

# Nigeria's Amalgamation, Social (In)Justice and Security Implications

Temidayo David OLADIPO  
& David Oluwafemi BODUNDE

## Abstract

*Nigeria emerged in 1914 after the colonialists amalgamated the southern and northern protectorates for administrative purposes without negotiation of the conditions of amity between peoples of both sides. However, with independence from British rule on 1st October 1960, come some challenges arising from glueing together peoples with divergent cultures, languages, historical antecedents and religions. Some of these problems have metamorphosed over time to generate serious security issues. Taking into consideration Nigeria's political history, this paper examines the implications of the welding of diverse peoples with different orientations for Nigeria's unity, peace and security. The core position of the paper is that amalgamation was accompanied by some inevitable social injustice that arose as a result of coercing unequals together; the consequence is that social injustice in the Nigerian state-bred insecurity. This is so because Nigeria, as a result of the amalgamation, was made to become a deeply divided society. This is responsible for entrenching deep fault lines which have engendered violence and thus threatened security in Nigeria. The methodology employed for the study is qualitative in nature and involves critical content analysis of texts, library and archival materials.*

**Keywords:** Amalgamation, Social Justice, Social Injustice, Security.

## Introduction

Nigeria is a nation comprising multi-ethnic groups with diverse cultures, languages and religions amid other differentiating factors. This reality is a product of the 1914 amalgamation of the southern and northern protectorates by Lord Fredrick Lugard,<sup>1</sup> which, in itself, is an outcome of

the subjugation of erstwhile independent communities through colonial conquest by Britain. The consequence is a country with over 250 languages. However, with independence from British usurpation, Nigeria, the most populous black state in the world, apart from struggling to secure a place in global politics, has had to battle with various issues confronting the state from within its borders. These problems include the crisis of harmonious coexistence of her plural citizens, the issue of ensuring unity in diversity, election crises, military *coup d'etat*, religious conflicts, crises regarding resource control and bad leadership. Nigeria, in trying to survive and thrive, has also had to grapple with the interference of globalisation, porous borders, insurgency and terrorism, which ensure that millions of dollars that would have gone into infrastructural development end up in securing the state, accumulation of debt from the International Monetary Fund and other financial institutions and countries, and neo-colonialism, which ensures some meddlesomeness in Nigeria's politics. All these challenges have, in some ways, contributed to why Nigeria lags among the comity of nations, even though it is considered as the giant of Africa. Although, the perception that Nigeria is the giant of Africa is not misplaced, because it is the most populous Black country with vast natural and human resources, yet, while these should have been of advantage, the mismanagement of resources by poor leadership and centrifugal forces of ethnic and religious tensions have hindered the state from taking its rightful place among developed states in our world today thereby undermining its claim to being a giant.

The amalgamation of 1914 has serious implications for Nigeria. A major implication of the amalgamation is that it ignored the deep divisions within the soon-to-be Nigerian state for administrative purposes. The amalgamation was not mindful of the implication of post-colonial politics, given the differences among the tribes and religious groups. What we now have is a Nigeria "permanently poised on an ethnic and religious powder keg" (Siollun, 2009:2), which is easily set off by mistrust, fuelled by politics, played by elites. Thus, established is a state in which justice, good governance, and a lot of values that guarantee a good state are jettisoned in favour of ethnic and religious affiliations. This has resulted in the inability to develop shared values and this lack of shared values has continually led to security threats.

## What is Security?

Simplistically, security is the state of being protected against threat, uncertainty or danger. It is a “stable, relatively predictable environment in which an individual or group may pursue its ends without disruption or harm and fear of such disturbance or injury (Green 2004:21 cited in Brook 2011). The need for security is both at the individual level and the group level. Thus, Craigwell (2003; cited in Brooks 2009) considers security as “the provision of private services in the protection of people, information and assets for individual safety and community wellbeing.” At the individual level, a person wants to enjoy his/her human rights, with the right to life is the most primal and assurance for the fulfilment of all other conditions that enhance the quality of life, which find protection in the other documented human rights. But as is the case that there is no “I” without “we” so is there no “we” without “I.” At the group level, the group wants an assurance that its rights will not be abused, ignored and that it will not be threatened into extinction by unfavourable conditions in the society it belongs to. To feel secured, the group ensures that those conditions required to satisfy individual and group needs are provided, and at the same time fortifies itself against external threats. When the group in question is a state, security is guarding against threats to the state’s sovereignty. Whether conceived in terms of the individual or thought of at the group level, security is about human well-being and prosperity. Of course, while it makes sense to apply the concept of security to animal life, the biosphere, the environment, or the economy, yet it is because (in)security of these affect human well-being, in the short- or long run.

“Security” is a highly contested concept. This is so because, as Brooks (2009:1) puts it, “security is multidimensional in nature and diverse in practice.” The contribution to its conceptualisation or definition from multiple fields is responsible for the contentious nature of the definition of security. According to Brooks (2009:1), “the multidimensional nature of security results in both society and industry that has no clear understanding of a definition of the concept of security. Moreover, the current concept of security is so broad as to be impracticable.” In our view, the way out of this is to consider many attempts at defining security as identifying just some types of security and seeking that the notion of security by the state and other stakeholders

in the security community consider them too. Scholars who have championed the course of environmental security, food security, among other forms of security have done so to invite focus to these types of security. Moreover, the attempt at the redefinition of security is aimed at demilitarisation of the concept of security, so that states, stakeholders, policy-makers can pay attention and invest in other areas which if neglected may spur violence and thus insecurity, or may even lead to some catastrophe, as is the case in negligence of care for the environment. The argument mainly is that security at the state level need not be “the defence of a nation, through armed force or the use of force to control a state’s citizens” (Brooks 2009:2). Security is diversified into many areas such that we may identify economic security, environmental security, health security, human security, food security, national security, personal security, among other forms of security. However, irrespective of the type of security being clarified, an important point to note is that security must centre on human beings; thus, it is the notion of human security that makes the idea of security to be meaningful. In the view of Ogaba (2010:35-36), security

has to do with freedom from danger or threats to a nation’s ability to protect and develop itself, promote its cherished values and legitimate interest and enhance the well-being of its people. Thus, internal security could be seen as the freedom from or the absence of those tendencies, which could undermine internal cohesion, and the corporate existence of a country and its ability to maintain its vital institution for the promotion of its core values and socio-political and economic objectives as well as meeting the legitimate aspirations of the people.

Brooks (2011:18) defines security as “assured freedom from poverty or want, precautions taken to ensure against theft, espionage, or a person or thing that secures or guarantee.” Security is the absence of those tendencies which might undermine the internal cohesion and corporate existence of a country. In the opinion of Galtung (1975:25), in an attempt to argue against the militaristic notion of security, security is “found not in terms of nation’s might but in terms of holistic understanding that moves beyond the currency of military power with the

state as a key actor.” Security goes beyond political realism established on the belief in military might. Rather, a country can only boast of having security if it can maintain vital institutions and conditions that secure certain core values which society should stand for. Thus, good leadership, environmental protection, respect for human rights and others are important parameters for determining security. For instance, the absence of good leadership contributes to insecurity. Proof of this can be found in the justification given for the Arab Spring, insurgency and terrorism in Nigeria, as well as insecurity in various underdeveloped countries of the world.

### **Social Justice and Security: Conceptual Linkages**

There is a debate about whether it makes sense to speak of “social justice,” for if it is merely about adding “social” to “justice” then it does not make sense, for justice is a social phenomenon. Antagonists of the concept, thus, attack it of redundancy for “justice is necessarily a social or interpersonal concern” (McLean and McMillan 2009:494). Offor (2014) points out that, justice is a social phenomenon that has to do with human beings, systems and processes in society. Nevertheless, just like many concepts that suffered from the crisis of acceptance into social science discourse at the start, it has come to stay. As it is used in contemporary discourse, social justice refers to justice in relation to the distribution of wealth, privileges, and opportunities within society.

Every society is a blend of different groups of people, consisting of divergent ethnicities, clans, and sometimes races. Just as individuals can be subjects of injustice, so can groups. This is made possible when political systems are constructed in such a way that some groups are permanently disadvantaged. Likewise, institutions and structures of society may be in the hands of a few groups that estrange other groups and their members from enjoying fair access to common goods, such as institutions and structures produce. At the core of the discourse about social justice is the “issue of how people are treated within a social arrangement in a way that they will not feel cheated” (Offor, 2014:95). The term, when used, is intended to refer to “the requirements of justice applied to the benefits and burdens of a common existence...” (Mclean and McMillan 2009:494). Social justice takes the concept of justice beyond its discourse and application to civil and criminal justice,

economics, or moral framework. Moreover, social justice rather than focusing on the requirements of justice between individuals shift the focus to just relations between groups within a society. It emphasises that all people should have access to privileges, opportunities, wellbeing, justice and wealth of the society. The aim is to guard against discrimination and deprivation of people from benefiting and enjoying common goods and, thus, guard against doing harm to the social fabrics through the generation of grievances.

Necessitating the need for social justice are two things: scarcity of resources available in society and the conflict of interests arising from different quarters aimed at harnessing such resources. Addressing these two issues requires finding ways through which the burdens and benefits of society can be allocated (Offor, 2014). When some members of society enjoy the benefits and others feel more of the burden, the balance of social order is affected in such a country, and there will be complaints about social injustice, which if not addressed may lead to the employment of violent means for seeking redress.

If you want peace, prepare for war. Inherent in this saying is the underlying suggestion that lasting peace comes by being fought for through the contestation of those issues of injustice that one disagrees with. Injustice breeds social disorder. People on the receiving end of injustice seek through diverse means- peaceful and violent- to redress injustice. In a country where seeking redress has been impossible, over the years, through peaceful means, there has been recourse to violence, which has led to insecurity. The Niger Delta Conflict is a case in point here. Poverty, inability to meet basic needs, environmental degradation, economic neglect, unemployment and hindrance to local economic activities, minimal educational opportunities faulty fiscal federalism, the fact that the resources tapped in the region have not been instrumental in galvanising the region economically, lack of basic socio-economic and developmental infrastructure that is at par with what is obtainable in other parts of the country, issues about compensation, the frustration arising from the inability to use legitimate means to get attention to the deplorable conditions of people in the region are manifestations of social injustice which have heightened insecurity coming from the area (Oladipo, 2017). The annoyance about social injustice in the region has been the basis of the justification for kidnapping for ransom,

assassination of political opponents, various acts of brigandage and piracy in the creeks and territorial waters, and different acts aiding insecurity by rebels. A lesson that is obvious from conflicts like that of the Niger Delta is that social injustice leads to a situation in which some restive youths go into crime and people readily support criminal and rebel groups against the state in the name of seeking redress for injustice. However, while it may be possible to have situations like that of the Niger Delta without violence and insecurity arising from it, yet it is incontrovertible that “genuine grievances should be redressed whether or not they provoke rebellion...” (Collier 2007:24).

### **Nigeria’s Amalgamation and the Question of Social (In)Justice**

Nigeria, today, consists of over 250 ethnic groups. Before amalgamation, what obtained in pre-colonial Nigerian societies were empires, a caliphate, kingdoms, chiefdoms, city-states and villages. The North was already used to their rulers’ exercise of absolute authority,<sup>2</sup> made possible by the spread of Islam. However, the southern part, which consists of the West and the East, had forms of indigenous government that were checkmated by constituted authorities; the east even boasts of a liberal form of governance that was republican or egalitarian (Oluwatobi, 2018). These various nationalities were, for amalgamation, subsumed into two groups- the northern protectorate and the southern protectorate. However, both have fundamental differences anchored on ethnicity and religion. While those in the northern part of the country had a lot in common in terms of Islamic religion, the southern part of the country is largely Christian. Religion can however be a divisive factor, and in fact, in the case of Nigeria has been one. It is a major consideration, for instance, in determining those that will be the president and the vice-president. Both cannot be of the same religion, no matter the competence they seek to bring to governance. The 2015 general election still had this influence with Bola Ahmed Tinubu being denied the vice president’s<sup>3</sup> slot as a result of the need to appeal to Christian electorates in the country. Other than this, appointments into political posts are expected to seek a balance between both religions, otherwise complaints of “lopsided appointment” will rent the air from the side of the religious body that feels marginalised. The same goes for ethnicity.

These two sides of the protectorates have some fundamental differences, anchored on religion- The northern being largely Muslim, the southern mainly Christian. This had further implications. The north, with the firm belief in its religious heritage, believes that the south is inferior in some ways. The belief is that the amalgamation is “between an ordered and cultured [northern] society on one hand and, on the other hand, between an impetus, aggressive and savage [southern] group” (Obi Ani, Obi-Ani & Isiani 2016:27). The consequence of this belief is further evident in the firm belief of the north to the right to rule the country, so much that Sokoto State, which is the seat of the caliphate in Nigeria, adopted as its slogan- Born to Rule.<sup>4</sup> A slogan that drew the ire of people from other states of the federation.

The amalgamation made Nigeria become a plural society and a deeply divided society. A plural society is one in which, according to Lijphart (1977:3-4), there exist segmental cleavages. Segmental cleavages may be religious, ideological, linguistic, regional, cultural, racial, or ethnic. However, beyond the existence of these segments, “political parties, interest groups, media of communication, schools, and voluntary associations tend to be organised along the lines of segmental cleavages” (Lijphart, 1977:4). Thus, segmental cleavages in a country make divisions in it problematic through making citizens organise themselves and some salient issues based on the divisions rather than identifying those things that unite.

Apart from being plural, Nigeria is also a deeply divided society. While describing Nigeria, Osaghae (2002:ix) holds that Nigeria is “arguably one of the most complex countries in the world and belongs to the genre of the most troubled complex societies called deeply divided societies.” This is so because there are sharp divisions among Nigerians with the division being rooted in religion and ethnicity. According to Guelke (2012:vi), “deeply divided societies are a special category of cases, in which a fault line that runs through the society causes political polarisation and establishes a force field. This divide makes establishing and sustaining democratic rule a huge challenge.” A deeply divided society is one in which fault lines created by ethnicity, religion and other divisions often lead to violence and create some challenges for the administration of the political system. In a deeply divided society, “conflict exists along a well-entrenched fault line that is recurrent and



endemic and that contains the potential for violence between the segments” (Guelke 2012:30). In a deeply divided society, there is antagonistic segmentation of society, sustained division along fault lines for a long period, and attachment to the fault lines have overriding importance and influence over a wide range of issues facing a deeply divided society. The implication is the prevention of the formation of political coalitions on issues that cut across the main societal divides (Guelke 2012: 28-29). In other words, the various segments have issues with arriving at a consensus on important matters and often challenge outcomes of political processes. The unfortunate outcome of all these is the recurrence of violence, especially in settling some political issues.

The amalgamation resulted in the lumping together of diverse (linguistically, culturally, and religiously) heterogeneous nationals, “around the Benue valley, the Gulf of Guinea and the Western Sudan” (Obi Ani, Obi-Ani & Isiani 2016:27) that are suspicious of, and distrust, each other. Eventually, at independence, a major consequence of the amalgamation is that it brought the question of social (in)justice to the fore in Nigeria. This was made worse by the policies of the colonialists which made “justice, equality, fair play and transparent governance assume secondary importance” (Oluwatobi, 2018:41). While courting the colonialists during colonialism and at the eve of independence, the different ethnic and religious groups tried to lay hold of vital organs of the state in order to dominate them, while estranging other social groups. This bred contempt and aggression towards state institutions on the part of estranged groups.

The various ethnicities were at different stages of political, economic and cultural development when they were merged. In contradistinction to their northern counterpart, the south was majorly ahead in education, commerce and knowledge of western-styled administration as well as in imbibing western skills. While the southern part embraced western education, the north, given mainly to Arabic education was, up till the eve of independence, lagging in terms of western education and influence. Lacking in the north also were other influences of western civilisation in terms of communication, sanitation facilities, hospitals, public works, and housing (Obi Ani, Obi-Ani & Isiani 2016). However, the ability to welcome and imbibe western education had further implications on the level of development of both

protectorates. This has eventually led to some form of perceived social injustice. First, “the Southern political sophistication and Northern traditionalism inevitably emerged as a major centrifugal force in Nigeria’s political geography” (Osuola and Muoh, 2015). In addition, the belief is that there are different recruitment standards for both sides into the civil service and educational institutions. There is also the fear of domination, expressed by the North about the post-colonial era. The fear is that those who had imbibed more western knowledge would indeed be at the helms of affairs of the country. Thus, while the south had expressed readiness for independence in 1953, through a motion moved by Anthony Enahoro, the North staged a walkout in protest against the motion in the Parliament, mainly because in terms of its capability for handling the new state they were not ready.

A major evil of amalgamation is that the peoples joined together in unholy wedlock never accented to the union. What we have is a country that was “artificially created by a colonial power without the consent of its citizens. Over 250 ethnic groups were arbitrarily herded together into an unwieldy and non-consensus union by the UK.” What this resulted in is a situation in which “Nigeria continues to grope along without Nigerians” (Ikime, 1985:21 cited in Osuala and Muoh, 2015). Unfortunately, “in such circumstances, there was no room for dialogue or public discussion on fundamental issues that would have addressed a number of problems that today border on the question of justice” (Offor, 2014:93). The beauty of such negotiation, if it had taken place, is that it would have enabled every group to negotiate the fundamentals of cooperative coexistence and imbued the system with predetermined fairness. On the contrary, if a society fails to achieve this, “whatever principles, structures and institutions that would evolve afterwards would be otiose and subject to unjust manipulation” (Offor, 2014:101), as is witnessed in Nigeria today. Moreover, some form of injustice is perpetrated in denying people the opportunity to negotiate the kind of society they want, the nature of government that should direct their affairs, and the laws that they believe will best deliver these.

This accounts for why various political leaders expressed doubt about amalgamation being successful to the extent that the various ethnic groups will be able to cement themselves into one Nigeria. In expressing such scepticism, Obafemi Awolowo in 1947 holds that Nigeria is a mere

geographical expression such that when one says “Nigerian” one is merely employing the term to distinguish those who live within the boundaries of the country and those who live without. Echoing this position of Awolowo is Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa’s view of 1948 that “Since 1914 the British government has been trying to make Nigeria into one country but the Nigerian people themselves are historically different in their backgrounds, in their religious beliefs and customs and do not show themselves any sign of willingness to unite... Nigeria’s unity is only a British invention” (Meredith, 2005:8). Thus, a major criticism against the amalgamation is that it was fundamentally the amalgamation of the administration of the North and South rather than being the amalgamation of the peoples of the North and South (Oluwatobi, 2018:36).

The mistake made during the creation of the Nigerian state, and in many African states, is that the consents of the federating units were not sought. As the force theory of the origin of the state postulates, the creation of most African states happened through the use of force. The problem with amalgamation is that it “did not convey the voluntary disposition of the people to co-commune. Thus, these societies had no common agreement on coexistence” (Osigwe Anyiam-Osigwe Foundation, 2012:8). The faulty foundation, on which Nigeria rests, has posed some challenges, one of which is that the allegiance that should come from a wilful entry into a social contract is lacking on the part of the people. This is partly the reason why people give allegiance to their ethnic groups over and above the state. Although, there was a political amalgamation in which the northern and the southern parts of Nigeria were merged in 1914, yet the country has not experienced the amalgamation of minds, which refers to the development of sensibilities about the Nigerian state on the part of every individual and group. The individuals in the various groups making up the Nigerian state have been merged physically or geographically but their minds, orientations, beliefs, and views about the Nigerian state are still worlds apart. Missing in the formation of the Nigerian state is the voluntary basis of association. And this is so because peoples of both Northern and Southern Protectorates, at the point of amalgamation, did not have the opportunity to sit together and determine the conditions under which they will cohabit.

Further exacerbating the perceived notion of social injustice in various parts of the country is the belief that the south is the beast of burden that financially funds the north since the north “has remained an economic parasite on the naturally endowed Southern Protectorate of Nigeria” (Obi Ani, Obi-Ani & Isiani 2016:27). For instance, there is the belief that a higher share of the oil revenue generated from the Niger Delta is allocated to states that are non-oil-producing. It is believed that the amalgamation was necessitated because the wealth of the southern protectorate was needed to relieve the cost of administering the northern part. This pattern has continued “with the mainly Christian inhabitants of the oil-producing southern areas bitterly resenting that the revenue from the oil drilled from their land is used to develop non-oil producing areas” (Siollun, 2009:2). Unfortunately, in addition to being regarded as the financial beast of burden, it is a general sentiment in the southern part of Nigeria that the north is the problem facing Nigeria- underaged marriage, the largest number of out of school children, insecurity in terms of insurgency and terrorism arising from religious fanaticism, in spite of the humongous investment that has been made on the north to improve it and even though the affairs of this country have been presided over by more northerners than southerners.

A major consequence of the social injustice arising from the amalgamation is the emergence of separatist groups seeking independence from the state that sometimes employ violent means to pursue their aims. Social injustice in the system led to agitation for resource control, insurgency, terrorism, banditry, agitation for secession, armed struggles against the state, ethno-religious crises, formation of ethnic and religious militias like Arewa Peoples Congress (APC), Odua Peoples Congress (OPC), Movement for the Actualisation of the Sovereign State of Biafra (MASSOB), Movement for the Survival of Ogoni People (MOSOP), and Niger Delta Avenger (NDA), among others. These groups were formed as responses to frustrations, marginalisation, social and political alienation that some ethnic groups have had to endure for years.

The amalgamation was an amalgamation of unequals in terms of population size. The north consists of about three-quarters of Nigeria’s territory and contains more than half of the population (Obi Ani, Obi-Ani & Isiani 2016). This has continually posed a challenge to Nigeria’s

democracy. The north, as a result of its overbearing population, occupies “a commanding position, with a potential stranglehold over the political process, capable of dominating the combined weight of the other two regions.” This situation has the potential of permanently placing some groups of persons consistently in the position of minority (Wiredu, 1996), unable to secure sufficient votes for their candidates to win in elections while the north can call the bluff of the others in having the majority of the votes.<sup>5</sup> The problem in relation to the issue of unfavourable and uneven population is however not limited to the north. It is replicated throughout the federation as many minority groups groan under the overlordship influence of major groups they share space with. In a lot of situations, for instance, members of the dominant ethnic group in an area usually control the spending by a state or a local government council. This, oftentimes, puts other ethnic minorities in that area at a disadvantage in terms of access to allocation (Frynas 2001).

While colonialism lasted, the 1914 amalgamation gave some challenges to the colonialists in the governance of the Nigerian state. This necessitated the enactment of at least five constitutions— 1914, 1922, 1946, 1951 and 1954. A vast number of the constitution-making efforts were directed at addressing issues arising from the management of actual and perceived crises arising from having people of diverse backgrounds sharing a state. A few years to independence, in the process of making the Lyttleton Constitution of 1954, two conferences were held to address issues with governance structures of the country in London between 30th July and August 22, 1953, and Lagos in January 1954. Whereas these efforts of the colonial government were directed at addressing issues hindering the unity of Nigerians, yet, unfortunately, the policies of the colonial government were instrumental in further deepening the divisions among those they hope will find common grounds to live together. Supporting this is the view of Osuola and Muoh that:

The British administrative policies and other subsequent legislation were intended to perpetuate the individuality and separateness of the north and by extension national disintegration. The policies from the onset were contradictions in the British efforts at Nigeria’s amalgamation. The separation in administration was *ab initio* a conventional ‘divide

and rule' system of the British which only buttressed and stressed the differences in the ethnic groups. To this end, they succeeded and initiated the stagnation in the true unification of the country. The anomalies in the administrative policies of the British were apparent in the contraption and contradictions of constitutional developments in Nigeria as handed down by colonialism (Osuola and Muoh, 2015:81).

A major failure of most of the constitutions under the colonialist is the incapacitation of the north from active participation in politics and politicking with the southern protectorates. This itself became a source of tension between the south and the north (Osuola and Muoh, 2015). The social injustice inherent in this act of the colonial lord is evident in the lamentation of Sir Ahmadu Bello that "the Nigerian Legislative Council was first set up in 1922 and since that time, the South has been gaining the art of democratic government ... thus ... the South had twenty-five years start over the North in the application of parliamentary procedure" (Cited in Osuola and Muoh, 2015).

In the final analysis, amalgamation has bred a lot of insecurity. In the first place, the British administered the north and the south not as partners in state-building but rather as contenders. And independence from colonial rule has changed nothing about the north-south divide. This mentality got carried into post-colonial politics, with both sides seeing themselves as rivals, with attendant implications for security and peace in the country. An area where this was evident in the immediate post-colonial day is the military. Coup and counter-coups were fuelled by consideration for ethnic and religious differences. Second, given the condition of social injustice in the system, which the Nigerian state has done little or nothing to address, the wound keeps festering with the further consequence of hatred and aggression displayed towards the state, and on the other against members of other ethnic and religious groups. A consequence of this is the promotion of ethnic politics and primordial affiliations, with people finding refuge with their religious and ethnic groups rather than with the state. Likewise, the contest for the control of state institutions has resulted in violence especially when it comes to elections, which is a means of determining who presides over the affairs of the state. For instance, electoral violence surrounding

the manipulation of the 1964 election contributed to the crash of the First Republic. Likewise,

electoral rigging in 1983 elections instigated by do-or-die winning attitude between the ruling party National Party of Nigeria (NPN) on one hand and the other parties notably Unity Party of Nigeria (UPN) and Nigeria People's Party (NPP) on the other hand caused another military uprising in December 1983. Electoral rigging in opposition states of Ondo, Oyo, Kwara, Imo and Anambra states by the ruling party (NPN) were met with armed confrontation with resultant killings, arson and destruction to property (Ajayi, 2007:327).

### **Conclusion**

In this paper, the attempt has been directed at evaluating how the amalgamation of the southern and northern protectorates of 1914 resulted in fault lines that introduced systemic social injustice into the Nigerian system that has resulted in security challenges as the amalgamation failed to lay a solid foundation for harmonious coexistence. The way forward is to return to the negotiation table. Oluwatobi (2018:35) makes a call for “a resolution among the federating units which must entail a renegotiation of the polity along with democratic principles.” This has to do with taking into consideration the various interests in Nigeria, with the aim of building a consensus of interests and opinions about the kind of state Nigerians want. What such negotiation will achieve is that it will help harvest the input of every group on the kind of state that they envision. Such inputs have the advantage that people help support what they believe that they have been instrumental in creating. A sense of having a stake in the polity is developed through this. Such renegotiation will ensure that “all parties are able to feel that an adequate account has been taken of their point of view in any proposed scheme of future actions or coexistence” (Wiredu, 1996:183). Indeed, this process has the capacity to addressing some of the pertinent problems of injustice that threaten the survival of the nation (Offor, 2014).

## Notes and References

1. The process of amalgamation started in 1906 with the fusion of the Colony and Protectorate of Lagos and the Protectorate of Southern Nigeria which then became the Colony and Protectorate of Southern Nigeria.
2. This made the policy of indirect rule acceptable in the north, while the southern part contested it.
3. Muhamadu Buhari who was contesting as a presidential candidate on the platform of the All Progressives Congress is from the North and a Muslim and thus Bola Ahmed Tinubu, a southerner was considered unsuitable for the post of a vice president because he is a Muslim.
4. This slogan no doubt had implications beyond Sokoto to suggest that the north is the one vested with the right to rule.
5. The constitutional arrangement has mitigated this by requesting that candidates satisfy certain conditions of votes having national spread before they can be declared as the winner, yet the dominance of the north in terms of population and influence it bears on elections is still manifest.

Ajayi, Kunle. 2007. Dimensions of conflict, crisis management and implications for development in Nigeria. *Development Agenda of the Nigerian state*. Eds.: A.A. Agagu and R.F Ola. Akure; Lord Keynes Publishing Company.

Brooks, 2009. What is security: definition through knowledge categorisation. *Security Journal*. 1-15.

Brooks, David J. 2011. Security risk management: a psychometric map of expert knowledge structure. *Risk Management*, Vol. 13, No. 1/2. 17-41.

Collier, P. 2007. *The bottom billion: why the poorest countries are failing and what can be done about it*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.



- Frynas, Jędrzej George. 2001. Corporate and state responses to anti-oil protests in the Niger Delta. *African Affairs*, Vol. 100, No. 398. 27-54.
- Galtung, J. 1975. *Essay in Peace Research*, Vol. 1. Peace Research Education, Action Oslo: Prio Monographic International Peace Research Institute
- Guelke, Adrian. 2012. *Politics in deeply divided societies*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Ikime, Obaro. 1985. In search of Nigerians: changing patterns of inter-group relations in an evolving nation state. Ibadan: Impact Publishers Nigeria Ltd.
- Lijphart, Arendt. 1977. *Democracy in plural societies: a comparative exploration*. London: Yale University Press.
- McLean, Iain and McMillan, Alistair. 2009. *Oxford Concise dictionary of politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meredith, Martin. 2006. *The state of Africa: a history of fifty years of independence*. Great Britain: The Free Press.
- Obi-Ani, Ngozi A, Obi-Ani, Paul, Ismail, Mathias C. 2016. The mistake of 1914: 100 years after. *Nsukka Journal of the Humanities*, Vol. 24, No. 2, 2016. 27-35.
- Offor, F. 2014a. Social justice, democracy, and the crisis of development in Africa. *Ethics and Public Affairs*. Eds.: F.A. Adeigbo, Dipo Irele and Amaechi Udefi. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- Ogaba, O. 2010. Security, globalisation and climate change: a conceptual analysis. Eds.: Osita and Ogaba, *Security in Nigeria*. Lagos, NII.
- Oladipo, Temidayo David. 2017. Social Welfare and the Niger Delta Conflict. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, Vol. 7, No. 11. 181-189.
- Oluwatobi, O. Adeyemi. 2018. Amalgamation and the crisis of governance: The Nigeria experience. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance* 8.3. 35-53.
- Osaghae, Eghosa E. 2002. *Nigeria since independence: crippled giant*. Ibadan: John Archers Publishers Limited.

- Osigwe Anyiam-Osigwe Foundation. 2012. *That sense of community, synthesis for nationhood: ethnic policy and national integration; from indigenes to citizens*. Brief on the central theme of the Emmanuel Onyechere Osigwe Anyiam-Osigwe lecture series.
- Osuola, Uzoma S. and Muoh, Obinna U. 2015. The doldrums of Nigeria's Amalgamation: a historical re-appraisal. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*. 79-87.
- Siollun, Max. 2009. *Oil politics and violence*. New York: Algora Publishing.
- Wiredu, Kwasi. 1996. *Cultural universals and particulars: an African perspective*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.