ACCOMMODATING DIVERSITY AND FEDERALISM: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF NIGERIA AND INDIA

Islam Ali iD

Department of Political Science, Zakir Husain Delhi College (Evening), University of Delhi, J.L. Nehru Marg, New Delhi, India

✉ islamali123@gmail.com

iD Islam Ali: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5434-8801

ABSTRACT

Despite being among the largest federations in the world, Nigeria and India both have a completely distinct approach to federalism. While Nigeria's centralized federalism has strengthened the exclusive, elite element already evident in its election and party systems, India's decentralized federalism is favorable for power sharing. Nigerian federalism, on the other hand, has grown in a way that impedes democracy. India has an overwhelming level of diversity. Even by themselves, religion and language exhibit a genuinely astounding diversity. India's most remarkable asset and greatest problem are both diversity. Federalism was seen by the designers of the Indian constitution as a means of including this diversity in the process of constructing the country. It expressed and formalized the democratic, pluralistic, and politically stable principles that they themselves had for an independent India. In light of this, it appears that the federal character of diversity (cultural, ethnic, linguistic, and religious) in both nations is robust. Similar to one other, both nations are dealing with a variety of difficulties in preserving their diverse identity through constitutional provisions and meeting popular expectations.

The relationship between diversity and federalism in Nigeria and India is examined in this essay. The study examines how both nations deal with diversity issues and preserve their federal nature. The study continues by stating that both nations may benefit by learning from one another's experiences in order to accommodate diversity and improve federalism.

Keywords: *Federalism, Diversity, Accommodation, Nigeria, India.*

Introduction

Following the demise of the fictitious concept of uniformity, diversity is now more widely recognized as the norm in human and social interactions in a globalized and interdependent world. Conflicts arising from diversity can be settled through federal institutional mechanisms in multi-cultural communities. Federalism is viewed as a comprehensive plan for coexistence. Harmonizing, negotiating various interests and identities is a constant or dynamic process. Federalism is a kind of political structure based on a balance between shared and individual authority that is protected by the constitution (Elazar, 1987). Both Nigeria and India are federal nations that are extremely diverse, yet they have quite distinct political histories. Manor claims that India's federalism has enabled the "politics of bargaining" to continue (Manor, 1998). However, Suberu argues that federalism in Nigeria has been completely insufficient to address distributive tensions and regional conflicts despite its good effects (Suberu, 2001). Between 1960-1975 and 1979-1982, Nigeria was a democratic nation; but, between 1966-1978 and 1983-1994, it was an authoritarian one. India, on the other hand, has been a democratic nation ever since it gained its freedom. In this essay, I will try to analyze how federalism works as a tool for accommodating nations with a diversity of cultures and ethnicities. The idea behind this attempt at a comparative analysis stems from the notion that Nigeria and India have a lot in common and may thus learn from one another's experiences. Colonized by the British, India and Nigeria have had contrasting experiences of blending democracy with diversity. Similar to other diverse societies, these two nations have experimented with a variety of constitutional and political processes, with varying degrees of success, to accommodate the political salient form of social diversity in their context.

Diversity and Federalism: A Theoretical Explanation

Diversity may be addressed in a variety of ways, from assimilation to accommodation. The accommodation strategy, which offers multicultural societies, is the finest possibilities. As Kumar Suresh correctly notes, the federal system of accommodation fulfills the fundamental purpose of accommodating variety. He further argues that, the federal form of accommodation is based on the notion of negotiating between autonomy and distinction at one level and identity and unity to another. As a political notion, it therefore opens up the possibility of sharing political space, resources, and opportunities. As a social and cultural philosophy, it is primarily focused on fostering harmonious relationships between groups. As a result, it unites many identities and diversities in a way that cannot be reduced to either an identity of pieces or an identity that has been homogenized. The idea of living together is the most effective way to convey and refer to the harmonizing federal design. Living "together in difference" is a term that accurately describes its true multicultural method of federal accommodation (Kumar, 2005).

Furthermore, as Akhtar Majeed correctly points out, diversity should not be

seen as a liability but rather as a strength that governments may capitalize on. Unfortunately, politicians frequently view diversity as an issue that governments have resolved. Contrarily, diversity must be seen as an opportunity for nations that are enhanced by a variety of languages, cultures, faiths, and traditions. A state can only contribute to a long-term, peaceful growth if it is able to embrace and build upon its diversity as well as cope with and accommodate other people's differences (Majeed, 2005).

On the other hand, scholars have been trying to define the term "federalism" for decades. Most books are a compilation of federal states from throughout the world, with authors tending to emphasis on a comparative approach. The Latin term "foedus," which signifies an alliance of people or groups working toward a common goal is where the English word "federalism" originates, aiming at the "promotion of both specific and common interests" (Karmis and Norman, 2005).

Federalism was previously used to bring together people from different governmental bodies that had a common language and culture; but, in today's world, it is used to bring together people from a variety of religious and cultural backgrounds. Montesquieu was one of the early political philosophers who emphasized the significance of federalism as an important means by which to accommodate a large number of people. He maintains that due to the fact that this particular "government is composed of small republics; it enjoys the internal happiness of

each component" (Montesquieu, 2005). It delivers the highest benefits as a form of governance "appropriate mechanism for accommodating the increasingly 'multicultural' nature of modern societies" (Kymlicka, 2005). To meet the challenges of internal diversity, states have experimented with the federal model (Elazar, 1991; Earle, 1937).

Federalism unites people and organizations in the pursuit of a shared goal. In order to preserve each component party's authenticity and identity, it distributes power and authority. Due to the division of sovereignty's exercise between the federal government and its component divisions, a federal state's authority and power are constrained (Trudeau, 2005). However, due to its extreme flexibility "it can accommodate the desires of different groups by forming various forms of self-government" (Kymlicka, 2005). Nonetheless, "federal structures do not resolve problems, at best it enables them to be managed" (Forsyth, 1989).

The following are the basic tenets of federalism: (a) A central government and a collection of member unit governments that share the same area and population. (a) Citizens have dual citizenship in the federation and the states that make up the federation. (c) The ability to make choices independently at each level of government. (d) The supreme law of the nation is the constitution.

Accommodating Diversity through Federalism

States with a multi-ethnic population are increasingly using federal political

systems today as a way to satisfy the needs of their ethnic groups and safeguard their territorial integrity. Some nations choose federal systems because it is another instrument for limiting governmental authority, for example USA and Germany. On the other hand, several nations, like India, Nigeria, Canada, Sri Lanka, Ethiopia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, and many more, embraced because it accommodated their diversity. Comparatively speaking to other forms of governance, federalism is a unique mechanism for accommodating diversity. It was believed that intra-state federalism was the only way to accept the various tribal, ethnic, and linguistic groups that exist within a single political system in the African environment. This is because the federal concept has traditionally been used to address issues that arise from the conflict between unity and diversity.

It should be underlined that a nation as different as India in terms of language, culture, religion, and other factors must embrace multi-cultural policies in order to preserve such diversity. Of course, implementing multicultural policy in various countries is not simple. The majority of nations worry that accepting diversity will cause social division and obstruct the development of a harmonious society. Additionally, it might be difficult politically to accept diversity. As a result, many regimes either repress or ignore these various identities in the political sphere. Contrary to this, there are several nations today that favor multiculturalism and value diversity. Linguistic diversity needs to be recognized, acknowledged, and given room in the public policy discourse since

language, ethnicity, and religion are the most significant markers of identity and sources of conflict in multiple society.

A multicultural society's unique characteristics produce circumstances that cannot be altered since they are based on a shared past. Furthermore, they cannot be successfully altered by infringing upon fundamental human rights like language or religion. These differences are qualitative rather than quantitative, making it impossible for a majority to change them alone. This contrasts with economic differences, which may be altered in a society through more equality or through majority-approved political policies. Additionally, they frequently have symbolic and emotional underpinnings. Although they can accept diversity in part through centrally directed decentralization, unitary regimes do not grow on diversity. On the other hand, federations can simultaneously offer regional self-rule for the federal units that are guaranteed by the constitution as well as shared-rule at the national level, such as through a two-chamber system or even in the structure of the executive. Federal systems can also set up procedures for the peaceful resolution of disputes amongst various groups or acknowledge diversity via the creation of new component entities. Diversity improves politics, society, law, and the judicial system. They promote tolerance, adaptability, and respect for one another. Human beings are varied by nature. A political system that capitalizes on and celebrates diversity provides more justice and better guarantees of human dignity because it acknowledges the fact that humans come in a variety of forms and

accepts this reality (Watts & Chattopadhyay, 2008).

Diversity causes issues, particularly when the communities or groups within the political system are treated unfairly or discriminatorily. The federal structure looks to be the greatest option in this situation for incorporating multiple cultural groupings.

Diversity and Federalism in Nigeria

Nigeria is situated on West Africa's southern coast. Nigeria, also referred to as the "Giant of Africa," has the biggest population of any African state at over 160 million people and a vast land area that is almost twice the size of California. Since its official independence from the British Empire in 1960, it has existed as a federal state under a variety of names, and it is, without a doubt, the most important economic and military power in the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) (Burgess, 2012).

Only three of the 54 nations in Africa are seen to have functional federal systems: South Africa (1995), Ethiopia (1995), and Nigeria (1999). Nigeria, a multiethnic and culturally diverse country, has seen conflicts brought on by these differences. The need to accommodate diversity in order to foster stability and advance development is one of Nigeria's most pressing issues today. Ethnic and religious conflicts have historically and present-day continued to be causes of violence. For instance, since gaining independence from the British imperialists in 1960, every election has resulted in violence between groups who disagree with the results: religious conflicts between

Muslims and Christians, ethnic conflict between the majority and minority, civil unrest, and insurgencies.

Nigeria reclaimed its freedom from colonial domination on October 1, 1960. But it wasn't until 1963 that the British Queen was replaced as the country's ceremonial head of state that it officially became a republic. In order to accommodate the separation of powers between the central government and the federating units, the constitution for the independent state was written in a federal format and organizational structure. This was articulated rather clearly in the Constitution, namely in Chapter 1, which states: "the federation of Nigeria shall consist of "Regions and a Federal capital territory" (Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1960). In a system quite similar to that of the United States of America, the three regions that made up the federal framework each had their own constitution in addition to the federal document. However, due to the fact that the federal government in 1964 had a lot of problems establishing the mid-western region, it did not allow enough room for the expansion of other areas to the point where they could accept other ethnic groups. Due to the flawed structure, just three zones were assigned to the 250 different ethnic groups.

The fourth after independence, and current, Nigerian constitution was adopted in 1999. Preamble is when the constitution is introduced. "We the people of the Federal Republic of Nigeria" in addition, subsection (2) of section 2 stipulates that Nigeria shall be "a federation consisting of 36 states and a

federal capital territory distributing authority among 774 local government councils as subnational units and the federal government" (Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999). This prologue makes the assertion that it can indicate that the Nigerian people were consulted by its drafters. However the text was entirely created by a military administration without any public input, making the assertion incoherent (Burgess, 2012).

Nigeria doesn't have any state constitutions. Because it keeps the greatest portion of the money and distributes to the state governments in accordance with a revenue formula, the federal government is still highly strong. The states rely heavily on the federal government in terms of state independence. There are 68 provisions on the executive list of the constitution that provide the federal government the authority to enact laws and collect taxes, compared to just 12 things on the concurrent list that balance power. "By mandating that a minimum of 13 percent of the revenue accruable to the Federation Account from natural resources extracted from any state should be returned to that state" (Constitution of Republic of Nigeria, 1999), the Constitution established specific constitutional procedures designed to improve the situation of the constituent states from which such resources were extracted. This provision was included in the Constitution as one of the specific constitutional procedures designed to improve the situation of the constituent states. In addition, the Constitution mandated the creation of a Federation Account, which became the repository for all funds contributed to or received by the federal government. The "derivation principle" applied to this. States are forced to rely on the federal police since they lack the ability to form their own militias. As a result, they have no actual control over security and are unable to stop the federal government's tyranny. Secession is prohibited by the constitution because it shows a strong desire to leave the union, as "Nigerians to live in unity and harmony as one indivisible and indissoluble sovereign nation" (Ayau & Dakar, 2005).

Ethnic and Religious Diversity in Nigeria

Nigeria may be described as one of the most severely split States in Africa because of its complex structure and network of ethnic groupings, religion, history of political disputes, and civil war. The ' most fundamental and politically salient identity' is typically considered to be ethnicity. According to a survey conducted by Lewis and Bratton in 2007, 48.2% of Nigerians self-identify as belonging to a particular ethnic group, compared to 24% who identify as belonging to a certain social class and 21% who identify as belonging to a particular religious group (Osaghae & Suberu 2005). According to contemporary classifications, there are approximately 250 separate ethnic groups living in ancient homelands, each with its unique needs. Igbo, Yoruba, and Hausa/Fulani are the three principal dominating ethnicities in Nigeria; the rest of the population is considered to be a minority. The northern part of the country is dominated by Hausa/Fulani. Analysts divide Nigeria into a mostly Christian south and a predominantly Muslim north in order

to categorize the country (Oranika, 2004). In the south, ethnicity, not religion, serves as the dividing line. Religion separates Christians from Muslims in the north notwithstanding the prevalence of ethnic minorities. Parties are established along racial and religious lines, and government programs are carried out in a manner that mirrors this aspect of the nation's political atmosphere. Cohesion has thus always been difficult in a country with a population estimated at over 160 million in 2006.

The revival and subsequent expansion of Islamic law in the Muslim North has brought forth the issue of religious strife in the federation. Nigerian civilization is characterized by three primary faiths: Islam, Christianity, and other traditional native religions all coexist in this region. Traditional African faiths are still extensively followed, however they primarily correspond to the north (Hausa Fulani), the south and south-east (Igbo), and the west (Yoruba). There are around 250 minority ethnic, religious, and linguistic identities that are institutionally invisible since they are not included in the definition of these dominant groups and communities. However, since its start in the post-colonial era, the question of inter-religious coexistence has been a fundamental component of Nigerian federalism.

The "Federal Character" idea, which dates back to the 1979 Constitution, was incorporated into Article 14 of the 1999 Constitution in an effort to normalize the cultural and ideological diversity that the federal state had inherited. By incorporating and directing these differences into a framework of principles that could successfully accommodate, defend, and advance their interests and identities, it was intended to legally recognize the live, breathing diversity in the body politic. This necessitated balancing significant sub-state divisions and diversities with the overriding objective of national unity, translated into concrete goals. The idea was initially focused on ethnic-national and geographical proportionate representation in the offices and agencies of the federal government rather than religion per se. Although place, status, origin, sex, religion, and ethnic or linguistic associations were included in the directive to "actively encourage" national integration and the federal character of the nation in the current Constitution, it had not been necessary in the past to take into account the Muslim-Christian divide. Since 1999, however, this emphasis, which had been growing in some states due to dissatisfaction with the distribution of offices, has significantly shifted to focus more on this particular clash of cultural diversity. This shift came about as a result of dissatisfaction with the distribution of offices. Fortunately, rather than at the federal level, these ethno-religious conflicts seem to be localized in certain of the states, making it likely that they may be effectively defused there (Burgess, 2012).

The federal concept was tested in Nigeria. It is clear that holding the country together has been its biggest accomplishment after a little more than 60 years. There is only one way to achieve national unity: through the federal system. Following the Biafran civil war in 1970, this was the key lesson that was discovered.

Since that time, the history of Nigeria's federation has been fraught with difficulty, as the country's legitimate government and system have been subjected to numerous internal difficulties and threats. However, there are still other significant sources of weakness, such as widespread corruption, a patchy record on human rights, social injustice, excessive polity centralization, election fraud, continued military influence, a lack of modernization, and the frailty of its democratic political culture. The politicization of religion and unequal resource distribution are likely the two issues that divide the country the most right now. The continued existence of the state, the recent relative internal peace and harmony, the emergence of civil society and its organizations, the gradual understanding and acceptance of federal liberal democracy, and Nigeria's expanding international role as a regional economic and military power in ECOWAS and the African Union must all be weighed against these weaknesses. However, this is the most important factor to consider. However, even after creating Nigeria in 1960, politics and the federal government are still involved in the mission of creating Nigerians.

Accommodating Diversity in Nigeria

Additionally, its constitution, in contrast to Nigeria's, has been eager to bind its component identities to the concept of territoriality. This has led to the development of nine separate sub-state units that have been developed in accordance with "settlement patterns, language, identity, and permission of the people involved." It is important to keep in mind that the solution to the problem of ethnic strife in Nigeria was to reorganize the country's 36 states in a way that (as far as was practically possible) prevented any one ethnic group, tribal group, or religious group from dominating any one of these units. It is clear that ethnic conflict results from the denial of the fundamental rights to access, identity, autonomy, security, and equality. This is made worse by the authoritarian roles that the government and the military play in society.

Religious freedom is protected by the constitution as well as other laws and regulations, and in reality, the government largely upholds these freedoms. The government "must not adopt any faith as State Religion," according to the constitution. Occasionally, the government-imposed restrictions on religious activities to meet security and general safety concerns. Along with a Federal Capital Territory, there are 36 states. Despite the fact that state governors and state legislatures have a great deal of autonomy in decision-making, the constitution prohibits state and municipal governments from establishing a state religion or giving preferential treatment to any religious or ethnic community. This is due to the fact that the constitution prohibits such actions. The Constitution grants each state the authority to establish courts in accordance with either common law or customary law as they see fit. In addition to courts governed by common law and courts governed by customary law, twelve of Nigeria's northern states also possessed Sharia courts that presided over both criminal and civil matters.

Three statements about Nigeria may be made regarding managing ethnic and religious diversity for national integration: First, both nationally and within areas, there is a lot of disparity. Second, state policies are probably quite regressive, with a disproportionate amount of spending going to local and national elites. Third, both common and elite Nigerians have a propensity to evaluate their community in terms of ethnicity or religion. We must thus ask ourselves the following questions: (i) How much of Nigerian politics may be attributed to ethnic (or religious) proclivities, and how much of it can be attributed to the country's long history of cultural diversity? (ii) How much do they result from a competition for resources in a particular institutional setting? (iii) How much do they contribute to and detract from political conflict? What organizations with constitutional support can be created to handle this ethnic and cultural variety and conflicts? (v) What steps may be taken to bring about national cohesion in Nigeria? Before Nigeria became independent, its constitutional experiences were mostly centered on controlling ethnicity, which had already shown clear signs of weakening the nation-building process. Nigeria has employed a variety of strategies to manage its ethnic diversity, including federalism, the creation of regional, state, and local governments, the transition from parliamentary to presidential government, the institutionalization of quota systems, the outlawing of ethnic political parties, consociational politicking, and the adoption of the federal character principle. In addition, the country has adopted the federal character principle (Oranika 2004). Institutionalists, who contend that there is a link between the type of political institutions and ethnic strife or peace, have supported these procedures intellectually.

The federal character concept has in many ways evolved into a storehouse for Nigeria's current problems, concerns, and difficulties. In essence, it serves as a gauge for the nation's civil society and grassroots pressures. The federal character principle is incapable of preventing privileged groups or individuals across the nation from manipulating sectional control of key offices of state, such as the military and the police force, just as it was not capable of preventing Northern (Muslim) politicians from holding the presidency for almost 40 years, from 1960 to 1999.

Diversity and Federalism in India

For the Indian states, federalism has served as a highly effective method for managing diversity and resolving associated problems since the time of independence. As has been mentioned, federal policies to address cultural and ethnic conflicts are strictly related to democracy, which stipulates that any political association or institution (whether statehood, sub-statehood, tribal or regional councils) that ethnic groups may demand as the fulfillment of their identity needs, must be democratically based and formed by the consent of the "ethnic" electorate and not to be something that "naturally" comes about. This means that any political association or institution that ethnic groups demand as the fulfillment of their identity needs must be democratic. The dynamic nature of Indian

federalism is explained by the significance of the democratic process and the founders' long-term perspective in attempting to combine a strong core with a federal structure.

"Cultural rights" articles 29 and 30 of the Indian constitution provide a general definition of the terms at hand. According to the provisions of article 29, "any section of the citizens residing in the territory of India or any part of thereof having a distinct language, culture, script or culture of its own shall have the right to conserve the same Group rights," which are accorded to "any part of the citizenry," are used in this scenario in a far larger framework, one that takes into account linguistics, script, and cultural practices. This is a fairly general assumption that may be applicable to any one of the hundreds of different local languages or dialects that are spoken, throughout the subcontinent, including the 22 languages that are currently recognized officially (including those in the Eight Schedule as Union or State official languages). The addition of the idea of a "distinct culture" to language and script is not only extremely relevant and novel, but it also expands the application of this article to include not only any other social group that is capable of claiming a distinct culture, language, "its own distinct culture" but also religious minorities (thereby reinforcing their protected status). According to clause (2) of the same article, no person shall be refused entrance to any educational institution on the basis of merely religion, race, caste, language, or any combination of these reasons, and article 30 stipulates the scope of this protection for groups, as "all minorities, whether based on religion or language, shall have the right to establish and administer educational institutions of their choice" (Basu, 2004).

Asymmetrical federalism was established into the 1950 constitution in response to the complex and asymmetrical nature of Indian society. The most notable example of an imbalance in power between states is the special status that article 370 of the constitution grants to the state of Jammu and Kashmir. As a result of this provision, the state of Jammu and Kashmir was able to create its own constitution, which was ratified in 1957, and the legislative assembly was granted a set of specific legislative powers. However, in August 2019 the special status of Jammu and Kashmir through article 370 has been revoked by the parliament and now Jammu and Kashmir becomes the Union Territory with the provision of legislature. Even more noteworthy is the fact that Article 371 eliminates asymmetrical provisions for a number of states, including as Maharashtra, Gujarat, Assam, Manipur, Andhra Pradesh, Sikkim, and Mizoram. In addition, the scope of Article 371 has been broadened to encompass Articles 371 A, B, C, D, E, and F, as well as Article 371 G. (Basu, 2004).

Since the previous four or more decades, diversity and multiculturalism have significantly altered Indian federalism, and as a result, they have received both criticism and acclaim. Today, federalism has become a key tenet of Indian democracy as a means of embracing diversity and power sharing in many forms and expressions. The significance of the federal principle in

accepting diversity has therefore been substantially verified by the advances in Indian democracy over the last few decades. However, the functioning of India's federal system also displays several shortcomings and limitations, both structurally and operationally. In retrospect, one understands that the federal system pattern that India had chosen, namely the Union form with its marked lean towards centralization of authority, had certain inherent weaknesses. Some of these defects and shortcomings emerged as the federal system and its procedures took shape, while others surfaced as popular demands for more state and local autonomy and for the redress of grievances gained traction in the form of regionalism. Since independence, if not before, regionalism has been possibly the most powerful factor in Indian politics. India is home to a wide variety of languages, cultures, tribes, groups, religions, and other identity markers. The geographical concentration of these identity markers encourages regionalism, which is further fueled by a sense of regional deprivation. People who live in India's underdeveloped regions have a sense of separatism due to their sense of regionalism. It has mostly fueled conflict and animosity between the center and the states, which has shown itself in calls for statehood, secession, and more state autonomy (Sofi, 2016).

Linguistic Diversity in India

India is regarded as having one of the most complex and diverse linguistic cultures in the whole globe. The entire number of languages, mother tongues, dialects, and speech subtypes used in the nation proved difficult to tally. Since the 1961 census, the mother tongue category has generated the greatest debate. A significant decrease in the number of languages actually spoken was shown in the 1991 census report, which included 1652 mother tongues. This shows that minority languages have been supplanted by dominant languages (Sarangi 2009).

During the campaign for Indian independence, there was a lot of controversy about the language to use for the new country and the diversity of languages in India. One alternative was to keep using English for official reasons when colonial countries gained independence, and several did so. However, a lot of people, like Mahatma Gandhi, strongly believed that speaking a foreign language would not be suitable (Baldridge, 2002). Given the difficulties between Hindus and Muslims over religion, Gandhi advocated the adoption of Hindustani, a language that was a compromise between Hindi and Urdu. However, Hindi gained popularity when India and Pakistan were divided. Articles 343 and 344 designated Hindi, which is written in the Devanagari script, as the new country's official language. With the intention of reevaluating its status as a secondary official language after fifteen years, English was chosen to be the secondary official language.

The Indian Constitution's Eighth Schedule grants official and legal recognition to different languages and their people in the areas of governance, education, the economy, and social standing. The languages that are classified in the

Eighth Schedule are awarded a specific level of cultural capital as a result of the crucial role that they play in social mobility. The initial version of the Eighth Schedule had 14 different languages. The list of 22 scheduled languages recognized by the constitution is seen in today's Eighth Schedule. Despite the fact that there has been an increase in demand from different linguistic groups for inclusion in the eighth schedule. The inclusion of a particular language or a variant of that language in the Eight Schedule is contingent on a number of factors. These factors include the number of speakers of the language, the breadth of the cultural heritage associated with the language, as well as the language's classical and standardized form. As a result, the center has recognized languages in accordance with federal regulations.

Accommodating Diversity in India

Minority languages and cultures are protected under the Indian Constitution. Minorities are described as being "based on religion or language" in the Indian Constitution. The Constitution has many clauses that defend the rights of linguistic minorities. Languages and the rights of linguistic minorities to retain their "distinct language, script, or culture" are discussed in Articles 29, 30, and 350 (Basu, 2004).

The difficulty with the three-language system since it leaves room for India's linguistic diversity. According to the Three-Language Formula, a person is required to study their mother tongue or a regional language for a minimum of 10 years, one of the official languages, either Hindi or English, for a minimum of 6 years, and the third language must be either another modern Indian language or a foreign language. The Three-Language Formula is a planning tool for language learning that may be used when deciding which languages will be offered in educational settings. There is agreement among states that secondary school pupils should get native language education or instruction in a regional language, even if not all of them endorse the Three-Language Formula (Cynthia Groff, 2003).

It also noted that the following factors contribute to the difficulty in implementing the three-language formula: a) the heavy linguistic load in the school curriculum; b) the lack of incentive in northern schools to teach a South Indian language; and c) the reluctance to teaching Hindi in southern schools, notably in Tamil Nadu, and (d) the expense of setting up instruction.

Abbi correctly points out the increasing loss of language diversity in India as a result of wider cultural homogenization processes and the effects this has on the social life of the affected linguistic minorities. As a result, in India, a language's prestige is defined by how often it is acknowledged. There are now 22 languages included in the Eighth Schedule that are recognized as official languages, although only one of them, Hindi, is regarded as the national language. Now that the Constitution has been amended, linguistic minorities are allowed the freedom to establish their own educational institutions for the purpose of preserving and advancing their language and culture, and the government will financially assist them in doing so (Abbi, 2009).

A Comparative Analysis

According to the historical study of Nigeria, federalism was adopted as a way to accept and manage diversity. However, the research starkly demonstrates that the key elements for success are not there. The "inconclusive nature of the federal character" is confirmed by the constitutions written both before and after independence as: First, the fusion of the constituent ethnic groups was forced upon them against their will. Nigeria's basic existence as a state is in doubt, and its innate instability is clear. It was through the use of force as opposed to the permission of the several towns that comprised it that its federal structure was founded.

Second, Nigeria's federalism consists of partners who are compelled to work together by force and the international community. Additionally, the central government's influence over the areas or states was strengthened as a result of the civil war and military dictatorship that followed. These two elements are at odds with one another in Nigeria. Thirdly, this is not the case in Nigeria since, historically speaking, constitutions were created to stifle diversity rather than represent the nation's multiethnic makeup. Conflicts have arisen as a result of societal pressures, which are mostly responsible for reshaping institutions and changing systems. Threats to the unity of the nation-state include ignoring these underlying sociocultural distinctions and failing "to limit the regions of conflict" (Otite, 1976). Every need for federalism has been broken by colonialists and later by indigenous governments throughout

Nigeria's history. After independence, there was never any place for conversation or supportive considerations. There has never been a turning moment to create a constitution that reflects a federal structure and reflects the objectives of component entities during the course of its sixty years. As federalism is designed to manage and accommodate variety in Nigeria, it virtually becomes impossible.

In the state of Zamfara, all criminal proceedings that include Muslims are required to be tried by a "Sharia court." In Niger and Kano, two additional states that also follow Sharia law, Muslims were given the option to choose common law courts for their criminal prosecutions. In adultery and fornication cases, certain Qadis (Sharia court judges) allegedly enforced harsher punishments to women than to men and demanded greater evidence to condemn men than to convict women. The government sought advice from the Nigerian Inter-Religious Council (NIREC) on how to reduce violence between religious groups. NIREC had quarterly meetings that were rotated around the nation. The federal government continued to openly support NIREC's work despite the organization's independence and apparently supplied cash for meeting expenses (Burgess, 2012).

There are some provisions within the Indian Constitution that render it incapable of functioning as a federal government in the same sense as the United States Constitution. Although it is asserted that neither the Union nor the States have [absolute] internal sovereignty within India because of the division of powers between

the Union and the States, both governments have full authority within their designated spheres, there are some provisions in the Constitution that are thought to be in conflict with the federalism principle. This is despite the fact that it is asserted that neither the Union nor the States have [absolute] internal sovereignty within India. For instance, the Constitution's Article 200 provides that state governors have the authority to set aside for the president of India the authority to examine certain legislation that have been approved by their respective state legislatures. Articles 356, 352, and 360, which give the president the authority to declare an emergency and can turn a federal system into a unitary system, are another article that is thought to violate the federalism principle. However, the provision is only intended to be temporary and can only be used in exceptional circumstances with restrictions imposed by the courts. There are several instances in which the federal government has unlawfully assumed the responsibilities of the state governments. In the case of S.R. Bommai v. Union of India, it was ruled that democracy and federalism are important parts of our constitution and are a part of the fundamental structure of our government. This decision was upheld by the Supreme Court of India. This represents a change in the way that Indian federalism has been construed (Fadia, 2005).

We have seen up to this point that the Indian Constitution strives to keep religion and religious concerns out of the state's business, whether it be public employment or education. It also intends to grant Indian citizens freedom of conscience and choice of religion. On the other hand, we have seen that the constitution also contains provisions meant to prevent the government from interfering in issues of faith. As stated in the Preamble to the constitution, one of the goals of the Indian Republic is to advance social, economic, and political justice as well as equality of opportunity and position for all of its citizens. This is one of the Indian Republic's proclaimed objectives. We spoke about how article 25 grants everyone the freedom of conscience and religion in the previous section. It does, however, state that this freedom is dependent on public order. It is obvious that the state is actually granted a lot of influence, aside from matters of conscience and religious preference.

The debate over how the Indian Constitution treats the connection between the state and religion has shown various ways in which the constitution strikes a balance between the need to forge a unified country and India's heterogeneous reality. A single Indian national identity and several group identities based on caste or religion are attempted to be reconciled by the Indian form of secularism. This aim led to the creation of a system that allows people to choose and practice their religion and ensures that they are not subjected to religious discrimination. The state is forbidden from promoting any one religion and is assumed to be distant and impartial in matters of religion. The state is frequently permitted to interfere with these rights, particularly when they concern collective rights or the rights of denominations and religious institutions, in order to ensure social welfare for the underprivileged groups in Indian society, despite the fact that

the separation of religion and state was probably the ideal.

Conclusion

It is possible to accommodate and bring together people with various political and cultural opinions by using a federal form of governance. Federalism distributes authority between the centre and component entities as a general rule. These parts can retain their individuality while being a part of a bigger whole. Federalism is thus ideal for a state like Nigeria or India that has several ethnic and religious identities. This study proved that Nigeria's decision to federate was caused by its diversity. On the other hand, it was found out that federalism is incapable of effectively managing and accommodating diversity because it is inherently unstable. The lack of federal requirements, such as the autonomy of state actors, desirability, and agreement, limited international influence, and a feeble central authority, are to blame for this instability.

The Nigerian state's very foundation is in doubt, but there is yet hope for improvement if we can find a way to address the problems, which Nigeria is facing. The basic problems of Nigeria cannot be fixed by the country's present structure; a dramatic change is required. New agreements between the different constituent groupings are required; these organizations should stand on a platform free from the shackles of the international community. The outcomes will be the consequence of social cooperation and agreement, in which each actor's willingness is engaged. These are the pillars and prerequisites for federalism's ability to handle and accommodate diversity.

The Nigerian government should provide a framework to support these federal circumstances, according to this study's recommendations. Ethnic communities will be able to completely negotiate their standing inside the federal system through to the platform provides by the government. The results of the discussions will be reflected in the Nigerian constitution, resulting in a nation where all people and all groups are able to experience a sense of belonging.

In contrast to Nigeria, a multicultural nation like India benefits from the theory and practice of federalism since it tends to advance democratic ideas and temperament by acknowledging, accepting, and defending many regional identities and rights. Therefore, in order to create a new federal identity for India, the immense diversity and innumerable types of identities must not only be reconciled but also protected, supported, and accepted. This is the central focus of the process of creating a federal country. It does not, however, imply that all of the components and features of diversity and all forms of identity must be preserved. The nation's unity and integrity are still threatened by a few flaws and vulnerabilities in the Indian federal structure. Unless it is absolutely necessary for the sake of the country, the central government should not meddle in local or state matters. In order for the formerly underdeveloped areas to feel like a part of the country as a whole, there should be a need to encourage their even growth. People's problems must be resolved in a legal and peaceful manner. The topic of regional needs cannot be used by politicians for their own purposes. When it comes to

managing their own affairs, the states ought to be afforded increased degrees of autonomy and flexibility, with the exception of issues that are of significance on the national level. Changes in centre-state relations are required to benefit the states and to implement a national education system that would enable individuals to get over their regional prejudices and grow to love their country. The federal objective of strengthening democratic development based on decentralized government and increased autonomy for units would be furthered by the formation of smaller states. If these are feasible to design, carry out, and effect, then we can truly be proud of having the best democracy with the greatest harmony and a wide variety of both natural and man-made landscapes.

For the multilingual state, the language problem must be acknowledged. Language ought to be considered a public good. A language grows stronger the more people who use it, and another distinctive quality is the function it plays in elevating the user community's standing in the country's economy. According to Patten, any method of language public acknowledgment should promote the "communication, symbolic affirmation, and identity" of multiple language groups in a multilingual society. Use of a specific language for governmental, business, and administrative reasons is a significant determinant of user community productivity (Patten, 2001). With the help of the federal accommodation concept, Nigeria and India have both managed their diversity to a certain extent. India and Nigeria both have long-standing divisions based on cultural identities.

Federalism is used in both situations to handle the diversity and cleavages resulting from racial and ethnic identities. Through federal mechanisms, both nations tolerate diversity, but we still need to develop institutions and policies that make diversity more accommodating and responsive to a diverse society.

References

Abbi, Anvita (2009).Vanishing Diversities and Submerging Identities: An Indian Case, in Asha Sarangi (ed.), *Language and Politics in India,* Oxford University Press, New York, 299-311.

Ayau, Ignatius Akaayar, and Dakar, C. J. (2005). Federal Republic of Nigeria, in John Kincaid and G. Alan Tarr, *Constitutional Origins, Structure, and Change in Federal Countries.*, McGill-Queen's University Press, Quebec,254.

Baldridge, J. (2002). Reconciling Linguistic Diversity: The History and the future of Language Policy in India, Obtained from http://www.languageinindia.com.may/ 2002, 1-3.

Basu, D. D. (2008). *Comparative Federalism*, Wadhwa and Company Law Publishers, New Delhi, i-x.

Basu, D.D. (2004). *Introduction to Constitution of India*, Wadhwa and Company Law Publishers, Nagpur,i-xii.

Burgess, Michel (2012). *Federalism in Africa,* Working paper on The Federal Idea, Quebec, 13-16.

Earle, Edward Mead (1937).Introduction, in The Federalist, *Institute for Advanced Study*, Princeton,viii.

Elazar, Daniel (1991), Introduction, in Elazar, Daniel, *Federal Systems of the World: A Handbook of Federal, Confederal and Autonomy Arrangement*, Longman Group UK Limited, Essex, 1-20.

Elazer, Daniel J. (1987). *Exploring Federalism,* University of Albama Press, Tuscaloosa, 29-30.

Fadia, B. L. (2005). *Indian Government and Politics*, Sahitya Bhawan Publications, Agra, 105-10.

Forsyth, Murray (1989). Introduction, in Murray Forsyth, *Federalism and Nationalism*, Leicester University Press, Leicester, 1-7.

Groff, Cynthia (2003). *Status and Acquisition Planning and Linguistic Minorities in India,* University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education, USA, 1-17.

Karmis, D, and W Norman (2005).The Revival of Federalism in Normative Political Theory, in D. Karmis and W. Norman, *Theories of Federalism: A Reader,* Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 4-26.

Kumar, Suresh (2005). *Managing Diversity in Plural Societies*, Manak Publications Pvt. Ltd., CFS, New Delhi, 41-44.

Kymlicka, Will (2005).Federalism, Nationalism, and Multiculturalism, in D. Karmis and W. Norman, *Theories of Federalism: A Reader*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 269-89

Majeed, Akhtar (2005). *An Introduction to Federalism*, Manak Publications Pvt. Ltd., Delhi, 1-17.

Manor, James (1998). Making Federalism Work, *Journal of Democracy*. Vol.(9), 9.

Montesquieu (2005).What Manner Republics Provide for their Safety, in D. Karmis and W. Norman*, Theories of Federalism: A Reader*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 55-57.

Oranika, Paul (2004).*Nigeria: One Nation, Two Systems.* Baltimore: Publish America, 1-17.

Otite, Onigu (1976).On the Concept of a Nigerian Society, in A.O. Sanda, *Ethnic Relations in Nigeria*, Caxton Press West Africa, Ibadan, 15.

Patten, Alan (2001). Political Theory and Language Policy, *Political Theory,* 29, (5), 1-10.

Sarangi, Asha, (ed.2009). *Language and Politics in India*, Oxford University Press, New York, 299-311.

Sofi, Wassem Ahmad (2016). Federalism, Regionalism and Accommodation of Unity and Diversity in India, *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*. 4, (7), 26-31.

Suberu, Rotimi (2001). *Federalism and Ethnic conflict in Nigeria*, United States Institute for Peace Press, Washington D.C., 10-20.

Trudeau, Pierre Elliot (2005). Nationalism and Federalism, in D. Karims and Wayne Norman, *Theories of Federalism.* Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 221-25.

Watts, Ronald L., Chattopadhyay, Rupak (eds. 2008). *Building on and Accommodating Diversities,* Viva Books, New Delhi, 3-8.