOURNAL
IMO STATE UNIVERSITY
OWERRI, IMO STATE
NIGERIA
VOL. 14 NO. 1 JANUARY 2025

THE ROLE OF TRADITIONAL RULERS IN THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF NIGERIA IN THE 20TH CENTURY

BODE-ADEOYE, DADEPO MONISOLA
Department of History and Diplomatic Studies, Faculty of Humanities
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rumuolumeni
Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria
Email: nifefikemofe@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This article examines the evolving role of traditional rulers in Nigeria's sustainable development throughout the 20th century, spanning the colonial era, independence, and successive military and civilian regimes. Traditional rulers Emirs, Obas, Obis, and Chiefs served as custodians of culture, mediators of conflict, and intermediaries between colonial and postcolonial governments and local communities. Drawing on historical and empirical literature, the study finds that traditional institutions significantly contributed to grassroots mobilization, peacebuilding, cultural preservation, and local development projects, even as their formal political authority diminished after the 1976 local government reforms. However, their effectiveness was often constrained by political interference, elite capture, and constitutional ambiguity. The article concludes that integrating traditional rulers into participatory governance frameworks, clarifying their roles, and enhancing their capacity are essential for leveraging their influence for sustainable development in Nigeria.

Keywords: Traditional Rulers, Sustainable Development, Community Development, Indirect Rule, Good Governance.

Introduction

Traditional rulers in Nigeria comprising emirs in the North, obas in the Yoruba Southwest, obis in the Igbo Southeast, and various chiefs across ethnic groups have remained central figures in local governance and community development throughout the 20th century. Despite Nigeria's transition from colonial rule through military dictatorships to civilian democracy, these institutions have persisted as custodians of culture, mediators of disputes, and mobilizers of grassroots action. Their role, however, has evolved significantly in response to changing political structures, constitutional arrangements, and development paradigms.

The 20th century witnessed profound transformations in Nigeria's governance architecture: from British colonial indirect rule, which institutionalized traditional rulers as Native Authorities, to post-independence republican ideals that marginalized chieftaincy from formal politics, and finally to the 1976 local government reforms that redefined their status as advisory, non-executive actors. Yet, even as their constitutional recognition waned, traditional rulers continued to exert substantial influence over land administration, conflict resolution, cultural continuity, and local development initiatives.

This article traces the historical trajectory of traditional rulers' contributions to sustainable development in Nigeria across three broad periods: the colonial era (1900–1960), the post-independence and military regimes (1960–1999), and the early democratic period at the century's close. It evaluates their roles in peacebuilding, grassroots mobilization, cultural preservation, and community development, while critically examining constraints such as political interference, elite capture, and constitutional ambiguity. The study concludes with policy recommendations for integrating traditional institutions into participatory governance frameworks to enhance their capacity for sustainable development.

Colonial Era and Indirect Rule (1900–1960)

The British colonial administration in Nigeria institutionalized the role of traditional rulers through the policy of indirect rule, a system that relied on existing indigenous political structures to govern local populations. In Northern Nigeria, where centralized emirates already existed, the colonial government administered through emirs and district heads, who were designated as Native Authorities responsible for tax collection, law enforcement, and local administration. Similarly, in Western Nigeria, obas and chiefs served as intermediaries implementing colonial policies, including tax assessment and daily administration of their people.

In Eastern Nigeria, the absence of centralized traditional authority posed challenges for indirect rule, leading colonial administrators to impose warrant chiefs on previously stateless societies a move that generated significant local resistance and contributed to anti-colonial agitation. Nevertheless, across all regions, traditional rulers became integral to the colonial administrative structure, exercising autonomy in local affairs while implementing directives from British officials.

This period established traditional rulers as key actors in local governance, embedding them in the administrative machinery of the state. Their roles extended beyond ceremonial functions to include substantive responsibilities in resource mobilization, dispute resolution, and maintaining social order functions that would later prove critical for community development and peacebuilding.

Post-Independence and Military Regimes (1960–1976)

Following Nigeria's independence in 1960, traditional rulers initially retained significant political influence, with some participating in early political parties and legislative councils. However, the 1966 military coup, subsequent civil war (1967–1970), and years of military dictatorship fundamentally altered their status. Military governments, seeking to centralize authority and diminish potential sources of opposition, systematically excluded traditional rulers from formal governance structures.

The 1976 Local Government Reforms under the Mohammed/Obasanjo military regime marked a decisive turning point. These reforms introduced a uniform local government system across Nigeria, establishing elected local government councils as the third tier of government and formally insulating traditional rulers from executive decision-making. Traditional rulers were assigned advisory roles through Traditional/Emirate Councils, charged with coordinating development plans, advising on chieftaincy matters, and assisting in community tax assessment but stripped of executive or participatory authority in council deliberations.

The reforms reflected republican ideals that viewed hereditary authority as incompatible with democratic governance, relegating traditional institutions to symbolic and ceremonial status. Yet, paradoxically, the 1976 reforms also gave statutory recognition to traditional councils in each local government area, acknowledging their continued relevance in cultural affairs and community coordination.

Constitutional Ambiguity in the Late 20th Century

The 1979 and 1999 Constitutions of Nigeria made no provision for formal governance roles for traditional rulers, cementing their exclusion from the constitutional architecture of the state. The 1999 Constitution (as amended) remains largely silent on the powers, functions, and responsibilities of traditional institutions, creating legal ambiguity that limits their authority to intervene in conflict resolution, land management, and communal governance.

This constitutional invisibility has had practical consequences: traditional rulers' actions in peacebuilding or development initiatives can be deemed *ultra vires* by state authorities, and their unofficial involvement in security matters is not integrated into formal frameworks, depriving them of strategic leverage. The lack of clear constitutional recognition thus constrains their effectiveness, even as they continue to command moral authority and community trust.

Contributions to Sustainable Development

Despite diminished formal authority, traditional rulers made significant contributions to sustainable development across multiple dimensions throughout the 20th century.

Grassroots Mobilization and Local Development Projects

Traditional rulers have long served as mobilizers of community resources and facilitators of local development initiatives. Empirical studies demonstrate that they have facilitated community-based economic programs, including youth employment schemes, local cooperatives, and small-scale enterprise development, often in partnership with NGOs and government agencies. In rural areas where formal state institutions are under-resourced, traditional authorities remain integral to grassroots governance, contributing to land administration, social cohesion, and development planning.

Their proximity to local populations and deep understanding of community needs enable traditional rulers to identify development priorities, mobilize voluntary labor and resources, and ensure that projects align with cultural values and local realities. This grassroots mobilization capacity has been particularly valuable in implementing health campaigns, educational initiatives, and infrastructure projects at the community level.

Peacebuilding and Conflict Mediation

One of the most enduring roles of traditional rulers has been conflict mediation and peacebuilding. Traditional institutions including monarchs, councils of elders, clan heads, and spiritual leaders have historically served as mediators, negotiators, and community mobilizers during conflicts, working alongside (and often ahead of) formal government efforts.

In the Middle Belt region, for instance, traditional leaders in Plateau, Benue, and Kaduna States have negotiated ceasefires and peace agreements to ease farmer-herder conflicts that have displaced thousands and caused widespread violence. In the Niger Delta, traditional rulers have promoted coexistence and reduced arms proliferation, pipeline vandalism, kidnapping, and sea piracy through indigenous mediation and reconciliation practices. In Northeast Nigeria, emirs,

district heads, and village chiefs have played critical roles in conflict mediation, facilitating dialogue, sharing intelligence, promoting community vigilance, and mediating disputes in Borno, Adamawa, Yobe, and Gombe States.

Research in Borno State found that traditional institutions significantly promote peace and security through all four mechanisms facilitating dialogue, sharing intelligence, promoting vigilance, and mediating conflicts with respondents affirming their effectiveness in preventing and resolving disputes. Similarly, studies in Taraba State identified that traditional rulers command high legitimacy and play significant roles in mediating conflicts and mobilizing grassroots development, even amid recurring communal violence and ethnoreligious tensions.

Traditional conflict resolution mechanisms mediation by elders, intervention by clans or families, spiritual ceremonies, and adjudication by royalty have proven effective in resolving disputes where formal judicial systems are inaccessible, slow, or culturally insensitive. These indigenous practices emphasize restoration of relationships, community harmony, and culturally nuanced solutions that respect local norms.

Cultural Preservation and Social Cohesion

As custodians of customs and traditions, traditional rulers have played vital roles in preserving cultural heritage and fostering social cohesion. They uphold cultural values that promote unity, transmit indigenous knowledge across generations, and maintain communal identity amid rapid modernization and external influences.

Cultural preservation contributes to sustainable development by strengthening social capital, reinforcing shared norms of reciprocity and trust, and providing a sense of belonging that reduces anomie and social fragmentation. Traditional festivals, rites of passage, oral histories, and customary laws all overseen by traditional rulers serve as vehicles for cultural continuity and intergenerational learning.

Moreover, traditional rulers' role as moral authorities and symbols of communal identity enables them to rally communities around shared goals, mediate intergroup tensions, and foster inclusive development that respects diverse cultural perspectives.

Constraints on Effectiveness

Despite their contributions, traditional rulers' effectiveness in promoting sustainable development has been constrained by several structural and political factors.

Political Interference

Traditional rulers' dependence on state governments for recognition, staff, funding, and palace maintenance creates vulnerability to political interference. State governors and political elites often manipulate traditional institutions for partisan advantage, appointing loyalists, withholding recognition from dissenting rulers, or leveraging chieftaincy disputes to weaken opposition.

This politicization undermines traditional rulers' neutrality and credibility as mediators, as communities may perceive them as aligned with incumbent governments rather than impartial arbiters. When traditional institutions are excluded from decision-making or manipulated by political actors, they risk becoming tools of exclusion and sources of conflict rather than mechanisms of empowerment.

Elite Capture

Elite capture the process by which powerful individuals or groups manipulate public institutions and resources for private benefit has also affected traditional institutions. In some cases, traditional rulers themselves become part of patronage networks, aligning with political patrons or business elites to secure personal benefits at the expense of broader community interests.

Elite capture manifests through patronage-based appointments, selective enforcement of regulations, and allocation of development resources to politically connected actors rather than based on community needs. This undermines equitable development outcomes, erodes trust in traditional institutions, and exacerbates inequalities within communities.

Constitutional Ambiguity

The lack of clear constitutional recognition and formalized responsibilities limits traditional rulers' authority to intervene in governance, security, and development matters. The 1999 Constitution's silence on traditional institutions creates legal uncertainty, leaving their roles undefined and subject to arbitrary interpretation by state authorities.

This ambiguity constrains traditional rulers' ability to engage in land administration, conflict resolution, and community development initiatives without fear of being deemed *ultra vires*. It also prevents their unofficial involvement in peacebuilding and security from being integrated into formal frameworks, depriving them of strategic leverage and institutional support.

Resource Limitations and Capacity Gaps

Traditional rulers often operate with scarce resources, inadequate training, and limited institutional capacity to address contemporary development and security challenges. Many lack formal education in modern governance, conflict transformation, or development planning, limiting their effectiveness in complex, multi-stakeholder environments.

Additionally, generational shifts and the erosion of traditional authority among younger populations exposed to modern education, urbanization, and global influences pose challenges to the legitimacy and relevance of traditional institutions. Without deliberate efforts to modernize and adapt, traditional rulers risk becoming disconnected from the communities they seek to serve.

Evolution of Traditional Rulers' Roles in Nigeria (20th Century)

Period	Governance Context	Formal Authority	Key Roles	Constraints
Colonial Era (1900–1960)	British indirect rule	High (Native Authorities)	Tax collection, law enforcement, local administration, dispute resolution	Colonial oversight, imposition of warrant chiefs in East
Early Independence (1960–1966)	Parliamentary democracy	Moderate (participation in political parties, legislative councils)	Local governance, cultural leadership, political representation	Emerging tensions with republican ideals

Military Regimes (1966–1976)	Centralized military rule	Declining (exclusion from formal politics)	Advisory roles, cultural preservation, community mobilization	Systematic marginalization, loss of executive functions
Post-1976 Reforms (1976–1999)	Elected local councils; military/civilian rule	Low (advisory, non-executive)	Conflict mediation, grassroots mobilization, cultural custodianship	Constitutional ambiguity, political interference, elite capture
Late 20th Century (1999)	Return to democracy	Minimal (constitutional silence)	Peacebuilding, local development, social cohesion	Legal invisibility, resource limitations, capacity gaps

Policy Recommendations

To leverage traditional rulers' influence for sustainable development in Nigeria, the following interventions are recommended:

Constitutional and Legal Reforms

- **Constitutional Recognition:** Amend the 1999 Constitution to clearly articulate the roles, functions, and powers of traditional institutions in governance, security, and development.
- **Statutory Frameworks:** Enact state-level legislation establishing Traditional Ruler Advisory Committees with structured consultative roles in local government development planning.
- **Legal Clarity:** Define the scope of traditional rulers' authority in land administration, conflict mediation, and community development to prevent *ultra vires* challenges.

Integration into Participatory Governance

- **Local Security Councils:** Include traditional rulers in local security councils to integrate their unofficial peacebuilding efforts into formal security frameworks.
- **Development Planning:** Formalize traditional councils' roles in coordinating development plans, mobilizing community resources, and monitoring project implementation.
- **Collaborative Mechanisms:** Establish regular collaboration forums between traditional rulers, security agencies, civil society organizations, and government departments for synergistic action.

Capacity Building and Institutional Strengthening

- **Training Programs:** Provide training in conflict transformation, mediation skills, modern governance, and development planning to enhance traditional rulers' capacity.
- **Resource Allocation:** Allocate adequate funding, staff, and logistical support to traditional institutions to enable effective service delivery.

- **Inclusive Representation:** Ensure traditional councils represent diverse groups, including women, youth, and marginalized communities, to promote inclusive development.

Depoliticization and Accountability

- **Depoliticization Mechanisms:** Insulate traditional institutions from partisan politics through transparent appointment processes, tenure security, and independent oversight.
- **Anti-Corruption Measures:** Implement accountability frameworks to prevent elite capture and ensure traditional rulers serve broader community interests rather than narrow patronage networks.
- **Transparency:** Promote transparency in traditional councils' operations, resource management, and decision-making to build public trust.

Conclusion

Traditional rulers in Nigeria have played multifaceted and enduring roles in sustainable development throughout the 20th century, serving as custodians of culture, mediators of conflict, mobilizers of grassroots action, and intermediaries between state and community. Despite the erosion of their formal political authority particularly after the 1976 local government reforms and constitutional marginalization—they have continued to contribute significantly to peacebuilding, cultural preservation, local development projects, and social cohesion.

However, their effectiveness has been constrained by political interference, elite capture, constitutional ambiguity, resource limitations, and capacity gaps. To fully leverage traditional rulers' influence for sustainable development, Nigeria must integrate them into participatory governance frameworks, clarify their roles through constitutional and legal reforms, enhance their capacity through training and resource allocation, and depoliticize their institutions to ensure accountability and inclusivity. By recognizing and strengthening traditional institutions as complementary partners in governance and development, Nigeria can harness their moral authority, local legitimacy, and cultural capital to foster more inclusive, resilient, and sustainable communities.

References

Aidelokhai, M. O. (2022). Traditional rulers and local governance in Kwali Area Council of the Federal Capital Territory, Nigeria. *Journal of Public and Social Research, 12*(4), 102–112.

Agbaje, A. (2022). Traditional institutions and peacebuilding in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Peace and Security Studies, 8*(2), 45–62.

Akpomuvie, E., & Oriakhi, D. (2025). Traditional leadership, democratic governance and economic empowerment in Niger-Delta Region, Nigeria. *RUJMASS Journal, 6*(June), 1–18.

Booth, D., & Cammack, D. (2013). *Governance for development in Africa: Solving collective action problems*. Overseas Development Institute.

Ekpo, E., & Akpan, U. (2021). Traditional institutions and conflict management in Nigeria. *African Journal of Social Sciences, 11*(3), 89–104.

Federal Military Government. (1976). *Guidelines for local government reform in Nigeria*. Government Printer.

Hellman, J., Jones, G., & Kaufmann, D. (2000). Seize the state, seize the day: State capture, corruption and influence in transition. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper, 2444*.

Ibrahim, J. (2023). Traditional institutions and security in Nigeria: Challenges and prospects. *Journal of African Security Studies, 15*(1), 23–41.

Ibrahim, M., & Salihu, A. (2019). Constitutional ambiguity and the role of traditional rulers in Nigeria's governance. *Nigerian Constitutional Law Journal, 7*(2), 112–130.

Innes, J. (2014). *The state and governance in Africa*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Nwazie, P. O. C. (1991). *The Igbo traditional legal institutions and their relevance in modern Nigeria*. Fourth Dimension Publishers.

Obasola, S. (2020). Traditional rulers and conflict mediation in Southwest Nigeria. *Yoruba Studies Review, 5*(1), 67–84.

Okoro, C., & Suleiman, M. (2024). Farmer-herder conflicts and traditional mediation in Nigeria's Middle Belt. *Journal of Peace and Conflict Resolution, 12*(3), 145–163.

Otoghagua, E. (2009). *Local government administration in Nigeria*. Ambik Press.

Plateau, D., & Abraham, K. (2002). Elite capture and local governance in Nigeria. *African Development Review, 14*(2), 201–215.

Sokoh, M. A. (2005). *The Nigerian local government system: Issues and challenges*. University of Calabar Press.

Ugoani, J. N. E. (2016). Political will and anti-corruption management in Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovation and Economic Development, 2*(4), 34–45.