

## THE POLEMOS BETWEEN NIGERIA AND NIGERIANS: PERSPECTIVE FROM HEIDEGGER'S OPENNESS OF BEING

Joseph Nnaemeka Agbo, PhD

Department of Philosophy and Religion

Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Nigeria

[jeocoagbo@gmail.com](mailto:jeocoagbo@gmail.com)

DOI: [10.13140/RG.2.2.21646.33605](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.21646.33605)

### Abstract

*The tears, fears and jeers within the Nigerian state seriously demand that Nigerians and the peoples of the world make an urgent and inevitable choice: to save the concept called "Nigeria" or the people called "Nigerians". With life, the most treasured aspect of human existence, becoming valueless in Nigeria, the country has become a metaphor of a gigantic human abattoir. This paper is a hermeneutic application of Heidegger's concept of Polemos (a Greek word that originally means war but which he ontologically reinterpreted as confrontation) as well as the "openness of Being" to the ambivalence between the Nigerian State and the peoples within her geographical territory. Polemos as confrontation should have been necessarily significant as a tool of engagement by the peoples in Nigeria. However, the paper argues that the occupation of the open region by the Caliphate-driven Nigerian State has ensured that there is neither mutual engagement among the peoples nor is there harmony between the Nigerian State and the Nigerian peoples. Employing the expository, historical and hermeneutic methods, the paper argues that the annexation and the domination of the cultural, political, economic and religious spaces by the drivers of the state has resulted in a Polemos that has left Nigerians gasping for survival breathes. The paper argues further that the initial motive for this culture of domination was religion and then, with the discovery of crude oil, the motive was exacerbated by economics. The paper thus reopens the call for a Sovereign National Conference (SNC) as the most-viable and peaceful option open to Nigerians to rescue Nigeria and prevent further collateral damage. The paper, however, concludes by positing that a new type of Polemos is required to clear the open space dominated by the state so that the being of Nigerians would become meaningful. For why should Haruna, Oluwole, Attah, Okpara, Obot, Agbonifo, Eno, Ihua, etc be sacrificed to save a terminology called "Nigeria"?*

**Keywords:** Being, Crude oil, Fulanislamization, Heidegger, Nigeria, Openness, Polemos.

## Introduction

Judged by its hapless record in the colony and provinces, the Nigerian System may be described as perfect crime of clumsiness reflecting a pitiful aspect of woe. The three basic principles necessary for the successful working of the Nigerian System are ignorance, fear and military terrorism; that is to say, the perpetuation of the natives in a state of idolized ignorance; the impregnation of their minds with an instinctive dread of the Whiteman and reverential ill of white prestige; and the paralyzation of their wills by the spectacle of military terrorism hanging over their heads like the sword of Demacles.

- The Lagos Weekly Record (February 1-22, 1919, in Kirk-Green, 1968) (273).

The above quotation depicts how The Lagos Weekly Record (a colonial newspaper) described and celebrated the retirement of Frederick D. Lugard in 1919 as Nigeria's Governor-general. But my interest is not in the man, Lugard. It is rather on the character of the state which he created and administered for 5 years (1914-1919). When one reads the account above in 2022, one hundred years after it was penned down, one discovers that the Nigerian state even appears to operate a Worse "system" today than in 1919. Perhaps, the only thing missing is the fact that the "Whiteman" is no longer directly in charge.

How did the Nigerian state emerge from among mutually co-operating and interacting peoples to create a tears-filled, fear-invoking and terror-stricken society? How can extra efforts be made to save a terminology, a concept, or a state, to the detriment of the flesh and blood, the human beings, within her territory? How did we submit to the intimidating and blackmailing mantra that the unity of Nigeria is "non-negotiable"? Whose interest is this fugitive unity serving? How can a clime be so blessed, so endowed, with so much potentials, so much human, natural and material resources; yet it has acquired the sobriquet of "the poverty capital of the world"?

The ugly situation within the Nigeria state has acquired the status of intractability because both the managers and analysts of the system have tried to be on the fence; that is, have tended to take the position of neutrality in the ambivalent relationship between the Nigerian state and the Nigerian peoples. One wonders when Nigerians would clear this forge, emerge from what Innocent Asouzu calls "the phenomenon of concealment" ("ihe nkpuichi anya"), and then, rescue their sovereignty. And in this drowning condition, there is no time, no luxury of

neutrality: if Nigeria cannot be rescued with Nigerians, then let Nigeria die so that Nigerians would live.

I have chosen to carry out this rescue effort by employing Heidegger's notion of *Polemos* (confrontation) and the idea of the openness of being. Although, Heidegger is not a classic example of a political philosopher, my interest is in the ontological interpretation of the conundrum in Nigeria has motivated me to draw my analysis from his philosophy, which has a lot of political implications. By the time I explicate the ideas of *polemos* and the openness of being in Heidegger, their significance in addressing the Nigerian situation would be laid bay even to the most-ordinary analyst.

However, before presenting this Heidegger's philosophy, I would briefly summarize the fundamental problems within the Nigerian state that make *Polemos* inevitable. I would do this for the avoidance of doubt-because anyone involved in social thinking within the African (Nigerian) scholarly circle should be conversant with the discussions that have been on for several decades. There are many social, political and economic issues at the top of the tree of the Nigerian state, but we would be more interested in locating the problem at the root of the tree.

I shall also discuss the relationship between the crude oil in the Niger-Delta region and the dominating character of the drivers of the Nigerian state; that is, the existence of a ruling caste that exerts a hegemonic influence on all facets of reality in the country. However, before that, I shall also briefly look at the subtle place of Islamic Jihadism on the unfolding manifestation of events in Nigeria. With the domination of people from the Islamic religion in practically every area of national life, the implication can be far-reaching, especially in a supposedly secular state like Nigeria. Those who hold the conspiracy theory of Islamization use this to justify their position. They argue that such deliberate action contradicts the so-called "federal character", as enshrined, for example in Section 14 (3) of the "Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria";

The composition of the government of the federation or any of its agencies and the conduct of its affairs shall be carried out in such a manner as to reflect the federal character of Nigeria and the need to promote national unity, and also to command national loyalty, thereby ensuring that there shall be no predominance of persons from a few states or from a few ethnic or other sectional groups in that Government or in any agencies.

Since my method here is expository, historical and hermeneutic, I shall also examine the metaphors of Aburi, Abuja and Araba as they relate to the past, present and future, respectively of the Nigerian state. Of course, if we remember the three characteristics of human existence in Heidegger – Existentiality, Facticity and Fallenness – which also represents the phenomenon of the past, present and the future, we then see that we are in familiar ontological ground in this analysis.

### **Nigeria: Sinking Structures On Faulty Foundations**

I begin to justify my call for a Polemos within the Nigerian state by examining the ontological foundation of that state: without intending to belabor or rehash issues that are replete in scholarly and (especially) public literature and circles, respectively, I want to summarize some of the works I have done which addressed these fundamental areas relating to the Nigerian State.

In my book which is titled *Sinking Structures on Faulty Foundations: Social Philosophical Essays on The A.B.C.D of Nigerian's "Failure" State*, I have located the main problems of Nigeria as being ontologically centered around four broad questions: A-malgamation, B-iafra, C-onstitution and D-elita. As it is necessary for one who wants to learn the English Language to begin by the A-B-C-D alphabets, so does Nigeria need to address this A-B-C-D at the core of her being if she hopes to come out of this quagmire. This book is a collection of papers I presented at various conferences in the past decade or thereabout.

The A-challenge (Amalgamation) has at its root the problem of unity. In my paper, "Hundred Years of Britain's Nigeria: A Historical and Philosophical Analysis of the idea of a 'Non-Negotiable' Unity", I had argued that the inability of the ethnic nationalities within the Nigerian state to first, take part in the birth of Nigeria; and second, their not being allowed to fashion the character of the union, have been at the base of the problem in Nigeria. Even Holy Writ has asked in the Bible book of Psalms 11:3 "if the foundation be destroyed, what can the righteous do?"

Although amalgamation was a colonial act, there has been enough time for Nigeria to decide on her being. Yet because of that foundation, the country continues to wobble and fumble in an attempt to develop. The failure to maintain the federal structure (so painstakingly worked out by the countries Founding Fathers between 1950 and 1960) has ensured that every attempt at unity has ended up being unism – the forceful attempt to decree unity as a sloganized ideology.

Nigeria's B-challenge (Biafra) is better situated within the broader issue of the Igbo question. The Igbo question in Nigeria has defiled social, political, economic, psychological interpretations. In my essay, "Biafra: The philosophy of the

Historical Ignorance of a Critical Generation”, I inter alia explained the Biafra question as first, the problem of survival, and then (ultimately) the quest to assert a unique identity in the face of the “pogrom” of the 1960s. Understood as such, Biafra was a “beacon” for survival from physical annihilation as well as the opportunity to say, “Hey, I am different. I want to be identified”.

The failure to address the Biafran question Polemos-ly has led to the Niger-Delta militancy, the Boko haram phenomenon and the agonizing massacre in the Middle-Belt Region, especially in Benue. The difficulty of comprehensive and correct interpretation or explanation of the Biafra-Igbo question has made some analysts (I belong to that group) to give it a “spiritual” under-pining, by arguing that since Ndigbo has some biological and historical affinity with the Jews (Hebrews), they must inevitably suffer the hatred the Jews suffered.

This interpretation is to the fact that no matter what the Igbo does (right or wrong), no matter how the Igbo is (good or bad), as long as he or she is Igbo (even when he or she denies his or her Igboness), he or she, like his or her Hebrew relation, would always be hated. Rudolf Ogoo Okonkwo, in his “The Futile Search for Good a Igbo” posits that:

“Let it be known that the original sin of the Igbo has not changed and would never change. It is the sin of being Igbo. It is from this that all other sins emerge and must not begin a defense of that right or a discussion of their Igboness on the terms of others... For many, a good Igbo is one who is only Igbo in his home, who is not Igbo every day and everywhere, who is apologetic for being Igbo, and who wears the following expression on his forehead: “how dare you assume I am Igbo?”

From the spiritual (Hebrew) perspective, it does appear, therefore, that Nigeria’s survival would largely depend on how she handles the global resurgence of the question for self-determination by Biafrans, represented by the global IPOB agitation I have examined the Biafra-Igbo question in a recent book, *Igbophobia: A Cursory Analyses of the Historical, Economic and Political Conditions of Ndigbo in Nigeria*. I addressed the C-challenge (Constitution) in my paper, “Transforming the Formless: The inevitability of a new Constitution for the survival and Development of Nigeria”. I argue that if the question of amalgamation created the Biafra-Igbo question, the issues surrounding Nigeria’s constitution has been the ultimate sustainer of an unjust state.

Here, my interest is not in a document Named “Constitution”. Rather, my interest is in structure, the form, the packaging, etc of that state. I argued that a document named “Constitution” cannot solve the problem of Constituting”, of how and who

decided to “structure” or “form” the Nigerian state. I employed the metaphor of the logic of well formed formula (wff) to show that Nigeria is not a well formed state (wfs). As a state “not well formed”, Nigeria, under the 1999 Constitution becomes a grossly unjust state.

A constitution that tells a lie in its beginning. “We the people...” (when did we Nigerians produce that document and how?); a constitution that gives “Fundamental Human Rights” in chapter 4, yet goes to section 6 (6)(c) and withdraws the rights, thereby making them non-justiciable; a constitution that contains 68 items in its “Exclusive List” for the Federal government); a constitution that gives the governor (sections 120-123) and the president (sections 90-92) power to spend money (unappropriated) for 6 months; a constitution that does not inspire obedience even by the government it is supposed to have constituted, is at the centre of the loss of sovereignty by the Nigerian peoples

The character of the state constituted by the “1999 constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria” resulted in the D-challenge (the rumble in the Niger-Delta Region). That constitution created an unbalanced structure with an “extensive state” that destroyed the “entitlement” or “derivative” economic formula of revenue that was the centre of and rudder that turned the 1963 Republican Constitution. The consequence is that government agents who are supposed to take care of society on behalf of the people, using the instruments of the state, decide to hijacked the entire Nigerian society and dictate what happens and should happen!

In my paper, “Robert Nozick on the Minimum State, an Entitlement theory of Justice and the Niger-Delta Question,” I have addressed issues relating to the Nigerian state, justice and the economic rape of the Niger-Delta Region by the managers of the state. Also, In the paper "The Poverty of the Forces of Statism and Democratism in Addressing the Niger-Delta Question in Nigeria", I have equally discussed the attempt made to solve the Niger-Delta problem by employing the ever-coercive power of the State as well as the liberal democratic alternative. These attempts have not been successful because they have ignored the fact that the problem is rooted in ethnic nationalism.

When those who manage the affairs of a nation-state behave as though they run a private business enterprise, the result is the type of tears, fears and even jeers in the polity that has become symptomatic of not just a “failed” but a “failure” state. For one can fail and not be a failure. Failure is a condition but failing is an event.

In my paper, “The crisis of Identity and the Quest for Development in Africa: The Place of Leadership in Creating a New Culture”, I had discussed the critical role of purposeful leadership in arresting the cultural drift of a country, using Japan and the U.S.A. as examples. With the annexation of Nigeria’s cultural space by what Chinweizu calls “Caliphate colonialism” (the replacement of colonial Britain by the Hausa-Fulani-Islamic Oligarchy), how does genuine, purposeful leadership emerge? How can we claim to be in a democracy, a liberal democracy, yet the structures, actions and (more critically) agents within the state are clearly undemocratic?

In his popular book, *The Revolution Betrayed*, Leon Trotsky describes the situation of the Soviet Union, just few years after the Socialist Revolution and discusses the need for a “new revolution”. Read the following lines as he captures the state of the Soviet Union under Josef Stalin, and see if you can find much difference between what went on then in the defunct U.S.S.R and the Nigeria of today. According to him:

Discussing the dying away of the state, Lenin write that “the custom of observing the rules of social life can lose all need of compulsion if there is nothing which provokes indignation, protest and revolt, and thus, creates the necessity for repression”. The essence of the matter lies in that “if”. The present regime in the Soviet Union provokes protest at every step; a protest the more burning in that it is repressed. The bureaucracy is not only a machine of compulsion but also a constant source of provocation. The very existence of a greedy, lying and cynical caste of rulers inevitably creates a hidden indignation... The irremovable leaders love to issue statements about the necessity of studying, of acquiring technique, cultural self-education and other admirable things. But the ruling layer itself is ignorant and little cultured. It studies nothing seriously, is disloyal and roots in social contacts... The Soviet population cannot rise to a higher level of culture without freeing itself from this humiliating subjection to a caste of usurpers

My thinking is that only a Poulos that emerges from the creation of a “culture of philosophy”, that goes beyond our age-long focus on the “philosophy of culture”, would provide us the pedestal for any possible “triumph” out of this condition of tears and “fears”. And to that I shall now turn.

### **Poulos, the Openness of Being and Fulanislamization in Nigeria**

One of the major objectives of this work is to provide a basis for Nigerians to move from the state of domination to engagement in their interaction with one another, on the one hand and with the Nigeria state, on the other. To be able to get into the

activity of engagement, one must understand Heidegger's ideas of Polemos and openness of being. For while Polemos makes engagement necessary, it is within the context of the openness of being that engagement becomes possible. Since what is true, what is unconcealed, what is disclosed is understood within the context of a more general opening up of the world, it becomes needful that the ideas of Polemos must be explained.

What is polemos? What is its place in the Heidegger project? And more specifically, what is its place in the search for any political application and adaptation of Heidegger's philosophy? The Greek word "polemos" has been said to be a theme that unites all the various periods of his work and which, although has been largely ignored by commentators, is the key to understanding Heidegger's politics. According to Gregory Fried, in his book *Heidegger's Polemos: from Being to Politics*, Polemos is:

A Greek word usually translated as "war", but that Heidegger transforms into a profound ontological concept through his interpretation of a single fragment from Heraclitus. Polemos for Heidegger must be understood as a confrontation. Only in confrontation do we most fully become what we are beings, summoned to an ongoing interpretative struggle with the meaning of the world and with the meaning of being itself (4).

The theme of Polemos is said to impugn on the issue of belonging and universalism or what is sometimes considered as identity and difference. It is equally tied with his analysis of Being, Dasein, the history of Being, nihilism and the crisis in western culture, as well as his (Heidegger's) hope for a redemption that would have a revolutionary character.

Polemos as "war" in Greek is rendered as "confrontation" by Heidegger through his employment of the German word *Auseinandersetzung*, which does not portray Darwin's struggle to ensure that only the fittest survives (it is not a struggle for existence) nor is it seen in Hobbes' concept of a war of all against all. Within the context of this understanding, confrontation is a respectful and mutual attempt to interpret what is before us. As a result Fried states that:

Confrontation is both a struggle over and an account of the sense of things, but not a naked attempt to impose meaning or dominion. Confrontation expects and indeed demands resistance as a catalyst for understanding...for Heidegger the confrontation constitutes the fundamental conditions of our existence... confrontation describes our being as an interpretative being, as beings for whom the meaning of other, of other beings and of being itself is



at issue... our being is hermeneutic and polemos as confrontation pertains to this interpretative manner of our being, (6).

From the foregoing, we see that confrontation (polemos) is neither an “imposition” nor “domination”. As a “naked attempt”, confrontation takes place in the “open” and involves the positive conception and use of “resistance” as a weapon of resolution of conflict. Each side in a confrontation must distinguish itself and take up its position within a free, bright, radiant, cleared and historically conditioned open region (or space)

This work is stimulated by the conviction that there is need for a polemos, a confrontation between Nigeria and Nigerians and among Nigerians, if we perceive any hope of salvaging the wobbling Nigerian state. There is need to clear the current “funaislamized” Nigeria state for an “open region” where ethnic nationalities can engage in mutually- respectful confrontation, and no nationality should be allowed or desire to “occupy” this free space, since it is exactly this “occupation” that results in the phenomenon of domination and hegemony. After all Heidegger, in “The End of Philosophy and the Task of Thinking” has argued that there is no ground upon which we can stand to prefer one philosophy over another. For every philosophy is the product of a historical epoch and must have served that epoch before anything could be drawn from it that could have relevance, significance and implication for any future epoch. He thus says:

“Not only do we lack any criterion which would permit us to evaluate the perfection of an epoch of metaphysics as compared with any other epoch, the right to this kind of evaluation does not exist. Plato’s thinking is no more perfect than Parmenide’s, Hegel’s philosophy is no more perfect than Kant’s...we simply have to acknowledge the fact that a philosophy is the way it is. It is not for us to prefer one to the other” (37). Over two decades have passed since the publication of Pierr. Bourdieu’s the Political Ontology of Martin Heidegger<sup>68</sup>. The book provides a sociological tilt to expose and analyze the radical and unrepentant politics of Heidegger’s philosophy. He argues that the conservative revolution of Germany of Heidegger’s day provided the sociological context of and for his reflection.

As it is in the boxing ring or a football field, there must be liberally an “open space” for the sporting confrontation between individuals or among groups or peoples. If confrontation is not just a naked struggle to impose one’s view on others, but a condition of our lived encounter, then this encounter must take place in a space; that is, within the Nothing.. Heidegger’s use of such words as “light”, “brightness”, “radiance”, “appearing”, “free”, etc portrays this openness. It is not just a source, it is “where” the phenomenon of “gathering” occurs and without this

Nothing, no thing would be and, in true Heidegger fashion, we must be interpretative (hermeneutic) in drawing implications from both polemos and the openness of Being, as well as the relationship between them. In fact, this work itself is a polemos, a confrontation with the mode of being of Nigeria and Nigerians. We desire to “confront” the current fixation within the Nigerian state and not to “back” it; that is, ignore it or accept it as normal or unchangeable.

As a “struggle” over what is on ground in Nigeria an “account” of her inner dynamics, Nigerians must seek to resolve their epileptic existence within the Nigerian state. However, having come with the dominating attitude of its jihadist inauguration and expantionist metaphysics, the Fulani caliphate has failed to appropriate the attitude of mutual engagement that makes confrontation(as engagement) both necessary and possible. The conceptual schemes of Nigeria’s ethnic nationalities are treated as nothing, as absent. Yet it does not realize that the absence of something is nothing. As Jim Unah, in his Heidegger: Through Kant to Fundamental Ontology writes:

Given the way he makes utterances, man, as Dasein, as transcendence, lives in a radical understanding of Nothing. Our Everyday Utterances and our moods reveal that even Nothing is something. Man never uses the word “nothing” in his daily commerce with the world with the implication of absolute emptiness or total void (315).

Though treated as “something”, yet caliphate colonialism treats other ethnic realities as inconsequential, at worst, or instruments of realizing its domination over Nigeria’s political sphere and space. Nigeria needs to create a political open-space where all nationalities, all cultures, must “dance”, display, disclose and (when necessary) disappear to appear. This is what Heidegger’s thinking has brought to the fore and seeks to encourage. According to Fried, Heidegger advocates “true respect among peoples, as among individuals, demand that each be allowed to come into its own, while insisting on a conversation that puts everything into question in the face of history’s challenge”(6). This conversational confrontation may (sometimes) degenerate into real braw, that (Paradoxically) would still need to be resolved through Polemos. Heidegger’s interest in the preservation of the “community”, a historical community (a vogue) rather than a focus on the modern liberal state has implication for Africa, and specifically for Nigeria. A historical community must preserve its past particularity to enable her pursue a present possibility. It is only within such preserved ontological habitat that the community (and its people) can play genuine roles in the inevitable encounters that take place within our world. In the absence of such self

understanding, the people are going to be “trapped” in the tantalizing universalism that both western and Islamic expansionist metaphysics have put humankind. Every national community has an identity and a uniqueness which constitute its point of strength and position in the place of Polemos.

As this work is being written, elections are about taking place in Kogi and Bayelsa States of Nigeria, and the desperation, violence and rancor that characterize the process are classic expressions of the reality within the Nigerian state which has resulted in the “closure” of the space that should exist between and among citizens and parties. With Berlin-created boundaries, capitalists economy and a political system that makes few individuals deities, Nigeria is under the iron grip of “a being that ensures that openness is impossible. There is no light, no radiance, no brightness, and (consequently), no freedom.

Any hermeneutic understanding of openness for us must be seen within the platform of a Dasein Africana. The African human kind gets access to his/ her world unmediated by the tools of western rationality. What is true, is true only for the African in his or her world, and that truth, the openness of which makes communication possible, must be allowed to “let be”; that is, to disclose itself from within the African world. It can only be “forced out” to the dismay that has become symptomatic of our today’s existence in Nigeria. Is it any wonder that Richard Rorty in *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* writes that “hermeneutics is an expression of hope that the cultural space left by the demise of epistemology cannot be filled” (60). The idea of “cultural space” here speaks of the opening that we are discussing. And realizing that western metaphysics manifested as “epistemology” (a theorizing about Knowledge) in the modern era, we then see why post-modernists see Heidegger as their herald. The arrest and occupation of the cultural space by epistemology needed a hermeneutic dislodging in order to create an “opening” for the unveiling of other cultures’ modes of cognition.

Our argument that Nigeria will not survive for long if it maintains a rigid and iron-cast view of its “caliphate” aspect is further buoyed by the fact that in its desperate, expansionist tendencies the caliphate quickly forgets that its appearance in Nigeria occurred within a thrown historical condition. For before the 1804 jihad of Othman Danfodio several ethnic nationalities existed and thrived within the geographical space that later became Nigeria. Patrick Enoch Nmah and Uchenna Ebony Amanambu have, a recent paper, discussed the effects of the Jihad of 1804 on inter-group relations in contemporary Nigerian society. Their conclusion is that “the effect of the 1804 Usman Dan Fodio's Jihad on inter-group relations in Nigeria has not only been controversial but also suspicious” (68). In its

nihilism, caliphate colonialism forgets that the openness of being is not a “thought” (not what we think about, it is a “da” , a “ place” where “Sein” stands as Dasein (Dasein Nigeriana) to enable it come to terms with the prevailing hermeneutic of the being of being. That the Nigerian people are groaning under the excruciating burden of an alien political culture stems from the fact that there was an interruption of their evolution in Time, that is, in History. The confrontation that would have kept the past, present and future, within the possibility of ontological fullness provided no chance to free ourselves by asking soul- searching, radical questions. Nigerians must ask the question how much longer they would have to endure the caliphate colonialism alternative for her socio- political survival.

In order words, would something fundamentally go wrong in Nigeria if she does not continue with this wholesale application of the caliphate colonial alternative? Have we swallowed, hook- line- and- sinker, Ahmedu Bello’s 11th October, 1960 declaration that “the new nation called Nigeria should be an estate of our great grand father Othman Danfodio. We must ruthlessly prevent any change of power...” (Quoted in Agbo, Igbophobia 62).

How do ethnic nationalities within Nigeria preserve their unique socio-political, cultural, linguistic, and religious differences while still identifying with this Nigerian state that is threatening to annihilate them?

The above question requires a polemos amongst themselves, a polemos that must take place within an open region, where freedom (or better still, autonomy) is expressed, unmediated by the colossal and imposing structures of western and Arabic metaphysical and religious thinking. In a recent presentation titled “Islamiztion and Fulanization in Nigeria and The Role of The Chhurch” Henry Ifeanyi Ogodu has observed that both Islamization and Fulanization (or what I prefer to call fulanizlamization) fears are real and he tackles the challenge by suggesting polemos by the church in Nigeria.

### **The Crude Oil Connection**

Is there nothing fundamentally wrong in trying to keep together strange bed fellows? How can people who feel fundamentally distinct in language, culture, tradition, custom, and the entire perception of reality, and who never agreed to form a political union, be continually compelled, cajoled, intimidated, blackmailed, seduced and manipulated into staying together, at all possible costs? How come that even when the peoples say, “ok, now that Providence has somehow brought us together, let us meet and decide the nature, character,

structure, and modus operandi of our togetherness”. They are not being allowed to do so?

There is no need to look for the answer(s) to these questions in the clouds’ it is located in the “spirit of crude oil”. The discovery of crude oil in 1956 at Oloibri (in current Bayelsa state) became both a boom and a doom for Nigeria. From its first export of 5,100 barrels per day, Nigeria over time, created a culture of lazy leadership who wait for the end of the month, and then go to Abuja to share oil wealth. Other minerals as well as agricultural products (that formed the mainstay of Nigeria’s survival before the coming of petroleum) were left unexploited. The fact that many past leaders of this country have shared out the oil blocks/wells to themselves and their friends, cronies, party loyalists, family members, in-laws, etc. has conspired to ensure that any attempt at restructuring the country has been rebuffed.

According to an NNPC (Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation) publication “Development of Nigerian’s Oil Industry”, there are 34 billion barrels of crude oil reserve and 159 trillion barrels of liquefied natural Gas reserves in Nigeria! It again informs us that of the 606 oil wells in the Niger Delta “355 are on-shore while the remaining 251 are off-shore. Of these, 193 are currently operational while 23 have been shot in or abandoned as a result of poor prospectivity or total drying up of the wells. Outside the Niger Delta, a total of 28 exploratory oil wells have been drilled... however, production is yet to commence in any of the wells”.

The statistics above shows that we have a natural gas deposit that is about 5,000 times more than the crude oil reserve and that we have even just began the exploration of oil in the Niger Delta!!! These operational wells have been acquired by few leaders who have ruled Nigeria, who have become stupendously rich to the detriment of the generality of Nigerians. Unfortunately for the peoples of the Niger Delta region, not only is the poverty in the area a paradox to the wealth from their territory, the environmental pollution therein has reduced the life-expectancy of the people. According to Otive Igbuzor, “the most important issue with regard to resource control in Nigeria is the ownership and control of mineral resources”.

In Nigeria, there are basically two types of crude oil licenses issued for the purpose of oil production: Oil prospecting license (OPL) and Oil mining license (OML) and the NNPC report has said that as at 1999 there are 48 OPLs and OMLs in Nigeria. In his essay, “How Babangida, Abacha , Obasnjó shared Nigeria’s Oil wells”, Obinna Akukwe observes that “Babangida, Abacha, Abdulsalami and Obasanjo awarded discretionary oil blocks to friends, associates, family members, party chieftains, security chiefs and all categories of bootlickers, spokespersons and cult

members without any laid down procedures”. Akukwe gives examples of some of these oil wells, their owners and possible volume of oil and estimated costs, and these statistics are startling and revealing and it provides the economic reasons for the refusal of their owners to allow any re-federation of Nigeria. I have decided to provide a tabular exposition of the situation in Nigeria concerning the oil wells, far beyond Aukwe’s essay, in order to provide the reader a bird’s eye perception of the facts. These only provide a minute idea of the situation in the oil industry and the Nigerian State. It does not tell the whole story. According to Akukwe, the so-called “competitive bidding” which Obasanjo introduced in 2006 is only a way to legalize illegality. The people in the oil industry are so powerful that they believe they can do just about anything that they can buy up Nigeria and they are succeeding in the name of competitive bidding...But I agree with him that:

The angst in the air is such that if this monster of illegal allocation of oil block is not addressed, the much touted revolution could begin all of a sudden and all who condoned this illegality at the expense of hungry Nigerians would have nowhere to hide...With the rot in the oil block awarding system and other root all over the Nigerian Nation, something worse than revolution may happen.

Is it any wonder that President Muhammadu Buhari has been the Minister of Petroleum since he became president in 2015. The sample below, gleaned from a publication titled “Full List Oil Block and Oil well Owners in Nigeria Today” by Bright Godwin, gives an idea of the current situation as of 2019.

S/N	Name of oil well	Name of operating company	Name(s) of owner(s)
1	OPL 246	SAPETRO	Gen. T.Y. Danjuma
2	OML 112 AND NOML 177	AMNI Inter national PDC	Col. Sanni Bello
3	OML 115	Oriental Energy	Alhaji Mohammed Ludimi
4	OML 113	Yinka Fola-wiyo pet. Ltd	Alhaji W.I. Folawiyo
5	OML 108	Express petroleum comp. Ltd.	Alhaji Aminu Dantata
6	OML 215	North East petroleum Ltd	Alhaji saleh M. Gambo
7	Asuokpu/umuyu margihal oil fields OML. 67	Septal Petroleum	Prince Nasiru Ado Bayero

8	OML.110 OBE oil field	Cavendish Petroleum	Alhaji Mai Daribe
9	OML 112 and 117	AMNI	Rilwan Lukman
10		Intel Petroleum	Atiku Abubakar, Yar' Adua and Bayero
11	OPL 245	Malabu Oil & Gas Comp.	Dan. Etete
12	OPL 289 and OPL 233	Clean Water consortium	Peter odili
13	OPL 248	Focus Energy/Group	Andy Uba
14	OPL. 291	Star Crest Energy Nig Ltd.	Emeka Offor
15	6 oil blocks	Con Oil	Mike Adenuga
16	OPL 302	Alfred James Petroleum	Alfred James, Femisola Awosika, A.o. Adeyinka and Sijuade family
17	OPL 310	Optimum Petroleum	Ibrahim Bunu
18	OPL 226	Soglas Nig. Ltd.	O. Udoji
19	OPL 215	North East Petroleum	Saleh Jambo
20	OPL 112 and OPL 117	AMNI International	Sanni Bello
21	OPL 108 and OPL 227	Express Petroleum Committee	Aminu Alhassan
22	OPL 109	Atlas Petroleum	Arthur Eze
23	OPL 205 and 206	Summit Oil	K.O. Abiola
24	OPL 115	Oriental Energy Resources	Mohammed Indimi
25	OPL 120 and 121	Allied Energy Resource Big Ltd.	Kase Lawal
26	OPL 122	Summit Oil	A. Olukun
27	OPL 34	Niger Delta Western	David Richards
28	OPL 241	Oil Word	Ibukun Olawepo, Rachel Akintola, Etc
29	OPL 248	Zebra Energy Ltd	B. C. Ojiakor
30	OPL 249	Oil and Gas Ltd	Reggie Uduhim
31	OPL 114,231,234,239	Not Available	B. Lulu Brigs
32	OPL 110	Cavendish Petroleum	Mai Derive
33	OPL 216	Famta Oil Ltd	Module Alakija
34	OPL 226	Crown Well Petroleum	Said Kudashi

35	OPL 278 and 236	Oando	Appia Korang, A. Peppe, Oba Gbadebo, O. A. Kpata, O. Adeyemo, M. O. Osunsanya, O. Boyo, J. A. Tinubu
36	OML 54	Eurafric Energy Ltd	Onoh Anthony, Onoh Christiana, Onoh Ngozi, George Udoekong, Nwauche Erastus
37	OML 38	Platform Petroleum Ltd	Ewendu Chidi
38	Not Available	Bicta Energy	Unejei T., Akinro C. A.
39	OML 40	Sahara Energy and African Oil Ltd	Du-Frayed, Baba Lawal, Cole Tonye, Odunsi Ade, Adeniji Titi, Akinla Ladipo, Bentley John, Ciroma Musa
40	OML 54	Niger Delta Company	Fatona Layi, Aret Adams, Uduimp Itsueli, Sammy Olagbaju, David Richard, Udi Ibru
41	OML 11	Prime and Suffolk Petroleum Ltd	Macpepple Victoria, Macpepple Henry, Macpepple Joy, Macpepple Emmanuel, Macpepple Elfrida
42	OML 67	Oriental Energy	Usman Danburran, Alhaji Indimi
43	OML 46	Bayelsa Oil Company Ayala	Aliyu Abubakar, Brigid David, Alamieyesheiga Anitonbrapa,



			Ifimaim Ekine, Jonathan Selereipre, Enddeley Francis, Chinwetelu Chris, Williams E.J.
--	--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Oil money is cheap money. The structures have already been put together by the foreign oil firms. After deducting all sundry duties, royalties and taxes (where they are paid), millions of dollars usually go into private pockets. The income is steady and massive. Sometime ago, while submitting a report to the federal government on the Nigeria extractive industries transparency initiative (NEITI), Prof. Assisi Asobie informed his shocked audience that oil companies in Nigeria have owed about N1.3 trillion in taxes since 1999, this is only possible in Nigeria, a Country described by Nobel laureate, Wole Soyinka, as “a gangland of unprecedented impunity (xii). This type of iron-grip on the “soul” of the Nigerian State would require more than persuasions, hope or wish to dislodge. No amount of rhetorics would achieve that it would require a Polemos. Freedom is not given, it is taken! Before the crash of crude oil prices in the last five years, imagine this 2012 statistics: Nigeria’s production quota then was 2.5 million barrels daily. At the then prize of \$113 per barrel, this will be \$282.5 million daily. Monthly sales will be \$8.475 billion, while (if the prize remains that way) in a year, it will be \$101.7 billion. The naira equivalent (at N 160 to \$1) will be N16.272 in a trillion in year. Nigeria budget for 2012 was N 4.5 trillion. If we remove duties, royalties, taxes, perhaps savings (perhaps in the so called sovereign wealth fund introduced by President Jonathan in 2011), where does the rest go? Crude oil business in Nigeria is the most non-accountable and non-transparent in Nigeria.

Unfortunately, Nigeria is also told that about N 3.7 trillion worth of crude oil is stolen from Nigeria yearly! Stealing crude oil is not a piece of cake. It is some people in leadership and those involved in the oil business, home and abroad that can do that. Yet, even most of what is realized from the number of barrels that are officially declared as our production quota vanishes, as a result of “executive roguery”. Under these conditions, who would agree or allow structural and fiscal federalism? Nigeria, certainly, cannot survive for long this way. We join Uche Igwe to ask, “How Much Longer Can We Survive As A Nation?”

**A Sovereign National Polemos**

Any and everyone that has opposed the convening of a sovereign National conference (SNC) to rescue this sinking ship called Nigeria have something to gain from the current contraption! Period! Otherwise I do not see why anyone, whose commonsense logic is still intact, would refuse to allow people to talk, honestly, sincerely and as a matter-of-fact. The interesting thing is that both opposers and supporters of SNC agree that there is something fundamentally wrong with the Nigerian state as presently constituted. The SNC that we are advocating for is not just a constitutional conference *Simpliciter* (like President Jonathan's 2014 jamboree), it is not a talk-shop; it is a convention for survival. It is a conference that will define who a Nigerian is and what Nigeria should look like in structure, in economy, in politics. An SNC does not have Nigeria as a focus, it has Nigerians as its focus. This SNC will not be attended by Nigeria. It will be attended by the Oluwoles, harunas, Okoros, Mohammeds, Dipriyes, OKoronkwos, Olabisises, Agbonifos, Enos, etc. that have been entrapped and encapsulated within the geographical territory baptized as Nigeria

Any one interested more in saving Nigeria than Nigerians has another agenda. When Mikhail Gorbachev faced the option of saving the union or the soviets, he chose the latter, for the former would have gone anyhow-despite perestroika and Glasnost packaged to save it. The decision about Nigeria must be left for the Nigerian people, for whom she ostensibly answers a "republic". The current situation whereby the decision about Nigerians is taken by a few cabal, using the instrumentality of a Nigeria, can no longer address the Cacophony of challenges threatening her very survival. In his essay "The Nigerian Experiment: Is It working?" Author A. Nwankwo puts it in perspective when he writes:

For me, the all-important question is: what then must we do to make the Nigerian experiment work? And I answer by reminding us of the Chinese proverb that says: however long you have been on the wrong road, turn back". And so we must turn back to discuss the terms of our engagement, as ethnic nationalities in the larger entity called Nigeria, at a sovereign national conference. It is a conference of all the ethnic nationalities in Nigeria whose delegate(s) will be empowered to (re-negotiate the terms on which their nationalities must remain part and parcel of a united and strong Nigeria defined by fairness and equity (457).

There are people who are scared of the world sovereign but what we mean by the word "sovereign" in this demand has two mutually inclusive applications and implications, the first applies to the pre-SNC and the other to the post-SNC. In the first place, the conference has to be sovereign because the different nationalities

would have to freely choose their representative(s) they would not be hand-picked by the (mis) managers of the current status quo or manipulated into choosing unpopular delegate(s). This is where the real Polemos begins. Secondly, the decisions at the conference cannot be changed by any other body or group, except there is a demand for it by the people in a nearer or far future.

On Friday, 1st June, 2012 at the 17th Bi-Annual delegates conference of the Academic staff Union of Universities (ASUU), held at ASUU National secretariat, university of Abuja, eminent virologist, Tam David-West presented a paper titled: "Ethnic Nationalism: Challenges And Prospects Of A Pan Nigeriana". In the presentation, he repeated, for the umpteenth times that he is an unrepentant anti-sovereign National conference" (27). David-west is interested in saving Nigeria instead of Nigerians. He says that the problem of Nigeria "is not constitution, it is ourselves" Who made the 1999 constitution? Some of us? Why did they make it this way? To control the political and economic base of the country. Interestingly, when I asked (him, as one of the 49 "wise men" that drafted what became the 1979 constitution) if it was what they submitted that Obasanjo decreed into the basis for the defunct 2nd republic, he did not exactly answer me because he knew that Obasanjo made lots of alterations to the document in order to sustain the caliphate domination in Nigeria.

A new constitution is not as imperative as a new state. The SNC's mission would be to fashion and package the character and structure of the new state, one that citizens would not be blackmailed and intimidated into loving at all costs. A new constitution can only emerge there from as a document that articulates and embodies the ideals, hopes, aspirations, expectations and beliefs of the people as expressed during the conference. What we need to organize is a leadership that is self-less and visionary, that does not think of pecuniary gains. Or a followership, driven by civil society, that would confront, in order to compel, the leadership to "let (not "make") the conference become a reality. And with the way our leaders (executive and legislature) are going, only the second option seems to be feasible, that is, practically possible . In 1990, Benin republic organized such conference under Matthew Kerekou.

It seems that those who love Nigeria to remain one are the ones calling for Sovereign National Polemos, while those who lust after her beautiful endowments, who nonetheless have raped and ravaged her, are those who want the status quo to remain the same. According to Tony Nnadi, General Secretary of the movement for new Nigeria (MNN), in his, "prologue: The Great Debate On

The “Nigerian question”, the SNC is actually the only peaceful way to avoid further collateral damage for Nigeria. In his words:

We can therefore say with conviction that the only peaceful option left to resolve the vexed ‘Nigerian Question’ and perhaps, save the Nigerian Project, is to immediately initiate a process for the replacement of the dying ‘1999 Constitution’ (not by amendment) instead of the ongoing hogwash and theatricals about visions, agendas, re branding and sundry shenanigans. A Sovereign National Conference is now absolutely inevitable if we still fancy any Nigeria. Failure to act quickly leaves the door wide open for all kinds of possibilities (2).

The modus operandi of the SNC has been articulated by various groups, at various fora. What is required is the continuous insistence till it becomes imperatively necessary, until we are able to see it as an inevitable escape for a country that is a giant in size and Lilliputian in achievement. Kwasi Wiredu is one African philosopher in the forefront of what he calls “critical and reconstructive self evaluation” it will be a tragedy for us to be compelled to come together and talk, under the mediation of external forces. In the mafia manager by “V” there is an axiom that says: “necessity breaks all laws” (37). The necessity for the survival of Nigeria demands that we do a gradual setting aside of the “1999 constitution”.

Another election, that enthrones another class, would never address the issues of resource control, true federalism, etc. that are at the root of the crisis. If a WORKING PEOPLE’S PARTY has any plausibility at all, it is vitiated by the fact that it is feasible only after the SNC is carried out and decisions taken therein are not tampered with for and by other interests.

### **In Lieu of a Conclusion: Abuja, Aburi, or Araba?**

The Nigerian State is caught up within the whirling spiral of 3 metaphors: Aburi represents the best possibility of a rejected past, Abuja is a stuttering present, and Araba portrays a possible future that may (or may not) be the best of options. These three metaphors define the past, the present and the future of Nigeria.

On 4-5 January 1967, the military leaders in Nigeria, in an attempt to avoid the looming catastrophe, met in a town called Aburi, in neighbouring Ghana, when general Ankra was Ghana’s Head of state. That meeting was the first meeting of the military rulers in Nigeria since August 9, 1966. The meeting agreed on a decentralization of power, which was the status quo before the army took over power on 15th January, 1966. The leaders also made an open declaration and commitment not to resort to force as a way of solving the problem. One can easily

say that it was the failure to implement the Aburi Accord, rather than the pogrom of May 29, July 29, and September 29, 1966, that finally plunged Nigeria into a 30-months civil war.

Close watchers of the Nigerian state believe that, if we are to face both the facts and the truth in the interest of Nigeria, there is something about and in the Aburi Accord that still holds the key to re-arranging the jigsaw puzzle called Nigeria. And as a matter of fact, I believe that the SNC is an Aburi-like option.

Abuja today represents the Nigeria of January 1966 May, 1967—a compulsory centralization, an insistence that the states are appendages of the federal authority. And why not? After all, the states were created by the federal authority. The first 12-state structure of May 27, 1967, of course, represented a last ditch attempt by Gowon to break the solidarity of the then Eastern Region. At present, with the federation creating the states, there is very little the states can do when it comes to asserting their rights to take certain decisions, especially on the question of self determination. Abuja, therefore, represents the best impossibility of a united Nigeria. Abuja represents the best enthronement of classical laziness in leadership; it represents injustice, oppression and the closest approximation of de facto power claiming de jure authority. If Nigeria is to survive, Abuja must devolve power, and since it appears, from our preceding arguments and facts, that since the central powers are not prepared to devolve power, the civil society must lead the people's agitation to take back their sovereignty in an organized SNC. Abuja, therefore, represents, in the Platonic characterization of democracy, "the best of all lawless governments and the worst of all lawful governments".

The Hausa language word "Araba" literally means "divide" or "share" and it gained currency when the northern Region of Nigeria wanted to secede from Nigeria. "Araba", though conceived earlier, gained currency after unitary decree No. 34 of May 24, 1966 by the then head of state, major-general J.T.U Aguyi-Ironsi. Faced with the coming danger of a "scattering" country and coming from the already systematized and hierarchical military institution, Ironsi felt that a unifying decree would be of help. It has been stated that Gowon was to have announced the secession of the North by August, 1966, but the then British high commissioner to Nigeria, Cunning-Bruce, prevailed on him not to do so.

Araba may not be the best option for Nigeria because Nigeria cannot be properly "shared" or "divided" without being "torn". The level of integration requires that a definite statement be made on the form of association under which the different nationalities would realize their potential(s), at their own pace. The Nigerian people must be allowed for the first time since 1914, to freely decide how they

want to live. Marriages without bride prices paid have always ended in divorce. Nigerians certainly have a choice to make.

### Works Cited

- Agbo, Joseph N. (2013) "The Principle of 'Refraction' as The Basis For a Culture of Philosophy in Africa", in *Filosofia Theoretica: Journal of African Philosophy, Culture and Religion*, VOL.2, NO.2, PP.423-456.
- Agbo, Joseph N. (2016) *Hundred Years of Britain's Nigeria: A Historical and Philosophical Analysis of The Idea of a Non Negotiable Unity*, in *Igwebuike: An African Journal of Arts and Humanities* vol. 6 No 1
- Agbo, Joseph N. (2011) "The crisis of Identity and the Quest for Development in Africa: The place of leadership in creating a new Culture", in, *UJAH:UNIZIK Journal of Arts and humanities*, Vol. 12, no. 2.
- Agbo, Joseph N.(2014), "Robert Nozik ON the Minimum State and an Entitlement Theory of Justice and The Niger-Delta Question" in *The Nigerian Journal of Philosophy*, VOL. 25, NO.1 PP. 89-107.
- Agbo, Joseph N., (2019.) "Transforming The Formless: The Inevitability of a New Constitution For The Survival and Development OF Nigeria" *Philosophy and Praxis: Journal of the Nigeria Philosophical Association* Vol. 9, pp 145-177.
- Agbo, Joseph N., (2012) "Balancing The Forces of Statism, Democracy and Nationalism in Addressing the Niger Delta Minority Question in Nigeria" Paper Presented at a Conference in Honour of Prof. G.N Hembe Under the Theme: Minorities, Federalism, and Politics in Nigeria" Held at Ibrahim Badamosi Babangida (IBB) university, LAPAI, Niger State, Nigeria.
- Agbo, Joseph. N, (2018) *Igbophobia: A Cursory Analysis of the Historical, Economic And Political Conditions of Ndigbo in Nigeria*. Enugu: Tradi Press.
- Agbo, Joseph. N. (2015) "Biafra: The Philosophy of The Historical Ignorance of a Critical Generation", in T. Uzodimma Nwala, ET ALL (EDS) *Igbo Nation: History and Challenges of Rebirth and Development*. Ibadan: KRAFT Book. PP 347 – 379
- Agbo, Joseph. N., (2021) "Sinking Structures on Faulty Foundations: Socio-Philosophical Essays on the A-B-C-D of Nigeria's 'Failure' State (Abakaliki: Alpha Citizen Press).
- Agbo, Joseph N .(2020), "The Poverty of the Forces of Statism and Democratism in Addressing the Niger-Delta Question in Nigeria", in *Sophia: Journal of Philosophy and Public Affairs*, vol.19,no.2,pp.229-241.

- Akukwe. Obinna (2012) "How Babangida, Abacha, Obasanjo Shared Nigeria's Oil Wells", in, Nigeria Masterweb Daily News, Available Online.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1991) *The Political Ontology of Martin Heidegger* translated by Peter Collier Stanford: Stanford University Press,.
- Chinweizu, (2015) *Caliphate Colonialism: the Taproot of the Trouble with Nigeria Lagos: clear coast communications.*
- Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999, With Amendment, 2011.
- David-West,Tam(2012). "Ethnic Nationalism: Challenges and Prospects of A Pan Nigeriana", paper presented at the 17th National Delegate Conference of ASUU, University of Abuja, Friday, June 1,
- Kirk-Green, (1968) A.R.M. *The Amalgamation of Nigeria* London:Frank Cass and Co ltd,
- Fried, Gregory (2000) *Heidegger's Polemos: From Being to Politics* London: Yale University Press.
- Godwin, Bright, (2019) "Full List of Oil Block and Oil well Owners in Nigeria Today" <https://www.currentschoolnews.com/articles/oil-block-and-oil-well-owners-in-nigeria>. Accessed October 13.
- Heidegger, Martin (1977) "The End of philosophy and the task of Thinking", in *Basic Writings of Martin Heidegger*, edited by David Krell, New York: Harper and Row.
- Heidegger, Martin (1977)"What is Metaphysics?" in, *Basic Writings of Martin Heidegger* edited by David Krell, New York: Harper and Row,
- Igwe, Uche(2016) "How Much Longer Can We Survive As A Nation? The Punch, Friday, October 14..
- Movement for New Nigeria (MNN), ,(2011). Press Conference, "Why we Reject the Nigeria Defined by the 1999 constitution", Lagos, September 5
- Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC) (2002), Online Publication, "Development of Nigeria's Oil Industry".
- Nnadi, Tony (2009) "Prologue: The Great Debate On the Nigerian Question" in *MNN Special Publication, Vol.3.*
- Nmah, Patrick Enoch and Amananbu, Uchenna Ebony(2017), "A Critical Analysis of the Effect of the 1804 Usman Dan Fodio's Jihad on Inter-Group Relations in the Contemporary Nigerian State", in *International Journal of Religion and Human Relations*,vol.9,pp.47-71
- Nwankwo, Authur A. (2004) "The Nigerian experiment: Is It Working?" in, Momoh, C.S. et al (eds.) *Law, Democracy and Its Dividends* Enugu: Snaap Press.
- Ogodo, Ifeanyi (2019) "Islamization and Fulanization in Nigeria and the Role of the Church", a paper presented at the Annual Seminar of Catholic Laity

Council of Nigeria, Onitsha Arch-Diocese, held at Shanahaan House, Basilica of the Most Holy Trinity, Onitsha, Anambra State, on Tuesday 21st August, 2019.

Okonkwo, Rudolf Ogoo (2019) "The Futile Search for a Good Igbo", Available online.

Soyinka, Wole (2007) "Foreword" in Wilmot, Patrick Nigeria: The Nightmare Scenario Ibadan: FANAFINA.

Trotsky, Lenon (1996) *The Revolution Betrayed*, trans. by Max Eastman, transcribed for the internet by Zodiac between August 1993 and March, 1996

"V", (1996) "The Mafia Manager: A Guide to the Corporate Machiavelli" New York: St. Martin's Griffins Press.