CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The major problem facing the nation Nigeria is the political leadership, which happen to be the product of its colonial antecedent spanning over a century. The colonial structure of government left behind by its colonial master which has been built upon by the nations nationalist who took over power has been cited by many scholars as the source of the problem of the country. The same system of government they fought hard to dethrone is still what they have upheld even after independence. Issues like the amalgamation of the northern and southern protectorate into one colony. That is, the unification of people who are diverse in history, culture, anthropology and level of economic development are mentioned as defects in the colonial policy of the Nigerian nation and these same unification was still in place even after the gone of the colonial masters, rather than going back to the Nigeria system of ruler ship where for the north we have sultan as the ultimate ruler and for the west the supreme authority was vested on the obas and his cabinet and finally for the eastern part of the country we have leaders of each clan coming together to make law, the nationalist who took over power still maintain the same ruling partner like the colonialist even till these day, the only notable difference is that the head is from the country.

These and many other reasons have giving a big blow to the foundation upon which the nation Nigeria stand and this is evident on the cry from different part of the country for secession which lead to the popular Biafra and Nigeria civil war.

1.1.1 AIMS

The aim of these work is to first give different definition of the term colonialism and to take account of the political development of Nigeria to see if colonialism was the best for the country by considering arguments for and arguments against colonialism to see which has an edge over the other and then make my own opinion on whether colonialism was the best for the nation or not.

1.1.2 CLARIFICATION AND DEFINTION OF TERMS

a) **PROTECTORATES**

These are territories surrendered to the British by the traditional authorities through Treaties, and in many case they were administered as one, that is, as a contiguous colony (Wight 1947:9)

1. **Indirect rule policy**

Indirect rule was a colonial administration system in which the local chiefs were used by the colonial officers to control the colonized people. Under such system chiefs/obas/Emirs were ruling their people, but in the actual sense it was the colonial masters who were actually ruling. According to sir lord Lugard indirect rule means “rule through the native chiefs who were regarded as integral part of the machinery of Government, with well defined powers and functions recognized by the government and by laws, and not dependent on the caprices of an Executive officer (Kirk-Greene 1918:68).

**1.1.3 Assessment of Indirect Rule**

 The Indirect Rule was successful in the North and was partially successful in the West but it was a failure in the East because the Eastern lacked any form of central authority or a recognized traditional institutions. Indirect recorded great success in the North because there existed a centralized traditional system of government which was headed by the Emirs and he enjoyed absolute and unquestionable loyalty from the people. This was in contrast to the West where although, there was a centralized traditional system of government headed by the Obas, however the powers and authority of the Obas could be challenged by another traditional institution or directly by the people.

**1.1.4 Sustenance of Nigeria Culture**

The need to sustain Nigeria culture by the British was another factor for the introduction of Indirect Rule. Unlike the French colonial policy of assimilation of her African subjects, the intention of the British s policy of association was to sustain and preserve African culture in her colonial territories. Lastly, Lugard s past experience in the East and Central Africa where he had successfully established Indirect Rule also informed his decision to repeat the same in Nigeria.

**1.1.5 Towards Unification**

The amalgamation of the northern and the southern protectetorated into one colony in 1914 was imperative against the background that the North could not find sufficient funds to maintain its own administration in spite of the annual grants from the Imperial Treasury so also the Southern administration. The financial situation of the Southern administration was buoyant based on the rapid development of trade. Therefore, Ojiako (1981) posits that: amalgamation was aimed at relieving the Imperial Treasury of its annual contribution towards the upkeep of the Northland For the purpose of achieving this objective, Lord Lugard amalgamated the Lagos Colony and the Southern Protectorate and the Northern Protectorate in 1914 and he created a Central Legislature which he called The Nigerian Council as an advisory and deliberative body. The Council was a creation of three Constitutional instruments: Order-in Council (1912), the Letters Patent (1913), and the Nigerian Protectorate Order-in-Council (1913) (Report of constitutional conference 1995:43).

**1.1.6 Criticisms against Amalgamation**

The unification policy which was introduced by Lord Lugard in 1914 was received by Africans in the North and South with mixed feelings. Both sides seemed to have concluded that it would bring about a fundamental change in the official outlook which some believed would not be a pleasant one (Okafor 1981:51). The Lagos Press and a section of the educated elite were vocal in their criticisms of the new administrative structure introduced by Lugard. In its editorial comment, The Lagos Standard had this to say: For the purpose of administration this vast territory of Nigeria is now divided into three areas, which are the Colony and the Northern and Southern Provinces. This would be an excellent arrangement if the principle was also laid down that each division shall be autonomous. Each area shall have within it a perfect machine for effective government, subject nevertheless to a central control. This central authority should have the power of dealing with matters peculiar to each. They would thereby become a federated State in which the Governor-General would be as it were a Foreman of works, but not the fountain from which all authority and power should emanate for them (see Lagos Standard). The amalgamation of a diverse people who were at different levels of social, educational and economic development into a unified, powerful, and centralized authority was seen as lopsided and unthinkable by the educated elite. They also condemned the over-concentration of powers in the Governor-General over a vast territory, over which he had little knowledge about and it was inconceivable how much authority can be effectively exercised by him, at any moment, in every part of the country. The system was also criticized for alienating the progressive public opinion from the political processes of the country. But in a tacit response to the criticisms, Lugard, in a write-up a year after the amalgamation, stated that he did not consider it as a geographical, political or more especially as a financial expression, rather a means whereby each part of Nigeria might be raised to the level of the highest plane attained by any particular part (See *Confidential Letter from F D Lugard). As regards the isolation of the* North in Lugard s Nigerian Council, Sir Hugh Clifford who succeeded him saw, while on tour in the Northern Provinces, how the policy had kept the North backward. He made the observation while travelling from the North to Onitsha, in the South. He submits: The presence of a detachment of Boy Scouts and a number of children from the neighboring mission schools emphasized the fact that we had passed from the Northern to the Southern Provinces of Nigeria. Until I reached Idah, which I have said, has only recently been transferred to the Northern Provinces, during my whole stay in the latter, I had not seen a body of school children drawn up in order, singing God save the King and other patriotic songs, which is an ubiquitous feature of all public occasions in most parts of West Africa In a fashion, these contrasted results of the British occupation epitomized the rival systems and ideas prevailing in the two sets of Provinces (Okafor 1981:86).

1.2 COLONIALISM

 Defining the term colonialism is not a straightforward task and as such there is no generally accepted definition of the subject matter according to the international encyclopedia of ethics. Some forms of historic and contemporal interaction between people have been described as colonial in character making the definition too narrow and any form of inequality of power between different international parties appears to be an instance of colonialism making the definition too broadly.

The definition is also problematic because of the difficult in distinguishing it from imperialism. Just as colonialism, imperialism also involves political and economic control over a dependent territory, but their etymology provides some clues about how they differ. The term colony comes from the Greek word colonus meaning farmer while imperialism comes from the Latin term imperium, meaning to command. Thus imperialism has to do with the way one country exercises power over another, whether through settlement, sovereignty, or indirect mechanisms of control. . A recurrent problem concerns the relation between the terms “colonialism” and “imperialism.” For some, “colonialism” refers to a particular model of political organization, typified by settler and exploitation colonies, and is best seen as one specific instance of imperialism, understood as the domination of a territory by a separate metropolis. Others use the term more broadly to refer to the general imperial policy.

According to Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy colonialism is a practice of domination, which involves the subjugation of one people to another. Colonialism is the direct and overall domination of one country by another on the basis of state power being in the hands of a foreign power (For example, the direct and overall domination of Nigeria by Britain between 1900-1960). Sometime a denial of fundamental human right could be term as colonialism example the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial counties and people, adopted by the UN general assembly in 1960, accepted that “the subjection to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human right”, in order words colonialism could also be defined as the denial of the fundamental human right of a group of people.

Also another definition of colonialism according to Ronald Horvath is a form of domination that is, the control over the territory and or behavior of other individuals or groups. (1972:47). Colonialism also has to do with the imposition of colonial power, culture and custom on the colonized. For Stephen Ochen, Basil C. Nwankwo (2012). Analysis of colonialism, colonialism is the direct and overall domination of one country by another on the basis of the state power being in the hands of a foreign power (domination of Nigeria by Britain between 1900-1960).Two striking things in all the definition above are the words foreign and domination in order words for anything to be termed as colonialism it must contain both words. Domination could mean the denial of self-determination and the imposition of rule rooted in a separate political jurisdiction.

The first objective of colonialism is political domination; its second objective is to make possible the exploitation of the colonized country. When we talk of colonialism in Nigeria we are talking of phenomenon which took place between 1900-1960. It is a phenomenon which is part and parcel of another phenomenon called imperialism. In fact, colonialism is a direct form of imperialism. This is why it is often said that “all colonialism is imperialism, but not all imperialism is colonialism”. Colonialism began as a result of changes in the mode of production in Europe (For example, the emergence of industrial revolution). The industrial revolution ushered in a new process of production in place of the earlier slave-based economy. The industrial revolution was a revolutionary trend in the history of mankind. The problem of how to lubricate machineries came up with the emergence of the industrial revolution.

The slave trade and slavery have by this time fulfilled their basic function of providing the primitive capital. When Europeans ended slave trade, they did not lose interest in Africa because Africa could supply Europeans with raw materials and new market for their goods. The scientist explorers were interested in Africa wild life and natural resources while the missionary wanted to convert Africans to Christianity and many of them taught European ways of thinking. The quest for the investment of the accumulated capital and the need for raw materials led to the colonization of Africa.

The African economy before colonization was primitive and based on barter system. Since one of the objectives of colonialism was to find market for the European manufactured goods and raw materials for the industries, there was need for an organic linkage between the African economy and market with that of the international system controlled and directed by the colonizers. Through direct control of African economy and political administration made possible colonialism. Africa was compelled or forced to accept the international division of labour which assigned her the compulsory role of production of agricultural raw materials required by the industries in Europe. This explains why up till today, the role of Africa economy and states in the world market or international trade is the production of primary goods and agricultural products. The advanced countries of Europe controlled the production of manufactured goods. As we know, one of the reasons for the colonization of Africa was the need for a suitable market where the numerous European manufactured goods could be easily disposed of at a reasonable profit. Since the African economy was essentially based on barter system, there was the need to monetize the economy to be in line with the European market and the international trade standard. This money was introduced as the only official acceptable medium of exchange and to enforce this, there was need for the colonialist to take direct control of the administration of the African colonies.

Furthermore, there was also the need for the colonialist to take full control of the African economy and administration to ensure that Africa was made a consumer nation for European manufactured goods. If this situation was not guaranteed, it would affect the development and progress of the new industrialization in Europe, because most of the industries would be compelled to close down if there are not ready market and consumers for their products.Later in the nineteenth century, Europeans nations began to compete for control of Africa and to avoid wars over territory leaders met to discuss how to divide Africa (no African were consulted). This colonization often increased tension and led to violence among African groups.

Before going further, it is necessary to be aware of the flow of events. For the purposes of this project the "colonial" period is essentially the period between World War I and World War II while the pre-colonial will covers the 19th century up to World War I. During the pre-colonial period there is already direct contact with Europeans who operate in port cities such as Bonny, as well as indirect contact though the purchase of European goods through trade as well as the production of products intended to be sent to port cities. This commerce of course was added onto the slave trading networks which had existed since around 1500. As a result of a meeting of European powers in Berlin in 1884, the interior of Africa was divided into colonial possessions of European countries. The English move into the land of the Igbo followed shortly thereafter, covering the period from 1889-1914. And, in 1914, northern and southern Nigeria was unitedfor administrative purposes into a single British colony (Amalgamation of the northern and southern protectorate).

World War I was truly a world war with participants drawn from five continents and military actions spread around the globe. There were some specific outcomes and impacts for Africans as a result of WWI. These include the fact that military conscription (draft) of numerous African colonial subjects into European armies generated great amounts of anger. But the war had more concrete consequences. Africans who fought alongside European whites found out that these "masters" were ordinary people, not supermen. Furthermore Africans expected to be rewarded for their service to their colonial masters with social and constitutional changes as well as economic concessions in ways that would improve their living conditions at home. The educated elites followed up on President Woodrow Wilson’s (United States) call to reorganize governments on the basis of national self-determination. The term means that people should be independent and live within political boundaries that corresponded to where they lived.

Rather than relaxing colonial strictures in gratitude after the war, the European presence in Africa intensified. "The period 1919-1935 was colonial imperialism’s last territorial drive in Africa. By 1935, all those areas that were still holding out against the imperialists and clinging to their sovereignty were all brought under effective occupation and put under the colonial system. This meant that more Africans were feeling the pinch of colonialism by the 1920s than were by the 1910s. One would therefore expect to see a corresponding change in the scale of anti-colonialist or nationalist activities. Moreover, the new administrative measures and ordinances that were introduced during this period to underpin the colonial system—this was the heyday of the British system of ‘indirect rule’—gave more and more powers to the traditional rulers and the newly created chiefs to the exclusion of the educated elite. Speaking about the indirect rule in Nigeria as a country with three regions namely: the easternpart, the western part, and the northern part. indirect rule was successful both in the westerner part and in the northern part of the country as a result of the enthronement and respect for monarch but failed woefully in the eastern part because of lack of respected chiefs because each family was headed by the group of okpara and in the clan each family appointed people to represent them. Frustration and disappointment therefore grew among the educated elite, and since their number increased during the period, there became reactions not only intensified and anti-colonial but anti-traditional rulers as well." (Boahen, African Perspectives on Colonialism, 76-77), and economic conditions changed. The 1920s and 1930s saw worldwide economic crises which caused the price for those things produced in African countries to drop sharply. At the same time the prices of goods imported from Europe skyrocketed.

1.2.1 REASONS FOR THE COLONIZATION OF AFRICA AND THE STRATEGIES

The colonization of Africa by European powers was necessitated by several factors. Notable, among the factors was the emergence of the industrial revolution which brought about a rapid change in the socio-economic transformation and technology of the European countries. The industrial revolution led to increase in production. The progress in the industry went faster than the progress in agriculture. It was becoming increasingly hard or difficult for the agriculture to satisfy the demand for raw materials required in the industries. There was therefore, the need for the European powers, for example, the British to go outside the country to look for additional raw materials. Furthermore, as a result of the decline in agricultural production, there was the problem of how to produce enough or adequate food to feed the fast growing urban population. In other words, the rural areas in Britain for example, were finding it increasingly difficult to produce enough food to feed the increasing urban population. Similarly, there was also need for market, not only for the production of raw materials but for food to sustain the increasing population. New products were produced at a faster rate than the population could disposes due to a rapid increase in technology and Africa having a large population constituted a ready market for such products. Furthermore, as result of low wages paid to workers, there was accumulation of profits by the industrialists at a faster rate than they could invest back. There was under-utilization of capital in Europe at this time, and a need to find where these capitals will be transported and invested for the creation of new products. It was during this process of investment of the surplus capital that imperialism emerged. The question I now wish to ask is, what factors made it possible for the direct colonization of Africa by European powers? In other words, what strategies did the colonialists use to maintain their direct economies and political domination of African states or territories during the period of colonial rule of the continent? The question above is what I would be attempting to give an answer to in the paragraph that flows.

The colonialists used a number of methods and strategies to compel Africans to submit to colonialism and colonial administration. These included the use of conquest, forced labor, taxation, and monetization of the economy. The first method or strategy used by the colonialist to colonize and maintain effective occupation and administration of African territories was by conquest. The various African states or territories were conquered. Conquest made it possible for the European powers who were the colonizers to take direct control and effective occupation of African territories. In response to pressure from their traders, the European powers began systematically to interfere with the sovereignty of African states and to intrude upon their internal affairs. The Europeans began to help one faction to depose a ruler and install another, and to bestow honors, titles and recognition upon those whose rule they found it in their interest to support. The officially goals of such interference were to suppress the slave trade and to promote “legitimate” trade.

Another effective strategy which the colonialist used to maintain direct control and domination of African territories was taxation. Taxation in the form introduced by the European colonizers was alien to most African people. Some African communities such as in Northern Nigeria paid tax to their rulers but this could be in cash or kind. The colonial authority insisted that Africans should pay their tax in colonial currency. The implication of this was that Africans would be compelled to work either in the colonial civil service or in the industries and plantations in order to earn the colonial currency to pay their tax. Since Africans were not allowed to pay their tax in kind such as using yams, cocoa-yams, livestock, palm oil etc., they were indirectly compelled to make their labour services available for the colonialist in order to earn the money to meet up with their civic colonial obligation. The colonialists imposed taxes on Africans for two reasons. The first was that it was a source of labour for their industries and plantations. The second reason was because they wanted the colonies to bear the cost of the personnel and the administration.

Monetization of African economy was another effective instrument or strategy used by the colonialists to take direct control and political administration of the African territories. Prior to colonization, African economy was essentially based on barter system. Furthermore, even where a sort of currency was introduced these currencies lacked general acceptability, were too heavy or bulky and hardly divisible into smaller units of exchange. In fact, the currencies lacked the good qualities of a modern medium of exchange. It was necessary for the colonialists to monetize African economy in order to integrate it into the world market and international trade. The currencies introduced in the African territories were those used by the colonialists back home. It was therefore easy for them to regulate the use and value of the currency as a means of maintaining effective control of the African economy and their administration. The colonialists made the currency too difficult for Africans to obtain. The way they did this was to make the prices of raw materials and agricultural products produced by Africans to be too cheap. On the other hand, the colonialists made the prices of goods manufactured by them to be too dear or high, so that an African would spend all he had toiled for, for year or more to purchase a little of the foreign goods. The implication of this was that Africans kept on working hard and making their labour service available to the colonialist in order to get foreign manufactured goods they required. The consequence of this was that while Africans kept on becoming poorer, the colonialist profits kept increasing. Since the currency used in the African colonial territories was controlled by the colonialist, they determined the character and nature of development of the African economy and political administration. In fact, monetization of the African economy and introduction of currency institution was an effective imperialistic instrument used by colonialists to maintain effective control and domination of African territories.

The last strategy used by the colonialists to maintain direct control and administration of African territories was the payment of low wages to Africans employed in the colonial service. The payment of low wages to Africans was seen by the colonialists as a method or strategy to compel more Africans to make their labour services available to the colonial plantations and industries. For example, if a man was married and working for the colonialist, what he receives as wage could not keep him and his wife, family and relatives alive. The implication of the low wage paid to the African man was that his wife, children, relatives etc. would be compelled to join the colonial service in order to make ends meet. This was to the advantage of the colonialists because more labor force was made available for use in the plantations and industries. If the African man had been initially well paid or rewarded, there would be no need for his wife, children and relatives to join the colonial service. Instead, they would have worked in his farms or enter into trading.

The legitimacy of colonialism has always been a topic of debate especially among French, German, and British philosophers in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Enlightenment thinkers such as Kant, Smith and Diderot were critical of the barbarity of colonialism and challenged the idea that Europeans had the obligation to “civilize” the rest of the world. At first it might seem relatively obvious that Enlightenment thinkers would develop a critique of colonialism. The system of colonial domination, which involved some combination of slavery, quasi-feudal forced labor, or expropriation of property, is antithetical to the basic Enlightenment principle that each individual is capable of reason and self-government. The rise of anti-colonial political theory however, required more than a universalistic ethic that recognized the shared humanity of all people. Given the tension between the abstract universalism of natural law and the actual cultural practices of indigenous peoples, it was easy to interpret native difference as evidence of the violation of natural law. This in turn became a justification for exploitation.

The concern of political and moral philosophers in the western tradition has been on the legitimacy of colonialism. A particular problem here concerns the prior identification of colonialism as characteristic call exploitative. Some historians have challenged the claim that the current members of particular historically mistreated peoples have themselves been harmed by colonial injustice, as a result of a deeply controversial argument that such persons may in fact have gained a net benefit from the treatment of their ancestors (Ferguson 2002). This claim must be assessed carefully. It does not in itself represent a defense of historic colonialism: it might still be maintained that colonialism has not led to an overall net benefit for the colonized people when the suffering of past persons is taken into account, or that even a net overall benefit would be insufficient to justify colonialism on anything but the crudest consequentialist accounts. However, the question of the status of current generations is seemingly relevant to the question of contemporary reparations, if their rationale is grounded in the idea that past injustice has caused harm to those living in the present. We might consider three possible responses to such an argument. First, the empirical assumption of the argument might be challenged: many historians have disputed upbeat assessments of the contemporary effects of colonialism, and have instead pointed to a lasting legacy of failed states and intercommunity violence (Brendon 2007). Second, one may question how counterfactual comparisons to identify harm and benefit should be made in relation to colonial exploitation. This is generally done by reference to assumptions of the most probable outcome in the absence of colonial intervention: we are asked to imagine a world where there was no interaction between colonized and colonizers, and thus no colonial injustice, and to determine whether those living in the present are now better or worse off than they would be in comparison. However, this is not the only, and arguably not the most appropriate, way to calculate who has won and who has lost. It may better to imagine a counterfactual where there was extensive interaction, fully consensual in nature, that took place in a context of non-domination and non-exploitation, and which would seemingly require very substantial levels of compensation in some cases (Butt 2012). Third, one may expand one’s understanding of the wrongs committed in the colonial period to encompass failures to fulfill duties of distributive justice. Insofar as historic colonial empires subjected peoples to political control, it may be thought that colonial subjects became members of a larger political entity, and so were entitled to a fair share of this entity’s social production – a share which was denied to them at the point of institutional decoupling during decolonization. If one holds, for example, an egalitarian account of distributive justice, and believes that there has been an ongoing failure to transfer what is owed, then present-day reparative obligations may be colossal (Ypi et al. 2009).
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