

**Racial Capitalism and Difference: Structuring  
Exploitation and Expropriation of Resources  
through Differences in Nigeria**

**Buhari Shehu Miapyen**

Submitted to the  
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy  
in  
International Relations

Eastern Mediterranean University  
February 2021  
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

---

Prof. Dr. Ali Hakan Ulusoy  
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in International Relations.

---

Prof. Dr. Ahmet Sözen  
Chair, Department of Political Science  
and International Relations

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in International Relations.

---

Asst. Prof. Dr. Umut Bozkurt  
Supervisor

---

Examining Committee

1. Prof. Dr. Onwubiko Agozino

2. Prof. Dr. Shedrack Gaya Best

3. Prof. Dr. Erol Kaymak

4. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Julian Saurin

5. Asst. Prof. Dr. Umut Bozkurt

## ABSTRACT

Nigeria is a colonial creation and has diverse identities. These identities range from linguistic, ethnic, gender, class, spatial and religious forms. This thesis aims to analyze differences in Nigeria by drawing on the racial capitalism framework developed by Cedric Robinson. Differences in Nigeria are often analyzed by referring to class, ethnic divisions or civic/primordial dualism. Robinson made a novel contribution with his racial capitalism framework because he does not understand racialism in terms of differences in skin color but he explains racial capitalism as capitalism using differences (racial, gender or other forms of differences) to structure exploitation and expropriation of resources. The analysis conducted in this thesis is original because racial capitalism theories are often used to explain North American and Caribbean development yet they had not been used to explain African development in general and Nigeria in particular. This thesis will analyze racial capitalism in Nigeria by focusing on the recent history of differentiation and dispossession in the Niger-Delta region. It will engage itself with these questions: How are identities produced in the colonial period? How have these identities been reproduced in the subsequent post-colonial era in the Niger-Delta areas? How are these identities employed to structure exploitation of people and expropriation of resources to support capitalist accumulation? This thesis will also discuss land dispossession and pollution as dimensions of capitalist exploitation in the Niger Delta and examine the rise of community-based social movements in resistance to oil exploration and exploitation.

**Keywords:** exploitation, expropriation, racial capitalism and difference

## ÖZ

Nijerya kolonyal bir oluşumdur ve çeşitli kimliklere sahiptir. Bu kimlikler dilsel, etnik, cinsiyet, sınıf, mekansal ve dini biçimlere uzanır. Bu tez, Cedric Robinson tarafından geliştirilen ırksal kapitalizm çerçevesinden yararlanarak Nijerya'daki farklılıkları incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Nijerya'daki farklılıklar genellikle sınıf, etnik ayrımlar veya yurttaşlık / ilkel düalizmine atıfta bulunularak analiz edilir. Robinson, ırksal kapitalizm teorik çerçevesiyle yeni bir katkı yapmıştır çünkü ırkçılığı ten rengi farklılıkları olarak anlamlandırmamış ama ırksal kapitalizmi, kapitalizmin farklılıkları (ırksal, toplumsal cinsiyet ve diğer farklılıkları) kullanarak sömürüyü ve kaynaklara el koyulmasını yapılandırması olarak açıklamıştır. Bu tezde ortaya koyulan analiz özgündür çünkü ırksal kapitalizm teorileri genellikle Kuzey Amerika ve Karayipler'deki gelişmeyi açıklamak için kullanılır, ancak genel olarak Afrika'nın ve özel olarak Nijerya'nın gelişimini açıklamak için kullanılmamışlardır. Bu tez, Nijer-Delta bölgesindeki farklılaşma ve mülksüzleştirme yakın tarihine odaklanarak Nijerya'daki ırksal kapitalizmi analiz edecektir. Bu tez şu sorulara yanıtlar bulmaya çalışacaktır. Sömürge döneminde kimlikler nasıl üretildi? Sömürge sonrası dönemde Nijer-Delta bölgelerinde bu kimlikler nasıl yeniden üretildi? Bu kimlikler, kapitalist birikimi desteklemek için insanların sömürülmesini ve kaynaklara el koyulmasını yapılandırmak için nasıl kullanılıyor? Bu tez aynı zamanda Nijer Deltası'nda kapitalist sömürünün boyutları olarak arazi mülksüzlüğünü ve kirliliği tartışacak ve petrol arama ve sömürüsüne direnişte toplum temelli toplumsal hareketlerin yükselişini inceleyecektir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** sömürü, istimlak, ırksal kapitalizm ve farklılıklar

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	iii
ÖZ .....	iv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	ix
1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Introduction .....	1
1.2 Research Problem.....	6
1.3 Statement of the Research Problem .....	7
1.4 Research Questions .....	9
1.5 Research Aims and Objectives.....	9
1.6 Methods.....	10
2 THE REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE .....	15
2.1 Introduction .....	15
2.2 Capitalist State and the Bourgeoisie/Proletariat Divide in Nigeria.....	17
2.3 The Nigerian State and Ethnic Identity .....	20
2.4 The Two Publics: Civic and Primordial Dualism in Nigeria .....	24
3 THE THEORY OF RACIAL CAPITALISM.....	30
3.1 Introduction .....	30
3.2 The Black Radical Tradition and Philosophy .....	32
3.3 The Origin of Racial Constructions in European Society .....	37
3.3.1 The Destruction of the African Past .....	38
3.3.2 The Dark Ages: Europe and Africa .....	38
3.3.3 The Genealogy of the Industrial Bourgeoisie (The Nouveaux Riches)....	40
3.3.4 Western Civilizations and Capitalism .....	42

3.3.5 Race and Nationalism as Instruments of Domination and Exploitation...	43
3.3.6 Land Dispossession and Intensification of Poverty by the English Industrial Capital.....	44
3.3.7 The English Colonization of Ireland: Land Dispossession and the Roots of Racism against the Irish.....	45
3.3.8 English Working-class Consciousness and the Irish Workers .....	46
3.3.9 From Babeuf to Marx: A Curious Historiography .....	47
3.4 Debating How to Know and Understanding Capitalism: Marx and Robinson in Perspective .....	48
3.4.1 Robinson’s Readings of Karl Marx, The Black Radical Scholarship and The Theory of Racial Capitalism.....	51
3.5 The Limitations of Robinson’s Perspectives.....	57
3.5.1 The Effects of Capitalism on Societies in Europe and the World Beyond it: Robinson’s Views.....	61
3.5.2 Appreciating the Diverse Effects of Capitalism in the World Beyond Europe.....	62
3.5.3 Diverse Ideologies for Exploitation and Expropriation: The Anglo-Saxon Philosophy .....	64
3.5.4 The Construction of Identity Categories in British Empires .....	65
3.5.5 The Complex Character of the Capitalist System .....	67
3.6 Race Relations in Colonial Empires and Capitalist Wage Differentials as Racialism.....	68
3.7 Conclusion.....	71
4 THE CAPITALIST ECONOMY, EFFECTS AND THE DIFFERENTIATED SOCIAL WORTH IN NIGERIA .....	72

4.1 Introduction .....	72
4.1.1 Inter-Group Relations in Pre-Colonial Nigeria.....	74
4.2 The Formation and Amalgamation of Nigeria .....	80
4.2.1 The Imposition of Colonial Rule on the Niger Area .....	80
4.2.2 The Amalgamation of Protectorates into a Single Entity .....	83
4.2.3 Naming of the Territory .....	85
4.3 Formation of Political Parties and the First Electoral Process in Nigeria .....	86
4.3.1 How and Why Political Parties Were Formed.....	86
4.3.2 First Electoral Process .....	90
4.3.3 The Origin and Genesis of Minority Agitation in Nigeria .....	91
4.4 The Neglect of Indigenous Minority Communities, Dispossession of Land and the Plight of Pollution .....	95
4.4.1 Capitalism in Nigeria.....	95
4.4.2 Minority Ethnic Groups.....	97
4.4.3 Complex Dispossession as Essential to Racial Capitalism.....	101
4.4.4 The Plight of Oil Induced Pollution in Nigeria .....	105
4.5 Community-Based Social Movements and Militancy in the Oil Producing Region.....	108
4.5.1 The “Carrot” Response: Restitution .....	111
4.5.2 The “Stick” Response: Manipulation of Differences .....	112
4.5.3 Politics of Resistance and the Oil Workers Union in Nigeria .....	116
4.6 Making sense of the Oil Dependent Capitalism in Nigeria through Racial Capitalism.....	119
4.7 Conclusion.....	125
5. SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION .....	126

5.1 Introduction .....	126
5.1.1 Summary .....	126
5.2 Major Findings .....	133
5.3 Conclusion.....	134
REFERENCES.....	135



## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

AG	Action Group
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon Dioxide
IYC	Ijaw Youth Council
LGA	Local Government Area
MOSOP	Movement for the Survival of Ogoni People
NA	Native Authority
NCNC	National Council of Nigeria and Cameroons
NDAP	Niger Delta Amnesty Programme
NDVF	Niger Delta Volunteer Force
NGOs	None Governmental Organizations
NNDC	Niger Delta Development Commission
NPC	Northern Peoples' Congress
OMPADEC	Oil Mineral Producing Area Development Commission
UNANA	Urhobo National Association in North America
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Programme
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
WHO	World Health Organisation

# Chapter 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Introduction

This research explored different arguments advanced by scholars on the debates about differences in Nigeria. This thesis aims to participate in the conversation and make a contribution using the theoretical framework of racial capitalism by Cedric Robinson. Available literature on Nigeria focus on either class or ethnic divisions or civic/primordial publics dualism and these identity categories are argued to have shaped social power and access to resources in Nigeria. This research looks at capitalism as an organized mechanism for plunder, exploitation, expropriation and violence through the articulation or intersectionality of racialism, sexism and imperialism, which was hitherto not analyzed in Nigeria. This gap in the literature has been problematized and interrogated. Using the theory of racial capitalism, this research engaged in the conversation on the differences in Nigeria.

To achieve this goal, this research analysed the basic premises of the black radical tradition, which emerged from the shadows and influences of both the Hegelian and Marxist philosophies. However, the black radical philosophy later distinguished itself as a different school of thought, through the key argument that the division in a capitalist economy is not only along the bourgeoisie/proletariat difference. Race and gender, which are lived experiences of people of colour and women have not been given adequate attention in the Marxist literature. This assertion has been challenged

by Agozino (2014:174) that Robinson's claims were premised on scanty evidence that failed to detail the study of Marx's works like *Capital Volume 1* and many other works by Karl Marx.

Despite this limitation, it is possible to argue that Cedric Robinson, a black radical scholar made a seminal contribution to this neglect of race as a structure of domination in a capitalist economy in 1983. In doing so, he identified the limits of both the Marxist literature and challenged the understanding of race conceptualised and employed by the preceding black radical scholars. Race for Robinson is not about the differences among people based on their skin colour, but a structure of power or a means of structuring power through race, class and gender differences. Cedric Robinson rooted the analysis of racialism in history, tracing the roots of racialism from the Greek civilization into the feudal times. Accordingly, Robinson (1983) maintains that racialism is a feudal behaviour extended into the capitalist mode of accumulation. This re-interpretation of the meaning of race as a means of structuring power through difference is a novel concept.

Marxist scholars have argued and criticized Robinson's perspective as demonstrating an understanding, which is reductionist. It was claimed that Robinson presented a reductionist reading of Marxist scholarship. Meryerson (2000) in particular criticized Robinson for mistaking Marxist class analysis for a discussion on capitalism. Meryerson also identified the limits of Robinson's explanations about the effects of capitalism in Europe, which Robinson argues created a world divided in a form that positioned Europe against the rest of the world. This research argues that the effects of capitalism are much more diverse than the simple dialectics of Europe versus the world beyond it. The arguments of Cedric Robinson and his critique will be elaborated in

details in Chapter 3. Nevertheless, it is important to underline here that despite all the limitations of this perspective, his contribution to the understanding of race as a power structure is important. This research will draw on Robinson's racial capitalism that perceives race as a means of structuring power through difference to analyse differences in Nigeria. The survey of literature on this issue reveals that this subject matter was mainly analyzed through class, ethnic and civic/primordial dualism. As it will be elaborated below in Chapter two, these frameworks are marked with certain shortcomings and using racial capitalism paved the way to a new perspective on the nature of differences in Nigeria.

The modern Nigerian state is a colonial creation. The capitalist era in Nigeria started with legitimate commerce and later, colonialism. The colonial project in Nigeria was undertaken by the British imperial power in the 19<sup>th</sup> century to cope with the contradictions generated at home by capitalism. These contradictions include the excess manufactured goods as a result of industrialization, slowed industrial growth, which was occasioned by the market shortage, scarcity of raw materials to satisfy the hungry mouths of the new machines invented for production. It could be argued, the colonial enterprise began ostensibly, to source for raw materials overseas to meet the demands of production, explore more markets for the excess manufactured goods, and to seek possible investments outlets (Kautsky, 1961:112).

Colonial rule arrived at the shores of Nigeria in 1860 with a bang and explosive military campaign aimed at pacifying and reorienting the colonised societies towards serving the needs of capital in the metropolitan centres of world production. The levels of violence expressed during colonial penetration in the colonised economies included psychological, structural and physical violence (Fanon, 1963 cited in Amzat and

Olutayo, 2009:242). The end of the pacification heralded a new system of rules where the white elites were placed as cerebral authorities over reconstituted indigenous ruling structures. Hence, the indirect rule system in Nigeria. This kind of order was built on racial ideology; Africa, a dark continent in serious need of a civilizing mission. This kind of notion is expressed even today in Joseph Conrad's "Heart of Darkness" novel based on Africa. The "Heart of Darkness" projects the image of Africa as "the other world," the antithesis of Europe and therefore of civilization, a place where man's vaunted intelligence and refinement are finally mocked by triumphant bestiality" (Achebe, 2016:1). It must be understood clearly that race is not a biological entity but a social reality, constructed socially that engenders society and the world in general (Anderson, 1987:584). The white ruling class during the colonial era formed the top military and bureaucratic echelon, taking decisions in consultation with the home office in London, and handing down such decisions to the reconstituted indigenous ruling class for implementation on the colonial subjects. Stoler (1989: 635) argues that the colonial enterprise was built on constructed categories, indicating the differences and specifying who the colonizer, the colonised, white, native, indigenous or non-indigenous persons were. This colonial system, which was perfected in 1900, consequent upon the British experience in India, lasted till 1960. The capitalist structure of production substantially shaped the colonial and post-colonial projects in Africa.

Colonial Africa and Nigeria specifically had two bourgeois groups; the colonial administrators were mostly drawn from the rising bourgeois class in Europe, and the indigenous bourgeois class that emerged out of the colonial experience. These structures shaped and laid the ideological basis for legitimating the rule over the common people in the post-independence era (Ekeh, 1975:95).

In Nigeria, an indigenous bourgeois class was groomed to take over the colonial structures in the post-colonial era. They were politically oriented towards ethnic difference and affiliations. For instance, the Hausa-Fulani were made dominant in the north, Yoruba in the west and Igbo in the east. The minority ethnic nationalities were given less attention and the difference between the minority and majority identity categories were politicized. The political parties were the Northern People's Congress (NPC) in the North, Action Group (AG) in the west, and The National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons (NCNC) from the East.

The economy immediately sustaining the post-colonial era was cash crop production-oriented, which also took the same geographic spread, with cocoa in the West, cotton and groundnut from the North, and palm produce in the East, giving the majority and hegemonic ethnic groups, the economic advantage and access to foreign earnings.

In discussing Nigeria and access to resources, we must understand and appreciate the role western companies contribute in making money daily with the Nigerian indigenous power elites (Mayer, 2016:11).

The discovery of oil shifted the focus of production to extraction of primary raw materials mainly from oil and gas. This new economic phase is dominated by transnational oil corporations. Landless people are created and denied access to land. Also, the environment is heavily polluted. This helps both the state and the capitalist firms to gain huge revenues and high returns on investment.

Accordingly, this resulted in the formation of community-based social movements that effectively engaged in militant activities to push back the frontiers of domination,

exploitation of resources and the attendant environmental degradation and organised labor that resist exploitation of labor, as well as division of its ranks. In this way, the state responded in two ways; by "carrots" and "sticks". Carrot was the use of restitution. The state used sticks by creating differences and instrumentalizing such differences to discourage inter and intra-communal solidarity. This is where Cedric Robinson's racial capitalism became relevant. Differences are not just about the existence of ethnic, religious or linguistic variations but how these differences are instrumentalized to support the capitalist mode of accumulation.

## **1.2 Research Problem**

To understand differences in Nigeria, it is imperative to come to terms with the debate in extant literatures about differences, and access to social power and resource.

The Marxist oriented scholars argue that class division created by capitalism accounts essentially for the differences, and access to social power and resources. The ruling class and the working class always engaged in an antagonistic clash over resources and labor. This structure of exploitation created by capital became possible from colonialism and neo-colonial era (Schalzt, 1984; Amzat & Olutayo, 2009; Mayer, 2016).

Another group of scholars oriented towards ethnic studies and anthropology contest this Marxist perspective and suggested that ethnicity, rather than class differences in a capitalist economy is the most plausible explanation to the differences in social power and access to resources in Nigeria. These ethnic differences, it is argued remains the source of, animosity, tension and violence (Diamond, 1988; Osaghae, 2001; Ukeje & Adebani, 2008; Amuwo, 2010).

In furtherance of the debate, some scholars see differences in the country as a result of the existence of dual publics; primordial and civic. The antagonism between the two publics remains the sources of differences, the unequal access to resources and social power (Ekeh.1975; Arowosegbe, 2016).

Feminists In Nigeria advance the paradigm that patriarchy was also imposed by the colonizers to relatively deprive women and poor men of power in the political economy of Nigeria, irrespective of their ethnicity and class to some extent.

### **1.3 Statement of the Research Problem**

To reiterate, the variations in access to resources in Nigeria are explained by different theoretical frameworks in the literature. The problems inherent in these frameworks will be further elaborated in chapter four, yet their shortcomings can be summarised here briefly.

Marxist analysis views the differences in the capitalist economy as related to class structures. Class division is only one aspect of the differences in a capitalist system. The capitalist order is a racial system. There is no race-neutral capitalism or non-racial capitalist system (Kelly, 2017). Modern capitalism emerged with racialism infused in it from feudalism (Robinson, 2000) Explaining the differences from class perspective could mask other capitalist means of violence, dispossession and domination. In addition, it neglects other inherent categories used by the capitalist mode of production in structuring exploitation, that creates or supports violence, domination, and differentiated access to social power and resources.



The group of scholars who view divisions in Nigeria from the lens of ethnic identity, tend to convince their listeners that it is integral to human communities. How then is ethnic identity a problem in one human setting and not a problem in another setting? More facts and evidence are needed to reinforce the fact that ethnicity or ethnic differences is causal or the roots of fomenting violence, exploitation and accounting for differences in access to social power. The Nigerian experience is even more curious because most contentions leading to violence, domination and exploitation had not been about ethnic or cultural values. Ethnicity is a cultural category and contest over such cultural values are rarely present, yet ethnicity continues to receive blames.

The dichotomous publics (primordial and civic) are quite insufficient to give a complete account of the differences in Nigeria and access to social power and resources. Nigeria's political economy is a diverse socio-economic entity; therefore, it is much more diverse than such dualism. The Nigerian state's contact with capitalism (slave trade, colonialism, neo-colonialism and globalization), and the production and reproduction of differences leading to the unequal access to social power and resources have not been observed and analysed through the theoretical lenses of **Racial capitalism**. The making of the Nigerian political geography, the politicization of the ethnic difference and the exaggeration of hitherto existing differences can be understood better by identifying how capitalist race relations play out and the use of differences to structure exploitation. Hence, racial capitalism offers an analytical tool to observe and analyse or describe and interpret the production and reproduction of differences among people, the exaggeration of these differences, violence, dispossession and domination leading to unequal access to social power and resources. This research seeks to fill this gap in the literature. Cedric Robinson's understanding and analytical tool kit become useful for this research.

## **1.4 Research Questions**

1. How are identities produced in the colonial period?
2. How are these identities re-produced in the subsequent post-colonial era in the Niger-Delta areas?
3. How are these identities employed to structure exploitation of people and expropriation of resources?

## **1.5 Research Aims and Objectives**

This research aims to discuss and analyse racial capitalism from the perspective of Cedric Robinson. It seeks to present and analyse capitalism as an organized mechanism of dispossession through the instrument of the race (the intersection of race with capitalism).

This thesis shall explore the historical evolution of the Nigerian state, the Nigerian oil-dependent capitalist economy. The identification of land dispossession and the pollution of the environment as a corollary of capitalist activities, the rise of community-based social movements as a contradiction of the oil extraction, as well as how identities are configured and instrumentalized to structure exploitation and the expropriation of resources.

The following objectives will be achieved:

1. To explore and analyze the theory of racial capitalism
2. To explore the way identities are configured and formed in the colonial Nigerian economy.
3. To explore how post-colonial identities are re-produced in the Niger-Delta areas by the state and capital.

4. To discuss the nature and prevalence of land dispossession and pollution as dimensions of capitalist exploitation in the Niger Delta,
5. Examine the rise of community-based social movements as contradictions of oil exploration and exploitation,
6. Analyse how differences are employed to structure exploitation and expropriation of resources to support capitalist accumulation.

## **1.6 Methods**

This research employs the qualitative method of data collection and analysis. It utilizes secondary literature sources and deductive approach while relying on published articles to code<sup>1</sup>. Coding is a process of organising and sorting qualitative data. It helps the researcher to easily retrieve and categorize data that are similar in meaning so that the researcher can locate clusters and segments of the textual data that are related to one another (Stuckey, 2015:1), identify patterns, categorize, describe and interpret textual data to contribute to academic conversations to advance the frontier of knowledge.

**Qualitative Research** is how the observer or researcher attempts to describe and interpret the phenomenal world through the meaning people bring to them (Mayer, 2015:56 and 57). This observation could be carried out through interview, focus group discussions, re-examining published materials and many other means. This research uses the published articles obtained from the school library on the Thomson Reuters data-base, textbooks, newspapers and archival materials.

---

<sup>1</sup> Coding is a process employed in qualitative research method that involves reading through related textual data and creating a storyline, by creatively establishing thematic categories that seek to address the research question. Also, the keynotes noted or the memos could be used for clarification and interpretation (Stuckey, 2015:1).

Qualitative research scholars view social reality as a dynamic phenomenon or constantly shifting properties of individual's creation or explanation to events or such social reality (Bryman and Bell, 2011:27). Van Maanen (1979:520) argues that qualitative research cannot be limited to this narrow characterization, rather it is a broad term covering a wide spectrum of interpretative techniques that seek to describe, decode, translate and come to terms with the meaning of phenomena in the social world. Qualitative research could employ deductive or inductive reasoning. This research employed the deductive approach.

**Deductive** approach or reasoning is used by researchers to re-test existing data in a new context, which may involve testing hypothesis, models, concepts or theories (Marshall and Rossman, 1995 cited in Elo and Kyngas, 2007:112). Deductive reasoning is very useful when the structure of the analysis is operationalized based on past knowledge about a similar subject matter. It is a theory or hypothesis testing approach that proceeds from general knowledge to specific knowledge and is mostly associated with qualitative methods of data analysis.

It emphasises the examination of topics, themes, and inferences drawn from previous research. This approach allows the researcher to understand social reality in a subjective but scientific manner (Zhang and Wildemuth, 2009:319). It is a process constructed to condense data into categories or themes that is predicated on valid inferences and interpretations. In other words, it means the subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identification of patterns to interpret or make sense of the data (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005:1278). Ezeibe, Anichi and Iwouha (2018:176) argued that there are different types of qualitative approaches, one of which is the descriptive/interpretative

approach. This approach is oriented toward providing a description and interpretation of social phenomena.

In this case, this research proceeded from studying a broad literature on differences in Nigeria, identified patterns of the debate, code, organized, described and interpreted the data from a new perspective. It narrowed to a specific study on the Niger Delta region of Nigeria (From the general literature on the character of division in the Nigerian economy to specific study as it applies to the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria). This approach enables this research to participate in the conversation on differences and identity categories formation in Nigeria using a new and different perspective from the extant literatures.

**Data** is a naturally occurring or generated piece of information, which the researcher employs in the quest to address or answer research questions. This could be quantitative or qualitative. This research employs the qualitative methods of data collection and analysis. Therefore, qualitative data is primarily concerned with meaning as opposed to quantity or quantitative data, which is mostly oriented towards the utilization of numbers.

**Qualitative Data Analysis** aims to create categories, which will assist the researcher or provide a means of describing and interpreting phenomena in order to create understanding and generate knowledge (Cavanagh, 1997 cited in Elo and Kyngas, 2007: 108). The analysis of qualitative data involves exploring the properties and dimensions of the themes categorized. It also involves identifying relationships, discovering patterns and testing these categories or themes against the entire range of the data employed. This stage of the process is the most challenging stage of critical

qualitative data analysis. It is the most challenging because it depends on the reasoning abilities of the researcher.

However, qualitative data analysis does not produce statistical significance. This again makes the process more challenging. To overcome this particular challenge of lack of statistics, therefore, the researcher has available tools that could help in guiding the process. These tools are the skills of description and interpretation. The skill of description is necessary because the researcher uses description to express the scope and context in which the discussion or study is premised. The second tool, interpretation represents the researcher's personal and theoretical understanding of the phenomenon under study. The qualitative analysis of phenomena involves the researcher's ability to transform data into findings and there is no formula for the transformation. Most analysis in qualitative research becomes controversial precisely because such analysis is inquirer-dependent (Patton, 2002:275). In this way, the researcher needs to employ skills and tact in creating and keeping the complex and delicate balance between the description of the scope of study and the context of the research and the interpretation of data concerning the theory to make sense and contribute to knowledge. This approach to data management assisted the understanding of the phenomenon, about which this research aspires to contribute. From these data and other useful inferences from the previous relevant study, conclusions are reached.

The analysis of qualitative data is usually a mechanical exercise that is dynamic, intuitive and a creative process that involves reasoning, thinking and theorizing (Thomas, 2003:4; Basit, 2003:143). The purpose of analysing qualitative data is to determine the categories, relationships and assumptions that inform the respondents'

world views and the topic in particular (McCracken, 1988 cited in Basit, 2003:143). Obasi (1999:6) cited in Ezeibe et al (2018:180) corroborated that qualitative research is mostly non-statistical. It does not test hypothesis in a statistical sense of it, rather, it tests its hypothesis or assumptions using deductive logical methods.

## Chapter 2

### THE REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

#### 2.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses relevant literature on the categories of difference in the Nigerian political economy. From the survey of literature, three patterns of arguments tend to dominate the entire conversation on difference and divisions. The structure of exploitation and domination from the discussions in the available literature point more glaringly to three dominant theoretical discussions and frameworks.

The first perspective aims to analyse the divisions and identity formation by focusing on the capitalist mode of production. These scholars see capitalist system as responsible for dividing the Nigeria socio-economic system into the owners of capital (bourgeoisie or petty bourgeoisie) and the working-class (proletariat). Capitalism has been blamed for creating the class differences and deepening the problems of the working-class. Capitalism ever since it evolved from feudalism, have had different forms and manifestations in both time and space. In time, it first took the form of handcraft and later mechanization, organized along with a differentiated structure of production hierarchy, the drive for which is profit-making. Over time, it took the form of welfare as represented by the 20<sup>th</sup>-century Keynesian model. From 1972 to 2000 it took a neoliberal format with an aggressive attack on the working-class through wage compression and automation sometimes through advance robotics (over-accumulation) to enhance profitability (McNally, 2009:55).



Hudis (2018:202 and 205) contends that the capitalist takes care or looks after the worker (by paying subsistence wages and not beyond), only to the extent that the worker provides the labour-power needed to sustain profitable production system in the society. The labourer or the worker also cooperates only because the capitalist remains a source of market for her or his labour-power. This is the only commodity the worker possesses to exchange for his livelihood. At any point a capitalist finds a mechanical replacement for the workers' labour, no time is spared to dispense or discard the labourer's position in the production hierarchy, as she or he will be declared redundant, as exemplified by the over-accumulation of capital through the automation of the production process in the era of globalisation.

To the Marxist scholars, the Marxist framework of analysis, had been useful. However, this chapter identifies the limits of analysing differences in Nigeria along this class line. This limitation is hinged on the failure of the Marxist theoretical framework to capture other structures of domination in the capitalist economy like culture, race or gender.

The second perspective structured its arguments around ethnic differences or ethnicity in Nigeria. These literatures are summarized and the limitations identified. This ethnic difference thesis weaved around the ethnic theory framework offer very little to the understanding of the formation of identities and how such identities are instrumentalised and operationalised to support the capitalist mode of accumulation.

The third perspective focuses on a division between two publics which is claimed to be the nature of division in Nigeria. These scholars led by Peter Ekeh, look at the society from a division, which started at colonial era into the post-colonial time. This

is a division between two publics. A public that is characterised as one, a civic public and the other, a primordial public, corresponding to urban elites (civic) and the village life around traditional cultures (primordial) that is not integrated into modern life (Westernisation). This categorization is also flawed in that it failed to recognise the diverse character of the Nigerian society but simply reduced such diversity into the dual box of civic/primordial divide.

In view of the inherent limitations of these literatures and their failure to account fully for the production and reproduction of these identity categories, as well as how the differences are employed to structure exploitation and expropriation of resource in the Nigerian political economy. This research intends to participate in the conversation using the theory of racial capitalism, which is fully discussed in Chapter 3.

## **2.2 Capitalist State and the Bourgeoisie/Proletariat Divide in Nigeria**

Capitalism manifested in Nigeria in a pirate form. This 'pirate capitalism' drives the Nigerian economy into inactivity. The discovery of oil and the rise in the price around 1973/1974 led to the oil revenue surge. The switch over from the hitherto agro-driven economy to the oil-driven economy is just like a scenario, of an economy that had a weak engine transiting to an economy with no engine (Schatz, 1984:55).

The capitalist economy in Nigeria according to Schatz (1984:54), has two manifestations or forms; the 'Nurture capitalism' and 'Pirate capitalism'. Nurture capitalism started in 1949, when the productive sectors of the economy were dominated by private concerns, with rapid government investment in infrastructure. The later introduction to nationalist element in the economy, meant to support and promote indigenous business, hurt the international capital. This form of capitalism

entered different phases of crises, with each phase having its unique manifestation. Pirate capitalism on the other hand emerged with the arrival of revenues not from the real production sectors of the economy, but oil rents.

The new oils revenues changed the power elites' perspectives about governance. They have come to a new realization that the state is now seen and treated as an instrument or a means of helping themselves from the commonwealth of the people. It is also seen as a tool to further private interest. The state system becomes the most lucrative channel for fortune-seeking. Manipulation, therefore, replaced monopoly production, as government resources are corruptly diverted to unproductive channel and funding of the elites' appetite. This condition of manipulation, Schatz (1984:56) argues, becomes widespread and pervasive at federal, state and local authority levels. This is precisely the root of the crisis in Nigeria. The pains generated by these elite actions builds tension that exacerbates identity animosity, which sometimes leads to violent expressions.

Amzat and Olutayo, (2009:241) interrogate capitalism and the organization of production, as well as the distributive system, or the reward systems in Nigeria, which they concluded is challenged. Capitalism it is argued has equity problem from its structure. In the current circumstances that it has gone global, the contradictions have assumed a more complex form, because the same inherent contradictions between the bourgeoisie/proletariat has been waved into the structures of emerging economies. Amzat and Olutayo, (2009) maintain that during colonial era, economic reorganization of the forces of production and the relations helped to reshape the distribution of local opportunities to create wealth. This also created a potentially revolutionary class; the working class. Arguably, tension is created both by the capitalist structure of

production, the reorganization of production along the class line and the working-class agitations.

Capitalism generally as a system thrives only on inequality. Therefore, it has embedded in it from inception, the structure of inequality. This inequality found and still finds expressions in the lopsided distributive system and structure of domination in Nigeria that express itself as 'grafted Capitalism,' generating tension as it operates and reproduces itself (Amzat and Olutayo,2009:239).

The global capital continues to modify new approaches to register its presence everywhere in the world but restricting its direct contact with the exploited through such racial and xenophobic animosity. Understanding capitalism is akin to the notion, which says, the more you see the less you understand. The Nigerian situation expressed similar but distinct characteristics.

Mayer (2016:11) suggested that the differences in Nigeria and the identity animosity resulting in tension is between the domestic ruling class and the working class. The ruling class benefit from the state system and working-class is divided, even though they still constitute the class with revolutionary potentials. In discussing Nigeria and access to resources, we need to understand that, Western companies like the Royal Dutch, Shell, Agip, Chevron-Texaco, Julius Berger that make money on daily basis in collusion with the predatory ruling class.

The top bureaucrats who belong to the proletariat class, are recruited into the bourgeoisie circle as labour Aristocrats (Saul, 1975:305,306, Cohen 1991: 85-86 cited in Werbner, 2018:10). This bureaucratic bourgeoisie in Nigeria maintain a culture of

hegemony, dominate the lower rungs of the labour hierarchy, as well as emphasize political correctness by western countries and their cronies in the ruling class (Mayer, 2016:9). The labour leaders and the rest of the working-class Mayer (2016) maintains still resist domination and they take the titles of comrades, use revolutionary vocabularies and successfully organize strikes and succeeded in protest to prevent the ruling class from unpopular policies. The tension in Nigeria is essentially between the ruling class and the proletariat class. This perspective to the identity animosity is one part of the story.

This perspective, despite its strengths in identifying capitalism as the producer of division, has limitations in that it failed to identify other structures of domination in the capitalist system like culture, race, and gender. Rather it focused on class division and domination, whereas, the Nigerian economy is largely less industrialised and predominantly agricultural, with the majority of the land holding indigenous population as peasants. This framework of analysis will offer very little clue into the understanding of the nature of identity formation, the character of division and other means or structures through which identity is created and used in the capitalist economy.

### **2.3 The Nigerian State and Ethnic Identity**

Larry Diamond is one of the celebrated scholars on ethnicity in Africa. Ethnicity is viewed mostly as the main vehicle supporting capitalism in Nigeria. Diamond (1988:72) argues that ethnicity hides class differentiation and class struggle in Nigeria. Ethnicity tends to obscure state/ society relations, as politics has come to be defined by it. Diamond (1988:72) maintains that ethnicity is a political category in Nigeria. It is a vote-catching machine, and not in any way a cultural instrument. This is so for the

fact that all conflicts around politics and economy are not about the contest over cultural values and practices.

Amuwo (2010) added that the colonialist created lopsided federation and ethnic cleavages, which the elites used for protecting themselves, hence, class struggle is silenced on the platter of ethnicity (through the politicization of ethnic difference and other cleavages). The indigenous elites, on the other hand, played a role in supporting anti-people politics in a pattern that demonstrates a lack of coherence and coordination among the indigenous elites. Also, the indigenous ruling elites pursued a lazy but deliberate path to a mono-cultural economy on the backbone of crude oil and natural gas rents. The post-colonial economy is essentially structured to benefit the ruling elites and transnational capital. In a way, the old structures of domination are perpetuated. Accordingly, structured domination can only be transformed through popular resistance to be coordinated by a radicalized segment of the dominated class through the struggle for popular democracy.

Lubeck (1983:112), Diamond (1988:76) cited in Amuwo (2010:427), stressed that even though class differentiation, as part of the capitalist system is present in the Nigerian political economy, such differences are not a defining structure of the Nigerian society. It is but a function of isolated events that take place occasionally around the oil sector and the occasional state intervention to protect the interest of foreign capital and the interest of the capitalist class. Ethnic canopy remains a significant enclave for manipulation. But its potency to organize and mobilize of late have diminished. Ethnicity, Amuwo, (2010:427) argued tend to differentiate the Nigerian society more than class.

Ethnicity even when has suffered the loss of potency as an instrument for mobilization, it remains relevant in the distribution of power and resources in Nigeria. The minority struggle and agitation for redress against structural disadvantage, and disempowerment continue to witness poor momentum because of the hegemonic group's influence (the big ethnic groups; Hausa-Fulani and Yoruba) on existing socio-political status quo in Nigeria (Osaghae, 2001).

These minority ethnic nationalities have over time been seeking accommodation and recognition as separate component unit states within the Nigerian state. The demands over time have been transformed into the agitation for self-determination. Self-determination is characterized by the deep urge felt by the minority groups, especially those of the Niger Delta oil-producing region, making the demand for greater control over their local resources and greater political autonomy very salient. The demands also revolve around the demand for the protection of minority languages, cultures, religion, and separate states. Also, the protection from assimilation and domination by larger ethnic groups. It is aggregate demand for political autonomy of the minority groups and a weak central government within the Nigerian state project. This arrangement it is argued would ensure greater access to power and local control of resource by the indigenous people relevant to a given local political area (Osaghae, 2001).

The apparent state failure to address grievances or minority groups' fears and allow unimpeded access to material progress provoked and sustained the reign of agitations for a redress of the historical injustice. These minority nationalities historically have had to wage sustained struggle through agitations against the Nigerian state and the hegemonic groups benefiting from existing unequal socio-economic and political

status quo (Osaghae, 2001:3). Employing the constructivist framework of analysis, Osaghae (2001) explains the social construction of the respective identities in Nigeria, from colonial to the post-colonial. The major blame for the unstable variety of groups is placed on the foot of colonialism. It constructed and politicized ethnic identities and other politically relevant cleavages like regions.

Similarly, Ukeje & Adebani (2008), argue that grievances real, imagined, frivolous or justifiable, formed part of the spark points for the rise of nationalist agitations generally in Nigeria. This position is supported by James Coleman in his works, 'Nigeria: Background to Nationalism'. Colonialism as it arrived Nigeria, created new tensions, reinforced old ones and deepened economic insecurity. This condition remains the base structure of militant behaviours and define social worth in Nigeria.

However, ethnicity or the diversity of differences itself do not cause collective violence. What precisely supports differences leading collective violence and protracted social conflicts are the lack of identity recognition of the victimized groups in the society by the existing political and economic status quo, in cohort with the dominant groups. Conflicts generated in these relations are usually less amenable to compromise than those around the issues of material conflicts (Diamond, Linz & Lipset, 1995:42 cited In Ukeje & Adebani, 2008:565). There exists an unending demand by these dissatisfied groups for a sovereign national conference, resistance through several means to wade-off the marginalization and domination. The sum of the demand by these subaltern nationalities rest on equitable power-sharing among many other things from the Nigerian state and the hegemonic groups (Ukeje & Adebani, 2008:566).



The ethnic theory approach has contributed to the understanding of the Nigerian ethno-cultural character and how identity is shaped and defined by these ethnic characteristics. The approach also highlighted the importance of ethnic social category as a tool in the capitalist tool box in Nigeria. The limitation of this discussion lies in the fact that ethnicity is really not a problem parse, rather the utility of the differences by capitalism. This theory views the ethnic social category as a natural character defined by the acquired similarity in socio-cultural traits that differentiates one group from the other. Whereas ethnicities like Hausa-Fulani, Yoruba and Igbo are produced by colonial political establishment.

#### **2.4 The Two Publics: Civic and Primordial Dualism in Nigeria**

Ekeh (1975); Arowosegbe (2016) contend that the most potent difference in the Nigeria is neither ethnicity nor class, but a division into dicotyledonous publics. This dichotomy indicates more clearly the salient differences that exist, which supports domination in Nigeria.

Nigeria is divided or polarized into primordial and civic publics, and this polarization accounts for the animosity that sometimes leads to violence in Nigeria (Ekeh, 1975). Similarly, Arowosegbe (2016) maintain that the Nigerian society is dichotomized in a form of dualism that generates violent conflicts. The dualism is along "We- Them" divide. There are two citizenship forms in Nigeria, the constitutionally accepted citizenship and the local practice of citizenship. The citizen/ indigene dualism accounts for most of the differences and violent conflicts in Nigeria. The discriminatory policies and practices employed by the local, or provincial government for protecting the rights of indigenes to employment, political power and access to resources by other dominant groups outside their locality (Arowosegbe, 2016).

## **2.5 Capitalism and Patriarchy**

Male structural dominance is a prevalent social character of most pre-capitalist and capitalist production systems. In the pre-capitalist era, men controlled the labour of women and children in the family. The society from the time past had constructed social mechanisms that enthroned the male gender and taught him how to structure the technique of hierarchical organization and control (Hartman, 1976:138). Male folk are oriented culturally to believe having the strength, power, courage, self-confidence and the ability to meet the outside world in terms of danger, especially, the ability to confront both animal and human intruders (Asiyanbola, 2005:2).

Kandiyoti (1988:274) argues that the Feminist Theory has helped us to analyse the roles of patriarchy, gender and sexism in generating inequality in a capitalist system. However, patriarchy is a social relation that has material basis with a hierarchical relation between men and the solidarity among them to dominate women (Makama, 2013:118). It is a form of sexist oppression of and a major source of exploitation of domestic labour in a capitalist system (Fuchs, 2018:678). Gender on the other hand can be defined as socially and culturally constructed roles for men as property owners, decision makers, and heads of households. Sex is the biological difference between the female and the male gender. For instance, an adult female has a developed breast that secretes milk to feed a baby, whereas, the adult male does not have it (Makama, 2013:118).

Patriarchy in Nigeria is a very strong factor that determines and constantly shapes male power and the character of family in Nigeria. The male gender takes complete ownership and custody of the development of the lineage system, while the woman is

married out of the family. Because of this factor, men enjoy the cultural and family privileges of receiving orientation towards leadership of the family. The family on the other hand, orients the girl child towards domestic activities. These orientations have culturally profound impacts in the world views and later life of the girl child (Makama, 2013:117; Asiyabola, 2005:2).

This approach to studying the society is valid. However, it treats the Nigerian social landscape as a monolith. There exist some societies within the wider Nigerian cultural context that the male power is absent. For instance, in the pre-colonial Nigeria, the legendary role of the fiery Queen Amina of Zaria is very popular in the Hausa oral myth. These exceptions would obstruct the application of the Feminist Approach to study the pre-capitalist and capitalist Nigeria. Till date, there exist some cultures that women partake in the responsibilities that are considered the exclusive domain of the men folk.

From these extant works of literature engaged, capitalism and class relations, ethnicity, citizenship- indigene dualism, generate and account for differences and differential categorization among groups. Hence, preceding analyses view the violence from conflicts among the contending social groups or enclaves as emanating from either class conflicts, ethnic difference or citizen-indigene dualism. The challenges associated with the historical analysis of capitalism in Nigeria as analyzed by the scholars show clearly that most analysis and focus are often limited to colonialism and post-colonial context. The analyses fail to appreciate fully, slave trade as part of capitalism. Yeboah (2018) appreciates this fact and maintains that contemporary migration of sub-Saharan Africa (to which Nigeria is a part), the influx of Asians, and

Syrian refugees to Europe, North America, Canada, and Australia is an extension of capitalism in the global age, which commenced from the slave trade, colonialism to the present post-colonial era. By way of emphasis, contemporary events like global migration and the agitations in Nigeria for restructuring by subaltern groups can be appreciated only if its history is fully understood, because analysing it as a stand-alone phenomenon, could distort the true picture of the event.

There is a glaring paucity of literature linking the trans-Atlantic slave trade and pre-colonial political and economic events to the colonial and post-colonial projects. Rodney (1976) did, but his analysis is more historical and did not link the histories to contemporary agitations by minority groups in Nigeria. To transform the condition of domination, there is the need for the re-invention of local solidary networks to alleviate domination to redress contemporary structural imbalance against dominated groups (William, 1982:387; Bernstein & Byres, 2001:7; Idahosa, 2004 cited in Harris-white, 2012:110). Rodney (1976), equally argues African development is possible only when it breaks away radically from international capitalist encirclement.

From the literature, some relations among groups, which demonstrate complex racial character are analysed as either class relations or ethnic relations (Schalz, 1984; Amzat & Olutayo, 2009; Mayer, 2016; Webner, 2018).

The Nigerian politics and economy reflect the neoliberal precepts and has a historical link to these centres of capitalism, from the slave trade, colonial and post-colonialism. It operates within the global capitalist encirclement. The loud agitation by groups in Nigeria demanding the restructuring of the politics and economy complains the differences, domination, intensely religious, regional and ethnic animosity, especially

in the build-up to 2019 general elections in Nigeria. The vicious expressions of identity animosity in Nigeria cannot be mere coincidence. This research will interrogate capitalism and the role it plays in the production, reproduction and instrumentalization of differences.

This approach tends to limit the diverse character of the Nigerian socio-economic formation into a dual box. The Nigerian social, political and economic landscapes is much more diverse than this simple dualism. This framework needs to move beyond this bifurcation to express the diversity of the Nigerian identity composition.

However, Boas & Dunn (2013:1-33); Lonsdale (2008) cited in Arowosegbe (2016:65) in argues to express the limitation of this understanding, suggesting that the mobilization of claims, especially reified essentialized claims about identities and lack of recognition that creates exclusionary practices are deep expressions of race relations, rather than such analysis seen as the 'We-Them' dichotomy analysis.

Hudis (2018) maintains that race relations are hinged on blocked recognition. Lack of recognition of the dominated by the dominant group, groups or state structure, as the case may be. This involves the assignment of a reified object that obscures the true attributes of the dominated. This could be seen in a way that dominated or subaltern groups are less human or perceived to possess some denigrating attribute, or simply being mirrored in the dehumanizing image. These perceptions create conflict that often degenerates into an existential crisis.

From the weaknesses identified from the theoretical approaches in explaining the production of identities, the reproduction and its use in a capitalist system. This

research will participate in the conversation with a view to addressing this gap in literature and contributing to knowledge using the theory of racial capitalism.

## Chapter 3

### THE THEORY OF RACIAL CAPITALISM

#### 3.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to discuss and analyse racial capitalism from the perspective of Cedric Robinson. It seeks to present and analyse capitalism as an organized mechanism of dispossession through the instrument of the race (the intersection of race with capitalism).

To attain this objective, I provided the historical roots or the genealogy of racial capitalism, tracing it to the black radical tradition. This research also examines the limitations of the classical black radical scholars (Du Bois, James and Wright), as identified by Cedric Robinson. Furthermore, the limits of western radical thoughts and how he problematized race as a structure of power inherent in the European civilizational experience. In particular, the roots of racial construction, the neglect of African contribution to human civilization, the rise of bourgeoisies in European society will be assessed. Also, how western civilization shaped capitalism and the utility of race and nationalism in structuring exploitation, using the English proletariat as an epitome of the industrial workers. This chapter also seeks to indicate how Robinson supported his claims in an attempt to re-historicise race.

The proletariat is a term used to describe the industrial working class in Marx's analysis. Robinson sees the process of proletarianization of the industrial workers as

beginning with the English working class. This working-class in England was not a homogenous social group. The English bourgeoisie valued their labour differentially; the Irish labourer relative to the English labourer and this was a corollary of the 16<sup>th</sup>-century English colonization of Ireland. This historical process shows how the race was employed by the English bourgeoisie not necessarily because of any attempt to divide and rule the workers but because racialism has been a familiar social process in European civilization. According to Robinson, Marxist scholars had failed identify this extension of the feudal social mechanism into modern capitalist production that became an essential aspect of the capitalist system.

This chapter will discuss the debate between Marx and Robinson on major contentions. These include; (1) Marx's epistemological emphasis on arithmetic means (quantity) as a way to approach knowledge, which Robinson argues could hinder the comprehension and analysis of qualitative factors like race, gender and culture. (2) Marx's material primacy, both in the slave period and in the capitalist society itself. Robinson maintains that the economic factor may not be the most decisive, rather, both material and culture play a role in shaping society and its contradictions. (3) The idea of the dialectical collision of opposing classes in the society is ideological and not historical according to Robinson because the transformation of feudalism to capitalism was a bourgeois project, also, the socialist movement was a bourgeois project. The proletariat as a conscious class itself was created and given national existence by the character of bourgeois production; the proletariat got associated with socialism only in 1795 (Robinson, 2000:83).

Following an assessment of the arguments of Robinson, this chapter proceed with a discussion of the ideas put forward by the critics of Robinson such as Meyerson,



(2000); Foster, Clark and Holleman (2020). Furthermore, I will identify the limits of Robinson's views about the dual impact created by capitalism in his analysis of "Europe and the rest of the world beyond Europe". I argue that such a construct would impede our understating of the impact of capitalism in the world beyond Europe. Rather, I suggest that a plural or diverse landscape of effects is created, which varied in time and place. Despite the limitations identified by these scholars and the one this research identified, the theoretical utility of racial capitalism through Cedric Robinson's perspective is significant and can be utilized in explaining the Nigerian oil-dependent capitalist economy. Robinson has successfully expanded the conceptual utility of racial capitalism from a theory that was hitherto, used to study a specific economy (South Africa under Apartheid) to a theory that is used to study the entire modern capitalism.

I returned to analysing capitalism citing other relevant scholars; Fraser, (2018); Gordon, (2007); Kelley, (2017); Calathes, (2017). I concluded that race, as suggested by Robinson is not just about skin colour differences, but a means of structuring power through differences, which found roots in the European civilization. Accordingly, capitalism is not just a competitive liberal system, but an organized mechanism of dispossession of all sorts. It seeks to divide and differentiate the society through the fabrication of differences that are often transformed into racial categories. Such racial differences are employed as tools to promote exclusionary practices of all forms (social, economic and political) to support the regime of capital accumulation.

### **3.2 The Black Radical Tradition and Philosophy**

The black radical tradition commenced as early as the initial slave revolts in Africa in the wake of the slave trade (Kelley, 2017). The first organized slave revolts were in

African (Robinson, 2000:30), but the politics and philosophy of resistance has its roots deep in the works of W.E.B Du Bois<sup>2</sup>, C.L.R James and Richard Wright. One of the most significant contributions that are considered seminal was the “Black Reconstruction in America”. Du Bois argues that the book was written with two audiences in mind who hold different beliefs about the Negro race; the first group believes that the Negroes<sup>3</sup> in America and anywhere else in the world is an ordinary human being, who under ordinary condition could develop like any humankind. The second group defended by those who believe that the Negroes are distinctly and inherently an inferior being, who can never successfully take part in modern civilization. Du Bois maintains that the “Black Reconstruction of America” was written to re-enforced the position of the former and for the later, no evidence was enough to convince them.

Therefore, the contribution of the black folks to the reconstruction of democracy in America from 1860 to 1880 was a fact denied in the American historiography. Also, he identified and addressed the misconceptions and distortions in the American historiography, as well as the liberation of the black people in America, Africa, the Caribbean and anywhere else in the world.

In addressing these misconceptions in the American historiography, precisely in chapter 17, of the “Black reconstruction in America”, Du Bois (2013) argues that the falsification of American history in the 19<sup>th</sup> century to cover its shame was enormous. Many facts were omitted, neglected or distorted. This was because the South was

---

<sup>2</sup> W.E.B. Du Bois was born in 1868 at Great Barrington, Massachusetts. Just 5 years after Slavery in America was brought to an end.

<sup>3</sup> The term Negro or negroes is no longer used in contemporary radical literature. Its usage in this research is limited to such references as made in the classical literature.

ashamed of its actions in fighting to perpetuate human slavery. The North was also ashamed because it invited the black people to fight against the South to save the union, abolish slavery and establish democracy. Similarly, as earlier noted in chapter 5 of "Black Reconstruction in America", Du Bois (2013) argues that the white folks have failed to acknowledge that the Negro in America became free because the North could not win an outright victory in the American civil war against the South without the black people. The role of millions of arms in the hands of the black folks during the American civil war brought peace, democracy and emancipation to America.

Contrary to these contributions, Du Bois (2013:281) argues that the entire American historiography, with notable exceptions of few, is written by those who hold on to the notion of the inferiority of the black folks (Negro). This notion Du Bois (2013:282) maintains robs the American historiographic documentation of vital facts about the actual events that occurred during the American reconstruction and the events leading to the establishment of liberal democracy. These facts were simply lost under the huge heaps of propaganda, as very little or no efforts were made to record the black peoples' speeches, actions, works and wages. Instead, the dominant ruling white elites constructed messages, ostensibly to ridicule the black folks, deliberately omitted or obliterated their contributions and sometimes mischaracterized or misrepresented their statements.

CLR James<sup>4</sup> wrote about the Haitian revolution. He depicts in the book, "The Black Jacobins", the heroism of the slaves, in the freedom of San Domingo, later named Haiti

---

<sup>4</sup> James originates from Trinidad. He was involved with the social movements and loved the game of cricket. A lifestyle he copied from the English middle class. He became very active and later in 1935, wrote the Black Jacobins, capturing the slave revolt at San Domingo, now called Haiti

and their efforts in the transformation of the slave economy into an egalitarian economy under the leadership of Toussaint L'Ouverture<sup>5</sup>. The slave agency in the late feudal time and early modern colonial capitalist economy led by the French Monarchy in the revolution of modern Haiti is an evidence of the revolutionary potential of the slave agents. Therefore, the usefulness of the slave agency is not limited to the pre-capitalist mode of production.

The slave revolt began actively at Le Cap, a slave plantation in San Domingo in 1791, precisely two years into the French revolution. The slave revolt was inspired and bolstered by careful plans around traditional African cosmic logic, referred to as the Voodoo. The Voodoo was the medium of conspiracy, it gave them hope, courage and determination. The rituals and incantations followed the traditional African cosmology (James, 1989:86). The revolt, James (1989) maintains lasted for about twelve years, with the black slaves defeating the soldiers of the French monarchy, and later the Spanish invasion. The slave's army also successfully warded-off British expedition carried out by about 60,000 troops and another round of French expedition. This final defeat at San Domingo resulted in the formation of the Negro state of Haiti, which since then had been independent till date and this, James (1989) agrees is the only successful slave revolt in the history of humankind that culminated in the formation of a modern state.

---

<sup>5</sup> Toussaint L'Ouverture was the prominent revolutionary figure in San Domingo (Haiti) that led the successful slave revolt that ended in 1803 against Spain, France and England. This was reported in the C.L.R. James celebrated work, "The Black Jacobins".

Richard Wright<sup>6</sup> was a great novelist and published an essay, the “Blue Print for Negro Writing,” and a novel, the “Native Son” in 1937. Subsequently, he published “The Insider”; “The American Hallucination” and “American Hunger.” His literary works were not appealing to the American left-wing writers; James Baldwin, James Ford and Ben Burns (the editor of Ebony). They all discredited Wright’s works (Robinson, 2000:333). Similarly, Wright joined the American Communist Movement and the party in the 1930s. He served the party in the capacity of the organizer of the black Party cell in Chicago. Again, his actions were subjected to intense criticism from anti-communist activist like David Schine. These pressures informed Wright’s decision to quit the party in 1942 and eventually relocated to France with his family, where he later died in 1960 (Robinson, 2000).

However, Richard Wright made very useful philosophical contributions that remain indelible in the history of the black radical struggle in America. In the "Blue Print for Negro Writing", he indicated that the black race should create a value by which they will struggle, live and die. It was more relates a blueprint to violent radical struggle and a framework for both militant politics and revolutionary vanguard advocacy. Again, in the novel, "Native Son", Wright emphasized the need for the mobilization of what he considered "the scattered but kindred people" into a political unit that could chat for a revolutionary expression. He maintains that only through such revolutionary expressions could the black people find a home, a functioning value and a role in

---

<sup>6</sup> Wright is credited as the main thinker that suggested the practical purpose of revolutionary activism, by forming vanguards that would help give the black race meaning of life, value and a lifetime commitment to a genuine liberation project.

American society. In this way, he argues that the black race would transform itself from a passive victim to an active advocate (Robinson, 2000:333).

Wright argues that it is painful to reside in a world that denies people the right to live in dignity. Such an environment; where people dwell supplies the instrumentalities through which such people or organisms generally express themselves. If the environment where they reside is peaceful, it creates an orderly satisfaction. On the other hand, if the environment is warped, violence would be the natural consequence (Wright, 1937:27). Violence, Wright believes cannot be seen as separate from the formation of human consciousness; they are interwoven. This is so because violence usually emerges from desperate situations. Desperation usually creates a pre-condition for making a complete revolutionary commitment. A commitment to a social project is an action born out of compulsion rather than choice. Therefore, the more the rate of the social degradation of the human being, the more total would be his reaction (Wright, 1937 cited in Robinson, 2000:334-338). Considering that Robinson challenges the poor understanding of the preceding black radical scholars, what is racialism and how did racialism evolve?

### **3.3 The Origin of Racial Constructions in European Society**

Robinson posits that Aristotle provided the epistemological basis and the template of race in his "Natural Law". Explicitly, Aristotle indicated that the "deliberative faculty of the soul" is completely absent in a slave. In the case of the female gender, they have the "deliberative faculty of the soul" but such ability is ineffective in them. These assumptions devalued both the slave and female gender because these inabilities were suggestive of inferiority. Aristotle maintained that non- Greeks and non-Romans and all labourers and many other working categories or the mass of humankind are quite

slavish in their taste. They prefer a life that is suitable to a beast (Nicomachean ethnics, 1095b20 cited in Robinson, 2000:30). These race-based constructions and several other racial significations pervaded European history (Robinson, 2000).

### **3.3.1 The Destruction of the African Past**

In the entire history of the new world, Africans suffered the most significant oppression and distortion of their recorded history. Africans were assigned exclusive conception of human; either as Negro, Moors or Ethiope. The underlying concept that shapes this construction is a picture of a people with no civilization, history, religion or humanity. It suggests and characterizes a human group on the margin of existence in society. It is a fiction of "Negro, the dumb beast of burden fit only for slavery" (Robinson, 2000:115). The devaluation of African humanity and labour is inextricably linked to the economic and technical progress of the world. This is so because it was the triangular trade that stimulated the British industry. Historically, the blacks were respected by the Europeans not because of their colour but to the contrary, because of their superior civilization, Egyptians' ancient past and of late Islam. These images of the ancient glory, which have earned for the Africans respect have changed. Africa has over time within the European sensibility, came to represent a different species: an exploitable source of labour and resources.

### **3.3.2 The Dark Ages: Europe and Africa**

The 5<sup>th</sup> century AD dissolution of the Roman Empire witnessed the disappearance of knowledge among the Mediterranean European society. For those beyond the Mediterranean, their knowledge of Africa had been quite scanty. Robinson (2000:120) noted that Bartholomew Anglicus in his works the "Medieval Lore" observed that in the mid-13<sup>th</sup> century, Ethiopia was seen by Europeans as a land of the blue men. They had kept in their historical memory and consciousness that there existed two

Ethiopians, the west one near Spain (Mauritania) and other places close to Ethiopia was Numidia (Algeria and Libya), the province of Carthage (part of Tunisia), Guttural (Morocco) and Ethiopia Adusta in the east.

All these had disappeared in the common European consciousness. The ancient civilizations of the ancient world in Asia and Africa became legends preserved mostly only in biblical narratives. Knowledge had become exclusively a monastic affair. The knowledge acquired in the Christian monasteries became the sources of world knowledge.

In examining the rise of capitalism in European society, Cedric Robinson approached the analysis from what he referred to as racial capitalism. He noted that the social, political, cultural and ideological components of European feudalism contributed more to capitalism than the social manacles that propelled the bourgeoisie into the revolution (Robinson, 2000:42-43). Robinson suggested that many scholars tend to forget or ignore the facts of proceeding European history, especially the early and the medieval histories of Europe. Emphases are commonly placed only on the early modern (enlightenment) and contemporary times. Historically from the outset, European civilization contained substantial racial, tribal, linguistic and regional particulars and these differences were constructed on antagonistic posture.

Cedric Robinson took a deep dive into these early days of European early history and posited the facts that the devaluation of the “human others” or people other than those in European cultures have deep roots. The ancient popular reference to people outside Greek and Roman civilizations as “Barbarians” (p. 55) was a typical historical



example. The devaluation of humankind based on individual, group and nationality has its origins traced to European history.

### **3.3.3 The Genealogy of the Industrial Bourgeoisie (The Nouveaux Riches)**

This group of the new rich men emerged from the vagabonds<sup>7</sup>. They wandered around; they had a very good knowledge of the variety of what many people in the different locations wanted. These people moved different goods and consignments from one location to another, they moved in or travelled around in bands for their security. They also built storehouses, corporate port: usually referred to as transfer points for their merchandise and later, these transfer points were transformed into facilities for international trade. These ports or merchant colonies argues Robinson (2000:46-54) gained significant resources, which became a key source of funding medieval cities, especially Europe's interior cities. From this historical moment, the European merchants became bourgeoisie. By the 12<sup>th</sup> century, these bourgeoisies commenced the economic restructuring and re-ordering of the production forces necessary for the rise of capitalism. The craft of cloth-making signifies important watershed in European technical progress. The bourgeoisie in Flanders (the Flemish region of Belgium) was the first to successfully transform the rural industry into urban manufacture organized along with the capitalist logic of wage labour. This clue about the rise of the bourgeoisie was provided by (Henri Pirenne cited in Robinson, 2000:51). This development initiated important human population concentration that gave rise to urbanization. (These facts of the rise of urbanization were corroborated by both Pirenne and Karl Polanyi). Industries they argued brought cities and such city centres created commercial prosperity. The bourgeoisie then lured the serfs to abandon the

---

<sup>7</sup> These are people in ancient European communities who were considered lazy and could not afford the cost of existence. They move about from one community to another in search of cheaper opportunities for survival. This social action empowered the vagabonds with knowledge of the aggregate goods and services available in the various communities.

feudal Lords and was integrated into paid wage labour but in a way, they re-enslaved the serfs through that wage labour.

The modern world bourgeoisie: the "bourgeoisie of the 16<sup>th</sup> century accumulated in the interstice of states" (Robinson, 2000:52). The state acquired new capacity, as machinery of rule through bureaucracies. These bureaucratic channels were structured and patterned to solve administrative, regulatory and extractive concerns. They also functioned to coordinate armies, to facilitate the national elites in international competition and ensure domestic repression of those who violated state laws or held contrary opinions to the official opinion.

In the 17<sup>th</sup> century, the bourgeoisie was characterized by its mercantilist and political attitudes. The bourgeoisie developed a robust mercantilist structure that ran on the zero-sum format. The gains of others were other loss. With this new political and mercantilist appetite, the ruling class and the nobility schemed and enthroned the state agency, while leaving the imprints of its character on the entire European society. Since much of their character has to do with violence, the society was weave into the chain of violent social order. The working-class functioned and availed the state and the privileged-class with material and human resources necessary for further accumulation of power and wealth. The bourgeoisie reserved for the state, the monopoly of the instruments of coercion. This event to Robinson was the beginning of capitalist alliance with state and therefore, the idea of the masses was a later construction. This was also the roots of the industrial bourgeoisie and the character of the bourgeois production produced the proletariat.

### **3.3.4 Western Civilizations and Capitalism**

Robinson (2000:58) maintains that the social and ideological components of European civilization had assumed an essential ramification during feudalism. Many financial centres in Europe sprang up in response to the new economic activities (mercantilism). Italian banking is an illustration. Throughout Europe, a small group of all well-informed men kept in touch with an active correspondence and controlled the entire network of exchange in bills and specie. These networks of elites dominated the entire area of commercial monetary speculation. The bourgeoisie that led to the rise and development of capitalism were drawn from the particular ethnic and cultural group. It is important to understand the character of the new emerging bourgeois society. The working class and the military mercenaries of leading European states were migrants from other ethnic and cultural groups. For other non-leading European states, its peasants were from other cultures and its slaves were from a different world entirely.

Importantly, Robinson (2000:59) noted that the European new civilization through capitalism was configured not to be homogenous or intend to do so, rather, it actually by default intended to differentiate, to exaggerate regional, sub-cultural and dialectical differences into racial ones. In a way, the slaves became natural slaves. In other words, cultural groups that were considered racially inferior in European society suffered such an image because such a notion was a tool or instrument of their domination and exploitation during the early middle ages. Tartars in the 16<sup>th</sup> century suffered the same image in the Italian city-states.

As these developments persist, the third world began to gradually fill these inferior social categories of a civilization. On the other hand, the bourgeoisie and administrators of state power initiated and nurtured the new myth of egalitarianism

while taking every chance to divide people to enable their easy domination. When the society moved away from feudalism into capitalism, the capitalist system expanded into a world system. This brought with it, uneven development among European societies on the one hand and on the other hand, between the Europeans and the rest of the world.

### **3.3.5 Race and Nationalism as Instruments of Domination and Exploitation**

The race became a rationalizing tool for the domination, exploitation and or extermination of non-Europeans (including the Slavs and Jews). Even within the Europeans, secondary myths were created to deepen the hierarchy of power (German Teutonism, French Celticism, Britain and USA Anglo- Saxon). The 19<sup>th</sup>-century bourgeois society in Europe identified nationalism as a weapon to secure the place of their respective national elites within Europe and internationally. The bourgeoisie of the respective European independent nation-states refused to cultivate universal class consciousness or acknowledged their identity as a class. Rather capitalism at international level expanded and developed in competitive anarchy, with each national bourgeoisie viciously opposed to the other in an economic and nationalistic antagonism. Each of the national bourgeoisies solicited and obtained the support of its country and its national proletariat. As a consequence, nationalism mobilized the productive capacities of the people, secure new markets, new labour and productive resources.

This pattern and approach of national capitalism had destructive effects for both Europe and those people who by this historical development found themselves under such domination. Most of the European countries especially Britain, France to Portugal and Belgium enjoyed an early head start into these new adventures. Germany and Italy joined the scramble for colonies quite late. Germany and Italy hurriedly galvanized

their peasants, farmers, workers, and clerics, professional class, the aristocracy and the state around race. The philosophy of “*Herrenvolk*”<sup>8</sup> (Robinson, 2000:61). This form of nationalism unleashed huge violence into the domestic system, which was expressed abroad in the process of wrestling for colonies with other European national bourgeoisies. The development created Fascism, where the bourgeoisie maintained a full range of social, political and economic prerogatives. It controlled the national society and this approach became an effective tool for expanding domination and expropriation of people and resources of the third world. To this extent, it is important to note that racialism is not rooted in a particular era but in the entire European civilizational experience itself (Robinson, 2000:60-61).

### **3.3.6 Land Dispossession and Intensification of Poverty by the English Industrial Capital**

In England at the wake of agricultural mechanization, there was increase adoption of the reaping and threshing machine. This meant a significant drop in the use of manual labour for harvest, which increased manual unemployment. Between 1760 and 1810, Agricultural Capitalism with the support of state entrenched the policy of land enclosure. This policy makes the peasants lose their fields to the large-scale cultivators, about five (5) million acres (Robinson, 2000:65).

Those commons (peasants) whose lands were taken away, it was assumed were people who could not utilize such field or be presumed to lack work discipline; hence, they were dispossessed of such lands. This event sparked unemployment in some places in Europe. The unemployment rate in Yorkshire, for instance, rose from 25% to 100%, in Scotland to 70%, Safford 50%, Bolton over 30% were out of work. In Bluntly, 40%

---

<sup>8</sup> The philosophy of *Herrenvolk* is a notion that reifies and emphasize the supremacy of the Aryan race (the blue-eyed gifted Germanic whites) over other European races

of the citizens were unemployed. The figures were reported by Hobsbawm stressed Robinson. The same, he maintained that E.P. Thompson estimated the working class in England to be 5million within the period under review. However, this number fluctuated depending in the season, but 1.5million people were constantly engaged in employment. It is significant to note argued Robinson that all these scholars measured only the condition of lives of the workers and not their ideological, social and moral content (Robinson, 2000:65).

### **3.3.7 The English Colonization of Ireland: Land Dispossession and the Roots of Racism against the Irish**

Robinson (2000:70) citing the works of James Anthony Froude "the English in Ireland" noted that the Normans using their military aristocracy invaded Ireland in the 12<sup>th</sup> century. It was recorded during the invasion that "except the religious leaders, virtually all the Irish people resembled mob of armed savages". The culmination of their defeat made the English introduce English civilization. By the 16<sup>th</sup> century under King James (1603-1625), the colonization took a new dimension, as the Irish lands in Welford, Langford and Leitrim was taken and the people alienated from it. In 1641, just some few years before the rise of the Westphalian state system, the Irish rebellion began, the first rejection of the English rule since the conquest. This development dovetailed into the religious wars between the Catholic and protestant Christian communities, which pervaded European societies. The Irish being predominately Catholics and the English being Protestants. The condition became worse as the suppression of Catholics and their execution persisted; the protestant privilege gained popularity. This then led to the alienation of the lands of the Irish labouring classes, with the associated legal mechanisms, which restricted and constrained the Irish people in all ramification.

These mechanisms included the acts against marketing Irish products; marketing Irish cattle in England (1681) woollen and coloured lines (1699), glass (1746). These regulatory mechanisms transformed the Irish economy into a dependent sector of the English economy. These events were decisive in influencing the pattern of response that shaped Irish nationalism in the 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. In England, the Irish immigrant workers were further constrained by the past hostility that existed between the interest of the Irish and the English national interest.

### **3.3.8 English Working-class Consciousness and the Irish Workers**

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Irish labour was the cheapest in Western Europe. They were used in heavy manual occupation at the base of the industry that required strong physical labour. In other words, they were mostly utilized in labour-intensive jobs. EP Thomson noted as cited by Robinson (2000:73), a trend among the Irish workers about their comfortability with minimum necessities of life, which was gradually making the English worker getting acquainted with such low standard of life.

The English Anglo-Saxon sees the Irish as an inferior race. Therefore, the English employer believed that the most rational choice of action to take was the valuing of the Irish labour and paying them such amount the English bourgeoisie considered to be the commensurate package to their devalued capability. In an attempt to characterize the inferiority of the Irish as held by the English society, Engels wrote as cited by Robinson (2000:76-78) that the Irish people expressed a more facile, excitable and possessed fiery temperament while the English possessed persevering, stable and reasonable tendencies. These characteristics argue Engels was produced by English capital production (E.P Thompson reported cited in Robinson, 2000:76-78). These differentiated values placed on the English and Irish workers served the capitalist very well but at a price, which was the Irish political radicalism.

### **3.3.9 From Babeuf to Marx: A Curious Historiography**

In corroborating further historical evidence about the fact of the existence of socialist thoughts and activities as a bourgeois phenomenon, Robinson (2000:82-86) maintains that Albert Soboul enumerated that the most powerful elements of the third estate of the French revolutionary periods were the bourgeoisie who composed about two-thirds (2/3) of the order of its Jacobin wing essentially, as the artisans and the shopkeepers.

The proletariat became associated with the socialist tradition only in 1795, with the formation of a group known as “the conspiracy of equal” by Francois-Noel Babeuf. Earlier in 1794, a government was formed, which was predominately bourgeois but very radical in its inclination. This government was overthrown and the most prominent of them, Robespierre was executed. Others were exiled while the rest were forced to take political refuge in the inner and remote villages. As a consequence, the new power elites directly abolished the radical legislation and the egalitarian policies promulgated a year earlier.

Accordingly, the left-wing leaders of the convention (the leaders of the Jacobins) that survived the attacks went underground, organizing themselves into societies and clubs. The example of such underground group was Union du Pantheon, which was also called the Conspirator. As Babeuf and his comrades in 1796 went underground, their ranks were infiltrated by spies. Chisel acted as a spy in the underground groups and betrayed them through a fake negotiation arranged by the Directory. By 1797, the group, Conspiracy of Equals was exposed and alleged to nurse a surreptitious agenda to take over power to quickly call for the democratic franchise that was encapsulated in the aborted 1793 constitution that was never allowed to be put to practice.



The Conspiracy of Equals proposed a temporary dictatorship of the workers, even though they had thought out a theory to guide the dictatorship of the Paris workers, which would have advanced to manhood suffrage. They also proposed the expropriation and the engagement of all people in the enjoyment of what was considered good in society.

Robinson considers these proposals as the actual formative notions of proletariat dictatorship in European socialism. Even though these ideas were not very popular, it gained support among the Parisians through unemployment.

### **3.4 Debating How to Know and Understanding Capitalism: Marx and Robinson in Perspective**

The term Racial Capitalism was developed in the 1970s and 1980s by South African scholars to explain the destruction of black economic institutions; land and social relations of production by the Apartheid system to create and maintain an industrial economy and a welfare state for the white community. It was construed to mean white people utilizing predominantly white-constructed institutions to acquire social, political and economic value on the spine of non-white people (Leong, 2013:2152; see also, Hall, 2004).

Robinson explains racial capitalism differently, indicating that it is the same with capitalism because modern capitalism carries with it all the racializing characters of feudalism. He contends that “Indeed capitalism was less a catastrophic revolution (negation) of feudalist social orders than the extension of these social relations into the tapestry of the world’s modern political and economic relations” (Robinson, 2000:43). Importantly, Robinson (2000:59) noted that the European new civilization through

capitalism was not configured to homogenize, rather, to differentiate, to exaggerate regional, sub-cultural and dialectical differences into racial categories. This system of capitalist order Kelly suggests evolved to produce in the modern world, racial capitalism, which depends on violence, slavery, imperialism and genocide (Kelley, 2017).

The race is real but it is in a dynamic state of flux to always elude proper characterization, yet appearing to be a past event and hanging around as a memory and a moral absolute. No doubt, racist ideological reflections in a capitalist society consistently manifest in different forms, indicating palpable pieces of evidence of its origin, traces of its mechanical construction and deposit its trail (Robinson, 2007 cited in Thomas, 2013:145).

Robinson (2000:27-28) alleged that Marx and European radical thinking believe to know the social phenomenon, factors like price, value, accumulation, profit and many other geometric factors in the capitalist system could be discovered by arithmetic means and certainty. The emphasis Marx placed on this scientific quantification, Robinson argues tends to reduce the importance Marx placed on other qualitative indicators like race, gender, and culture, which are equally important and will help us to understand capitalism as a mechanism of domination through not just class but also these non-material categories like race and culture.

The most profound contribution Marx made, according to Robinson, was in political economy, especially his contribution of the material conception of history, where Marx posited that the slave trader bore no responsibility for the production and reproduction of the material (physical) and intellectual component of the slaves from their societies

in Africa, to Marx, these were not the significant elements of the trade, what was very important was that the slave ships took real human beings from Africa (p.12). Also, Marx maintained that the role of a slave in a capitalist production was nothing but embarrassing remains of the pre-capitalist mode of production. Therefore, this status disqualified the slave as a historical and political agency in modern capitalist production (p. 28). However, Robinson stresses that Marx did not identify and recognized fully that the cargoes of those real human beings also hosted mixed languages and thoughts of cosmologies, myths, metaphysics, habits, belief and morality. These were the actual essence of their humanity (p.157). The black slaves arrived in the new world with this consciousness. It was through this African consciousness that the slave trade contradiction would be made manifest.

On the material primacy, Robinson (2000:77) alluded that Marx and Engels argue that the humankind produced their history under definite assumptions and conditions. Among these conditions, the economic factor is ultimately the most decisive but the political and other categories including tradition and culture, which are parts of human pre-occupation play only a part and not a decisive one. Arguably Robinson challenged this assertion and maintains that both the material, the idea system and culture play an equal and important role in shaping capitalism and the dialectical opposition to the system in all respects.

Robinson (2000:82-86), argues that the transformation from a feudal economy to a capitalist economy was a bourgeois project, especially that the French revolution was led by the Jacobins, who essentially are bourgeoisies. To this end, the transformation of the capitalist society may not necessarily and exclusively remain a proletariat project. The rise of the industrial proletariat was conditioned by the development of

the industrial bourgeoisie. It was under this bourgeois state that the proletariat obtained recognition and extensive national existence. The proletariat got associated with socialist tradition only in 1795 (p. 83). The 1789 French revolution, was driven by the Jacobins, and two-third (2/3) of the Jacobin's ranks, were bourgeoisies.

Robinson challenged the material conception of history, in particular, the dialectical collision of antagonistic classes that created new societies. He argues that such claims were pure speculation, ahistorical and stemmed from ideology and not facts of history. Robinson (2000:93) maintains that this historical development was not captured in Marxist analysis nor the western radical tradition.

Marx identified this proletariat as a historical agent and will vanquish capitalism through a revolution that will obliterate social and economic inequality. These proletariats, unfortunately, is not the only revolutionary agent (Robinson, 2000: 27 and 39). The English working class as a first reflection of the proletariat became intoxicated with the defence of the myth of national interest and racism.

The English working-class, which served as the mirror of production, exposed the limits of the Proletariat power and demonstrated how the English workers were consumed by the myth of superiority (the Anglo-Saxon chauvinism) relative to the Irish working-class (Robinson, 2000:68). This division along with racial and other dialectical differences was, therefore, the natural course of racial capitalism.

#### **3.4.1 Robinson's Readings of Karl Marx, The Black Radical Scholarship and The Theory of Racial Capitalism**

Karl Marx is obviously one of the most influential philosophers of his times and his contribution to knowledge endures till date. The black radical scholars like Richard Wright, W.E.B. Du Bois, C.L.R. James, Walter Rodney, Eric Williams, George

Padmore Andre Gunder Frank, were substantially influenced by the works of Marx. These scholars agree with Marx in many respects. For instance, Du Bois (1992:16) cited in Edwards (2020:165) argue that “the emancipation of man is the emancipation of labor and the emancipation of labor is the freeing of that classic majority of workers who are yellow, brown and black”. The relatedness notwithstanding, the black radical scholars suggested the fact that class analysis did not deeply capture the plight of the people of colour, therefore, the approach to understanding the capitalist mode of production and accumulation need to be reframed. The preceding black radical scholars before Cedric Robinson suggested that coloured people suffered slavery, were colonized and their economies were subjected to constant exploitation by the metropolitan core (the centre-periphery relationship) not only of class relationship. WEB Du Bois lamented about the problem of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, which he identified as a problem of the colour line.

Cedric Robinson took on Richard Wright, C.L.R. James and W.E.B Du Bois because of the way these scholars framed the discourse of race and racialism around colour line. To Robinson, Marx did not give attention to the role of culture and race, which is a lived experience of the people of colour. The shared past (history and culture) of the Africans who came to the new world are important not to itself but it is important precisely because it is the basis of their consciousness, the means of knowing and the essence of their being. This shared past contains philosophy, theories of history and social prescription native to it. Robinson maintains that the past is a construct processing its ways and imposing its own truths (Robinson, 2000:33). Culture was precisely what kept and made the slaves to survive the slavery era because they came with it from Africa, it is the essence of their being and the very means though which

slaves organized revolts (a tool of liberation) (Robinson, 2000:157). To Robinson, Aristotle found no reason to make an inquiry into the ethics, consciousness and needs of the slaves. However, Marx differed with Aristotle in a way because he saw slave trade and slavery as abhorrent but did not identify the revolutionary potential of the slave in the capitalist economy. Marx explains that slaves have no role in the capitalist economy but only can be seen as the embarrassing remains of the pre-capitalist mode of production. This to Marx disqualifies slaves as a historical and political agency in the modern world (Robinson, 2000:28). Conversely, Robinson argues, the transatlantic slave trade and the slavery of the new world were integral to the modern world economy. Indeed, Marx, identified that the slave labor was the basis of “primitive accumulation” but it was erroneous to confine the relationship to those moments alone or define slave labor as a pre-capitalist stage of labor (Robinson, 2000:39).

Furthermore, Robinson asserts that slave revolt began in Africa in castles, onboard slave ships and later in colonial settlements. In the study of Haitian revolution by C.L.R James in his works “The Black Jacobins”, the agency of the slave was evident. Also, In the Hegel’s “Cunning of History”, Robinson (2000:29 and 31) maintains, it is evident that the Franco-Haitian slave owners fled to Louisiana, Virginia and the Carolinas with many slaves. This meant transporting the Haitian revolution. These impacts were visibly seen in the Gabriel-led revolution in 1800 at Virginia, the Louisiana Pointe Coupee Conspiracy of 1795 and the Denmark Vesey of 1822 outside of Charleston. C.L.R. James in his works, “The Black Jacobins” earlier identified the role of culture in the Haitian revolution, where the slaves used the African cultural voodoo as a source of inspiration, instruction and direction during the liberation struggles (James, 1989: 86).

However, Robinson asserts that the Marxist argument that emphasizes the transformation from feudalism to capitalism resonated only with the European civilizational experience. Robinson contends that feudalism is not revolutionarily different socially, ideologically and politically with capitalism. Robinson (2000:42 and 43) argues that; “The social, cultural, political and ideological complexes of European feudalism contributed more to capitalism than the social fetters that precipitated the bourgeoisie into the social and political revolution...indeed capitalism was less a catastrophic revolution (negation) of feudal social order than the extension of these social relations into the tapestry of the Modern world’s political and economic relations”. Capitalism simply integrated these feudal habits into its mode of accumulation.

Returning to the preceding black radical scholars, Robinson argues that their understanding of the history and concept of racialism is poor. The Black radical scholars, especially W.E.B Du Bois, C.L.R. James and Richard Wright understood race from the differences among people of their skin colour. This is illustrated in their respective analyses. In particular, the debate between Booker Washington and W.E.B. Du Bois about race upliftment in America clearly demonstrated how racialism and race is poorly framed. Race to Robinson, is a structure of power or a means of structuring power through difference. These differences could be regional, subcultural, ethnic or other dialectical differences. It is therefore not only about skin colour identity (Kelley, 2017).

From historical evidence, Robinson (2000:43 and 44) argues that from the outset, European civilization contains substantial racial, tribal, linguistic and regional particularities that were constructed on antagonistic differences. That prior to the 11<sup>th</sup>

and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries, the term “barbarian” was a function of exclusion rather than consolidation. Those whom the Greeks and Romans referred to as barbarians were people from diverse races with different cultures, who today we refer to as white Europeans from languages and cultures in Europe other than Greeks and Romans. Secondly, racializing workers has been a colonial process as exemplified in the colonial expansion in Europe itself and not essentially a colour defined process. In fact, Robinson (2000) suggested that the first European proletariat were racial subjects; they were Jews, Blacks, Irish, Slavs, and Gypsies. These racial subjects were framed in the exact terms the Tartars were framed in the Italian cities in the medieval times. Therefore, race and the idea of *Herrenvolk* (the rule by ethnic majority) were all abstracted from the delusion of medieval citizenship, even though the two are different, they are related. Racialism and its permutations are actually not rooted in a particular era but the entire European civilizational experience. Race in the 17<sup>th</sup> century became largely a rationalizing tool for the domination and extermination of non-Europeans including the Slavs and Jews (Robinson, 2000:60-61).

In integrating the rest of the worlds into the capitalist mode of accumulation, the African economy was integrated systematically through slave trade, colonialism and neo-colonialism. African labor was integrated into the capitalist system in the same terms the Irish labor was integrated. The development, organization and expansion of the capitalist system and its ideological components essentially assumed a racial dimension (Robinson, 2000:35). It is important to note that European civilization is not a product of capitalism, rather, the character of capitalism can only be understood in the social and historical context of its appearance, which is from the Western civilization (Robinson, 2000:58). Capitalist social structure is thoroughly infused with



divisions and differences, which it inherits from feudalism. To this extent, capitalism by default did not intend to homogenize political, social and economic structures rather, it intended to divide and exaggerate regional, subcultural and other dialectical differences and transform them into racial categories (Robinson, 2000:59).

Capitalism is racial not because of any deliberate attempt to divide worker but precisely because its mode of accumulation employs substantial feudal racial habits (Robinson, 2000). The theory helps us to understand the complex link between the past slavery and colonialism with the current predicaments of the black people, other marginalized social categories and indeed post- colonial political economies like African economies (Issar, 2020). Arguably, Robinson noted that the black radical tradition is not a site of contestation between Marxism and the tradition nor its revision. It is a theory of “cultural corruption of race” and a culture of liberation (Robinson, 2000:31).

These dialectical, racial and subcultural divisions Oriji corroborates is inextricably linked to the integration of the Caribbean, the Americas and Africa into the entire gamut of the capitalist network, beginning with slavery, to colonial and post-colonial eras. Arguably, the trans-Atlantic slave trade formed the basis for the cultural framing of African “Blackness” (Pierre, 2013) cited in Oriji (2019). Therefore, contemporary movements like the Black Lives Matter (BLM) are political reactions to the historical and systemic injustice created by capitalism. The BLM is an evolving culture of liberation. This is so because such identity-based movements blame racism, which they feel is central to their predicaments. They also lament the social reality, where it is observed that marginal attention is given to their plight by the mainstream left-wing

discourse and politics. The BLM seeks to evolve a functioning value that will shape their participation in the global political economy. Racial capitalism in simple terms refers to the mutually constitutive entanglement of racialized and colonized exploitation within the process of capital accumulation. It was and is still being facilitated by slavery, colonialism, imperialism, exploitation and expropriation. It clarifies the central place of race in profit maximization and capital accumulation (Edwards, 2021).

The study of capitalism in Africa will benefit from Robinson's perspective because it strips racialism from its colour character and re-characterizes it as a structure of power or a means of structuring power through difference. In a sense, any form of difference could be instrumentalized or racialized by the capitalist system and operationalized in a structure that could facilitate its modes of accumulation. These differences could be identified in capitalism as it manifests in the African political economy. Just as Ann L. Stoler reminded us that the colonial politics of exclusion was built on the construction of legal and social categories that identified who was white, native and also who will become citizen rather than subject, which children were legitimate progeny and which were not, who were indigenous and non-indigenous to a location (Stoler, 1989:635). These categories constituted the basis upon which subsequent production of identities are hinged that are constantly being reproduced in accord with the dynamics of capitalist logic of accumulation in Africa.

### **3.5 The Limitations of Robinson's Perspectives**

There is no doubt that Cedric Robinson has made a seminal contribution in the way he conceptualized the role played by racialism in a capitalist system. Robinson also underlined that capitalism evolved from the old feudal order with racialism. The way

Robinson presents racialism not just as a color division among workers because the first European proletariat were Jews, Gypsies, Blacks, Slavs and the Irish (racialized subjects) and the division between the Irish and English working class or communities, but as a feudal habit, which finds significant reflection in modern capitalist mode of accumulation is very important. This division is not because of any conspiracy to divide but it was because racialism is a familiar feudal behavior. It is about instrumentalizing differences, which mitigates social solidarity among victims of exploitation and expropriation that have implications for profits in the capitalist market. The theoretical utility of this conceptualization of racialism is significant. This is also important because this new understanding will open new window for scholars to explore how differences are instrumentalized in a capitalist context in both emerging and developed economies that have shared skin-colour identity.

However, Meyerson (2000) argues in a critique of Robinson's contribution that the contribution Marx made did not exclusively put class as the only determinant of domination and exploitation but Marx argued that class is the primary structural determinant. He argues that Robinson tended to equate class with capitalism, as well as class analysis with economic determinism. This is precisely the factors that allow Robinson to criticize Marxian class analysis from a cultural perspective. Meyerson (2000:4) maintains that the black radical tradition is essentially characterized by a shared epistemology that recognizes the primacy of metaphysics (race and culture) over matter, the ultimate objective of which, is the promotion of non-violent means to change. Meyerson argues further that race and gender may not structurally determine capitalist dynamics. Race may also have gender implications. Accordingly, only racist and sexist ideology or racial and gendered division of labour exist. Therefore, Meyerson (2000) argues that ideology and the division of labour are both vehicles in

service of class-rule. Class-rule is a form of class struggle that generates its anti-thesis and may contain both opposition and the goal of perpetuating its dominance.

Agozino (2014: 174) observed that Robinson in his work dated 1983 focused only on how Marxism influences the black radical tradition and especially, the works of Du Bois, James and Wright. Meanwhile, he maintains that Robinson cited only a letter by Marx. In this letter, Marx clearly stated that understanding the enslavement of Africans was of crucial importance for the explanation of capitalism. Agozino laments how Robinson characterized these expressions by Marx as a form of oversimplification of the role of enslavement to capitalism. Agozino argues that Robinson did not attempt a detailed analysis of Capital Volume I and other major works of Marx.

However, Zhopia Edwards made some clarifications that point to the proximity of the entire black radical scholarship to the Marxist approach in the understanding of capitalism as a global system of oppression. Edwards (2020:165) clarifies that the black radical tradition perspective draws heavily from the studies of how Marx through the historical analysis of class shows how either class alliances or class conflicts shape the political, economic and social transformations and also the impacts of the development of capitalism in the global south. The only missing link is the poor attention given to the analysis of capitalism as a global system that subjugates the racialized workers despite the glaring evidence of racial hierarchies, ideologies and oppression, as well as its legacies in the social structures and lived experiences of societies considered to be on the margins of the global political economy (Edwards, 2020:165).

Martha Gimenez has lamented over how it is a fashion in contemporary studies of inequality to criticize the inadequacy of Marxist contributions, especially as scholars seek alternative theoretical perspectives to address the inequality entrenched by capitalism. Most often, these scholars tend to forget that the political and theoretical priorities of Marx and Engels differ considerably from contemporary concerns, which modern social scientists experience and interrogate. Class, which Marx had analyzed is not an ideology supporting the legitimate oppression of a group of people, rather, it simply denotes an exploitative relation between people, which is mediated by their relations to the means of production. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels could not have written everything about inequality in a capitalist system considering the dynamic character of the capitalist phenomenon. Neither Marx nor Engels committed their time to the in-depth research on gender, race or other structure of oppression in a capitalist system that could have satisfied today's critics of Marxism (Gimenez, 2001:24).

However, both race and class, as structures of domination, overlap and diverge, with the possibility of the oppressed people experiencing both class and racial oppression. This analysis is epitomized in the works of Berberoglu (1994), where he examined the underlying class forces that led to gender and racial division of labour among the USA working-class.

Arguably, humans generally are an assemblage of social relations and they do indeed leave their lives at the core of the intersection of several unequal social relations based on hierarchically interrelated structures, which cumulatively constitute the historical particularity of the capitalist mode of production and reproduction. Gender and race as structures of oppression should not be dismissed as false consciousness, they are indeed experienced and lived social realities. However, Gimenez (2001:26) argues that

race like other structures of oppression cannot be understood adequately if it is analyzed outside class or in isolation from the realities of class exploitation, these structures intersect with another. Intersectionality is a description of the microlevel process, which systems of oppression is carried out and how each individual and group occupies a social place within the interlocking structure of the oppression (Collins, 1994:74). Everyone, especially the oppressed social categories in a capitalist system is located at the intersection of numerous social structures. This debunks the one-sided abstraction of the nature of human exploitation and expropriation. Neither class nor race is sufficient to explain the structure of oppression. The intersection of the class with race offers better nuances in understanding how oppressed people are subjected to exploitation and expropriation in a capitalist economy (Gimenez, 2001:28). Building on Martha Gimenez notion of diverse structures of capitalist oppression and domination, we argue that the effect of capitalism is not only diverse but the structures of the domination are also diverse.

### **3.5.1 The Effects of Capitalism on Societies in Europe and the World Beyond it: Robinson's Views**

Capitalism is not simply a form of activity (production) and the reflexes of such activity. It is indeed an enormous historical force that has shaped the character of the present world (Robinson, 2000:100). The extension of slavery and racism to non-European people as an organizing structure by the late feudal lords and the early bourgeoisies of the 14<sup>th</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries, made them to preserve these habits and social conventions of racialism. The English bourgeoisies, therefore, integrated the African labor in exactly the same way and terms they integrated the Irish labor (Robinson, 2000:101). Robinson (2000:60) noted that:

Eventually, however, the old instruments gave way to newer ones, not because they were old but because the ending of feudalism and the expansion

of capitalism and its world system- that is the increasing uneven character of development among European people themselves and between Europe and the world beyond.

These dynamics produced new oppositions, while giving new opportunities and demanded new historical agents that manifested in Europe and England. These new oppositions in Europe destroyed the last remains of the unified Christendom, as well in England, the conflicts between the Agrarian capitalist and landowners. Robinson (2000:60) maintains that the delusion of medieval citizenship was replaced with race and the use of the German phrase *Herrenvolk* (governance by an ethnic majority) in the 17th century. Even though the ideological construction of the two were different, it was related.

### **3.5.2 Appreciating the Diverse Effects of Capitalism in the World Beyond Europe**

Robinson's suggestion that capitalism created an uneven development and hence two worlds of Europe and world beyond it (Europe), a sort of interpretation that could be modelled as Europe versus the rest of the world, which is not too far away from the mainstream black radical scholar like Walter Rodney's perspective of how capitalism divides the world along the core and the periphery. Again, it is close to the views of Samir Amin, Gunder Frank as well as Emmanuel Wallerstein that view capitalism as a divisive phenomenon, which dissects the world's political economy into the core, semi-periphery and periphery. To Robinson, capitalist domination is not just along racial and cultural lines in Europe, but also along the regional dichotomy of Europe and the world beyond it. Some of these totalizing constructions resonate with the views expressed by Hewitt (2002:138) that the ownership of capital and its control today stems from the historic and geometric accumulation of wealth by the capitalist system since its inception in the sixteenth century. The system centralizes and organizes capital through an ascriptive solidarity that depended on familial relations of marriage

and inheritance. This ascriptive solidarity has its roots in European patriarchal family system, which is strongly supported by both the European private property system, racial solidarity and endogeneity. The net impact of these historical events is the practice of exclusion. Just as Robinson (2000) argues that the use of the word “Barbarism” in the ancient and medieval times was a function of exclusion and not consolidation, therefore, exclusionary practices of all forms is racism. To this extend, racism is deeply structured in both the metropolitan core and the peripheral societies that experienced colonial and neo-colonial relations.

These forms of interpretations that identify regions or geographical locations as structures of domination is complicated. Breckenridge (2021:3) observes that such totalizing use of the term “Global South” (like the rest, periphery or the world beyond Europe) simply lumps countries like Latin America, India and African Countries into a single fictitious space. This categorization obscures the specific experiences and features that are particular to Africa or the respective African countries. In fact, the idea of Africa described as a single socio-economic formation is misleading or what Paolin Hountondji (1983:161) cited in Breckenridge (2021:17) characterized as “the deceptive singular”. Rather, we argue that capitalism produces diverse patterns of differences, unevenness in development and divisions in colonial and post-colonial Africa and the intersection of numerous layers and structures of oppression in the global political economy. These differences are sometimes defined by the legacies of their respective colonial histories and post-colonial relations.



### **3.5.3 Diverse Ideologies for Exploitation and Expropriation: The Anglo-Saxon Philosophy**

The colonial structure was built on the notion of the cultural superiority of the “white man’s values and the inferiority of the native cultural values. White colonizers were different people with different culture, biological characteristics and class interest. These colonizers (white) were different from the native (black) colonized people (Stoler, 1989:635). Racialism became well entrenched in Africa during colonial rule through this process of “nativity”. The natives were identified by their ethnicities. The ethnic differences categorized and compartmentalized the natives (Pierre, 2013; Onimode, 1983 cited in Oriji, 2019). Africa was also devalued as a non-historic continent. For example, Grosfoguel (2007:214) cited in Ndlovu-gatsheni, (2014:189), maintains that Africans were defined in the 16<sup>th</sup> century as people without letters, in the 18<sup>th</sup> century as people without history, in the 20<sup>th</sup> century as under-developed or people without development, and in the 21<sup>st</sup> century as people without democracy. These events substantially shaped the colonization of Africa. Since Africans were devalued in the teleological interpretation of their historical existence, in a sense, they needed to be civilized. Colonization according to Magubane, (1971) cannot take place without eroding the structural features (social, political and economic) of the native host societies. This was the background of African colonial political economy that was handed over at independence to the post-colonial majority or minority power elites.

We begin with the premise established by Robinson (2000) that nationalism and colonialism were the key tools used in exporting capitalism to the world beyond Europe. Yet the European nation-states were not influenced by universal nationalist feelings. Robinson (2000:60) identified diverse philosophies that shaped the leading European colonizing powers in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. He argues that the creation

of European secondary myths to deepen racialism, as well as consolidate the pyramid of social power in Europe was evident; the German *Teutonism*, the French *Celticism* and the English Anglo-Saxon. These myths he argues, extensively shaped the nationalism of the leading western European nations of Germany, France and England. This then will imply that capitalism through colonialism would be felt differently beyond Europe. If it is so, these diverse effects need to be explored. These effects we argue varied and depended on the exporter of the capitalism (colonial power) from Europe to the world beyond it.

Considering that these leading European powers (France, Germany and England) led the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries rise of capitalism and the 20<sup>th</sup> century colonization of Africa. Given also that England was the leading industrial country then, the major British colonial possessions are used in this section to provide historical evidence and illustrate these diversities in the colonial societies in Africa and its impacts.

#### **3.5.4 The Construction of Identity Categories in British Empires**

The colonization of Nigeria was founded on first, unequal delineation of the three regions (north, southwest and south east). Secondly, majority identity categories were constructed in each of the three regions for ease of administrative control and effective exploitation of resources. Many ethnic nationalities existed in the North. However, the Hausa ethnic group was coalesced with the Fulani ethnic group to form the Hausa-Fulani. Meanwhile, Hausas (a very diverse ethnic group spread across some parts of modern northern Nigeria) and Fulani (a nomadic ethnic group spread across West Africa) are two distinct ethnic nationalities with radically different language, culture, mythology, history and ancestry. The diversity of Hausa people is seen clearly for instance (*Kanawa*- the ethnic group in Kano, *Katsinawa*- the ethnic group in Katsina)

(Okolie, 2003:78). What was common to these groups was their faith in Islam. Osaghae (1998) argues that the Hausa-Fulani (the new colonial created identity) gave the people a new tool to consolidate through the imposition of Islam over the non-Muslim areas that had resisted Jihadist incursion for several decades before colonialism.

In the south west, the diverse nationalities were wielded together into a monolithic Yoruba identity. This development was similar in the south eastern Nigeria, where the colonial administration aimed to construct majority identity from the hitherto diverse Igbo groups that developed political leadership only up to the village level. The different Igbo groups were wielded together to create one Igbo majority identity in the south eastern region. Okolie (2003) corroborated that identities like Igbo, Efik and Yoruba were created under British rule (Nnoli, 1995 cited in Okolie, 2003:70)

These majorities became the beneficiaries of the colonial structure in post-colonial times, whereas minority ethnic nationalities continued to wallow in victimhood. These majority and minority identity categories created significant social distance between people, who hitherto see themselves as socially related. In fact, Ukiwo, (2005:11); Osaghae, (1998) argue that prior to colonial administration, the diverse ethnicities in Nigeria cooperated on a wide range of social, political and economic issues. Wars and violent conflicts existed, but such conflicts were essentially for economic and political gains and not because of differences in social identity.

In Nigeria, majority groups succeeded the “white Man” and the minority ethnic nationalities remained and maintained the status of the “black natives”. In the post-colonial South Africa (Apartheid era), the British upon disengagement from colonial

adventure in South Africa, privileged the white minority over the black majority. In the United State of America (USA) another former British colony, the colonial structures gave privilege to the constructed majority white group (of different national, ethnic, cultural and linguistic backgrounds) over minority people of colour. The plantocratic and industrial capitalism constructed and reconstructed Africans as a homogenous black group. It also configured other identities like gender and sexuality in the United States of America (Issar,2020). These groups experienced capitalism and reacted to it differently.

From the forgoing, it is evident that within the same British colonial empire, different social categories were created and different effects were felt, which is produced by the capitalist system exported through colonialism. These effects make it possible for the capitalist system to exert oppression, domination, exploitation and expropriation of people and resources through multiple layers and intersections of numerous structures that facilitates accumulation.

### **3.5.5 The Complex Character of the Capitalist System**

Returning to our discussion on capitalism and despite the foregoing criticisms, characterizing capitalism as a system of ownership of the means of production by the bourgeoisies may oversimplify the system. This simplified context tends to obstruct our view of understanding the system as an organized mechanism for accumulation, domination, division, differentiation and dispossession.

Capitalism is a system with a competitive spirit. Such competition breaks community spirit and negates communal solidarity. Those who win impose suffering on the losers. As a result, people become frustrated. The frustration, resentment and anxiety predispose the victims to violence on the one hand. On the other hand, the capitalist

system mutilates and degrades the environment through violent pollution, suppress any expression of dissent and deliberately neglect the vulnerable segment of the society (Gordon, 1997). Capitalism is structurally and functionally arranged to divide the society in a way that relates closely with, and fabricates race (Fraser, 2018).

### **3.6 Race Relations in Colonial Empires and Capitalist Wage Differentials as Racialism**

Africa's serious engagements with the western world started with the slave trade and later, colonialism and neo-colonialism. Racism began in the mind of the slave hunter and the local slave trader argues (Kelly, 2017). However, racializing the blackness of Africans is a later form of racialism. Pierrie (2003, 2013) cited in Oriji (2019) argues that the trans-Atlantic slave trade and slavery provided the basis for understanding the global cultural framing of blackness for Africans. This was used as a criterion for subjugating the black Africans, which commenced during the slavery era in the new world. It was also employed during the colonial era and indeed today in the era of racial imperialism. African slaves were captured, enslaved and later racialized as a homogenous black group in the Americas. On the African soil, the Africans were framed, described and considered by the Europeans as "natives." By such reference, they became natives both in discursive practice at official level and the Europeans' action through the alienation of the natives.

This position corroborates the claims of Magubane (1971), who argues that the conquest of the black man was not a momentary act of violence that took the African ancestors by surprise and stopped. The initial violence was accompanied by a perennial process of brutality, which was institutionalized into the cultural records. In this records Magubane stressed, the supremacy of the white values is presented

aggressively that the white culture is satisfied only under the condition that the colonized cultures are reduced to a position of subservience, where the colonized themselves accept willingly or unconsciously, the supremacy of the white cultural values.

It was this notion of the cultural superiority of the white values and inferiority of the colonized that colonization of Africa was founded. The colonial enterprise was constructed on the notion that Europeans in the colonies were different biological and social groups; a group of people with common class interest, same racial characteristics, similar political ties and superior cultural heritage. Therefore, the borders between the colonizer and the colonized are self-evident and easily identifiable. As a consequence, the colonial politics of exclusion was based on constructing categories, legal and social, specifying who was 'white', 'native', citizen, indigenous, subject, legitimate children and who was not (Stoler, 1989). It is a form of differentiated value placed on social groups, which suggest the production of recognized differences that place different social worthiness and such differences becomes critical in the accumulation of surplus, profit and social power (Pulido, 2017).

Accordingly, Nigeria under colonial dispensation was racialized geographically based on the colonial nation-state. At the global stage, Nigerians and indeed other black Africans were racialized as blacks. On the African continent, racism was entrenched as an ethnic category through the process of nativity (Pierre, 2013; Onimode, 1983 cited in Oriji, 2019). At the end of colonial penetration in Africa, the differences between the colonizer and the native (the colonized) became more defined. The ethnic boundaries in colonial Nigeria Oriji (2019) argues was delineated deliberately to reflect the fragments. The ethnic fragmentation characterized and defined the natives.

The points of such ethnic difference became an instrument for their domination by the white colonizer and employed to mitigate collective resistance against the colonial entity. In sum, Oriji (2019) contends that colonialism racialized Nigerians at home (locally) as natives and as blacks globally. Satre argues that colonialization by its very nature and essence is cultural genocide. It cannot take place without systematically eroding the structural features of the native societies (Satre, 1968:38 cited in Magubane, 1971).

Today, in the post-colonial era, different forms of social hierarchies have been created, alongside, which differences are labelled, people's social status devalued and social power exercised through it: social cleavages, ethnic, economic, religious or social, when operationalized, they breed exclusionary practices that have implications for race relations. The race is not scientifically proven as a natural given. However, ample evidence abounds that it is a socially constructed process, which is different from one form of capitalism to the other only in space and time. It is both a cultural and economic phenomenon. It is cultural because race is a socially constructed process, which shapes the value of the social power of those influenced by it. Economically, it is employed as a weapon to structure exploitation. For example, race and inequality are produced in the process by which income is determined argues Howard Botwinick in his works; 'Persistent Inequality: Wage Disparity under Capitalism'. He shows that the same skilled labour can be paid differently (McCarthy, 2016). This idea about race aligns with the argument of Silvia Federici about how capital requires devalued labour not just because of the expansion of profit but also to discipline, pacify and divide the society (Goldstein, 2017). Dividing or differentiating people in society to exploit or expropriate them is essential to the logic of capitalism. Just as in 1877 when the industrial and political elites of America colluded and mobilized the biggest match

towards economic growth unprecedented in human history. This was done at the peril of the working people; Black, White, Chinese, European Immigrants, female labourers and rewarding them differently according to race, sex and country of origin, as well as social class consideration. This logic allowed the industrialist and the political elites to create different levels of oppression to stabilize and sustain the pyramid of wealth (Robinson, 2000:225). The capitalist system does not intend to homogenize but differentiate to dominate and dispossess (McCarthy, 2016; Virdee, 2019; Robinson, 2000:59).

### **3.7 Conclusion**

Cedric Robinson's seminal contribution has not just criticized Marxist tradition, but it also identified the weaknesses of the black radical tradition itself.

The essential elements of racial makers can be identified deep in history, varying only with time. The devaluation of human others as in the case of slaves, women and the totalizing construct of Barbarians in the early centuries of the European civilization. The devaluation of other humankind by the Europeans have led to the enslavement, extirpation, genocide, under-valuation of labour, colonialism, creation of status hierarchies and other forms differentiations that engenders human community. The limits of Robinson's approach especially on the effects of capitalism on the world stage remains the important contribution of this theoretical reviews. The impacts of capitalism on the world stage is diverse and varied to the extent of the diversity of the cultural philosophies of the powers exporting the capitalism to the world stage as well as the variations in time and place.



## **Chapter 4**

# **THE CAPITALIST ECONOMY, EFFECTS AND THE DIFFERENTIATED SOCIAL WORTH IN NIGERIA**

### **4.1 Introduction**

This chapter discusses the precolonial inter-group relations in Nigeria, as well as the colonial identity formations and analyses capitalism as a system that began in Nigeria during colonial times. In other words, the colonial enterprise constructed modern Nigerian political and economic structures. However, capitalism in Nigeria shapes the geographical distribution of political space, configured and continues to shape identities and instrumentalized the differences it created and continues to re-create to structure exploitation and expropriation to enhance the regime of capital accumulation. Capitalist production in Nigeria is more visibly seen in the area of raw material production; the crude oil being the most preponderant. The activities of capitalist firms that extract oil created two significant effects; the complex dispossession of land resources from indigenous communities and private land holders on the one hand, and the other, the pollution of the land, sea and aerial environments. The dispossession of land had been a significant historical character of the capitalist enterprise. This is exemplified in the 16<sup>th</sup>-century colonization of Ireland. Similarly, in Nigeria, lands belonging to indigenous communities and individuals in the oil-rich Niger Delta region in Nigeria have been taken away from the local indigenous people, who essentially are

peasants. The dispossessed peasants have effectively been depeasantized<sup>9</sup>. Depeasantization is a specific form of deagrarianization where peasants lose their collective capacity to use their land resource. Their social coherence is obstructed and this could lead to a reduction of their number in a location (Vanhaute, 2012: 6 and 7).

As a consequence of the extensive exploration and exploitation of the hydrocarbon resources, the environment of the communities hosting the hydrocarbon resources has been exposed to deleterious pollution in the land, sea and air. These pollutions and the depeasantization of the peasants through complex dispossession led to discontentment in the entire host communities. This dissatisfaction gave rise to the community- based social movements that resisted the state and capital. The social movements had sought through violent militant activities like the kidnapping of foreign staff, breaking oil facilities and disruption of production platforms as well as the entire production infrastructure to put pressure on enterprises extracting oil and the Nigerian state. The obstruction to production as a result of the militancy compelled both the state and capital to respond in two ways; the use of "carrot and stick" (incentives and disincentives respectively). Incentive encompasses the involvement of relevant stakeholders in form of restitution (cleaning up the environment and the implementation of amnesty program for repentant militants). The disincentives manifested themselves in the manipulation of the differences among the communities, which has negative implications for inter and intra communal solidarity.

---

<sup>9</sup> The idea of Depeasantization is vividly captured in the works of (Vanhaute, 2012) and it helps us understand the behaviours of capital towards land resources. In this study, I mean the dispossession of the lands belonging to the peasants and the deepening peasantry. The poor inhabitants of the indigenous communities are poor even with the land resources. Dispossession of such land without any form of compensation or credible arrangement to improve their social condition will only deepen such peasantry.

When people or communities cultivate a consciousness of exclusion based on certain identity categories, race relations will ensue. In other words, when differences are instrumentalized, race relation is present. This is precisely the novelty of Cedric Robinson's conceptualization and analysis of racialism. The main contribution of this thesis is analysing Nigerian capitalism in relations to its predominant political and economic activities as a raw material producer by using Robinson's racial capitalism framework. Robinson's work underlines that racialism that emphasizes skin colour differences is a recent racial identifier of racial markers. The English Anglo-Saxon and the Irish peoples' relations for over three to four centuries from available historical records provide a startling illustration of the fact that skin colour had not been essential to racialism nor race relations during feudalism and early capitalist development. This amounts to saying that race relations are present in all instances where differences of all forms are instrumentalized and operationalized. This thesis will use Robinson's framework of racial capitalism to explore how differences within Nigeria were instrumentalized to ensure capital accumulation by expropriation of resources.

#### **4.1.1 Inter-Group Relations in Pre-Colonial Nigeria**

Different groups and identities had existed in the geographical space expressed today as Nigeria before its contact with the western world. There exists evidence of inter-group relations that pre-dated its contact with western civilization. In order to fully comprehend the colonial and post-colonial identities, we need to understand the historic character of the hitherto existing societies. For instance, in examining economic development and inter-group relations in Nigeria before 1800, J.F.A. Ajayi argues that, with increasing awareness of the necessity of a national perspective, there is the need to see the individual peoples of Nigeria in a wider historical context (Ajayi, 1971). Pre-colonial polities of Nigeria existed as collective creations of their respective

community members who entered into various forms of social relations with other communities, forging some sort of ties either by force or through peaceful means, or by conscious or unconscious means. This was because none of them was self-sufficient enough, both in economic and socio-political terms, to exist without the other. The gregarious instincts that characterize the nature of man were permissive of their desire to relate with others beyond their ethnic, clannish or kinship difference.

Intergroup relations amongst the native Nigerian communities in the pre-colonial era can thus be said to have cut across political, socio-cultural and economic spheres of their existence. In those times, communities lived in conditions of mutual contacts and exchanges that fostered inter-communal cooperation and sometimes encouraged the forging of military alliances or defence pacts in times of external relations. Most often, the relationship was peaceful. This means that elements of symbiosis evolved amongst groups earning their living in different ways, but engaging in mutually beneficial exchanges (Rodney, 1972:52). In other cases, the relations were turbulent thus, inter-ethnic and intra-ethnic conflicts, wars and their resolution constituted another level at which the cultural groups interacted with one another (Usman, 1994:17). These interactions either aggressive or friendly aided the progressive transformation of the pre-colonial polities into relational groups.

The very fluid boundaries of the various ethnic groups of Nigeria, even before the 18<sup>th</sup> century, were rarely coterminous with the boundaries of the polities. Intensive migration, extensive networks of division of labour and commerce did not allow for the emergence of ethnically monolithic polities. One of the most important lessons of Nigeria's historical experience was that the kingdoms, chiefdoms, city-states and village confederations, which were products of the people's worldviews were

conquered by the British in the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Usman, 1994:5). The phenomenon was not peculiar to Nigeria but a continental phenomenon. Arguably, “inter-tribal wars, population movements and migrations had whittled down the corporate strength and cohesion of emerging individual kingdoms. Broken and temporarily stunned, African societies gathered themselves continuously into new kingdoms as they migrated southwards” (Alli, 1997:229). These events influenced the demographic dynamics, identity and state formations by the respective polities of Nigeria and perhaps, other groups on the African continent in the pre-colonial era. These wars or violent conflicts that existed (or other forms of relations) were not engaged because of the diversities among the people or the social difference of these identities or the dis-similarities of such identities but were carried out for economic and political gains ((Ukiwo, 2005:11).

In a nutshell, the net effect of these inter-group relations led to accommodation, assimilation, conflicts, cohesion, cooperation and competition. Sharing of socio-cultural practices, festivals, articles of trade, amongst others, also resulted from these relationships. They also engaged in several acts of political and military diplomacy which made war-alliances possible in the face of common aggression. Though their economies were at the level of subsistence, only able to provide for bare necessities, the people were engaged in trans-border trade relations, exchanging goods and services with each other, in the exploitation of areas of comparative advantage. Apart from this, “peasant welfarism” whereby less privileged relations from distant areas or even from neighbouring ethnic groups came to enjoy surpluses from more affluent relatives was another means through which kin-group relationships were maintained. This was in response to the communitarian spirit inherent in pre-colonial Nigerian communities.

J.K. Fayemi (2021:4) has given an incisive account of the common features of inter-group relations of Nigerian communities in the pre-colonial age. According to him:

Long before the white man set his foot on our land, our people had developed an intricate network of relationships. Even though they lived in their various enclaves as independent people, they traded together, they married one another, they fought together as allies in battles, and against one another as adversaries. Our cultures inter-mingled and produced a rich synthesis of cultures in such a way that no single culture is left pure and unaffected by new vocabularies, diets and even dress. Many of our empires and kingdoms were territorial rather than tribal. They luxuriated and thrived on their diversity, and formed unions and alliances based on shared understanding and mutual respect.

The present-day Nigerian society is a huge, complex and yet compact entity with a fairly long history of inter-group relations with neighbouring ethnic groups spanning many years from time immemorial.

As products of similar historical experiences and circumstances, the Nigerian pre-colonial polities lived in a complex web of multi-layered social, cultural, economic and political synergies, which were manifest in every sphere of their individual and collective lives. In order to demonstrate that these peoples existed within the same cultural and historical continuum with certain measures of contacts and interactions, Ikime (2018: 90-200) observed that:

It was not colonialism that introduced the Igbos to the Igalas; the Kanuris to the neighbouring States; the Efiks to the Ibibios and the Igbos; the Itshekiris to the Urhobos; or the Yorubas to the Nupes, etc. But they were put together by forces of geography and history, and knew about each other and respected their various cultures and susceptibilities.

Indeed, the restrictive force of the natural environment and historical circumstances enabled social coherence, ability to organise peculiar institutions, and adaptation to certain common practices.

Even though some scholars tend to see inter-group relations in terms of conflicts, but trade was perhaps the most important factor which linked many groups together. No community was self-sufficient in the production of agricultural and manufactured goods which it required either for its necessities or luxuries. Differences in physical environment and geographical factors tended to promote trade contacts and, hence intergroup relations (Falola, 1989:22). B.J. Dudley (1973: 22-3) asserts that contacts at the level of economy and culture were sufficiently significant to produce “linkages” which led to the emergence of “broad collective identities” in the Nigeria area before colonial rule. He thus sees intergroup conflict as one of the factors facilitating assimilation and diffusion of common culture, producing a “homogenizing effect sufficient for one to perceive the emergence of a wider community covering the area known as Nigeria”. Indeed, migration and inter-group conflicts were already inducing diffusion and assimilation and creating a common political culture before the advent of colonialism (Hodgkin, 1960: vi-ix). In his analysis of pre-colonial links between South-Eastern Nigeria and the Benue Valley, A.E. Afigbo maintained that, ‘in all, the links helped to impose on the whole region a measure of cultural unity which is deserving of further study and emphasis in a period when it is political to highlight these links, which unite Nigeria’s many ethnic groups at the expense of those which divide them” (Afigbo, 1974).

The pre-colonial polities also had several mechanisms for cementing strained relationships through: exchange of gifts, payment of tributes, inter-marriage, and even offertory of propitiatory rights at designated shrines. In politico-military terms, some of these mechanisms amounted to “treaties of protection or friendship” whereby weaker or stronger groups consummated strong military ties. Memories of past incidences of aggression or conflicts/wars and animosities amongst them are

sometimes smoothed through joking relations which were also kinship expressions that cut across clannish and ethnic boundaries. In economic terms, the production relations of the people were facilitated by their living in conditions of economic interdependence which were aimed at exploiting opportunities of comparative advantage. Amongst the various Nigerian communities, the notions of communality and common humanity was developed and entrenched in their values, ideals, norms and beliefs. All these guided the people's ways of relating with each other, in a form of community organisation. In the view of Berthoud (2019:56) "in such a mode of organisation, a number of relationships between members of the community with individuals of related ethnic groups and the invisible world were expressed in the language of kinship, both consanguineous and by alliance or affinity". These led to formation of identities amongst the groups. It is believed that they saw greatness and also witnessed declines, and these were developments which indeed characterized their evolutionary trends. In what has come to be popularly referred to as the Middle-Belt, the region lying in the heart of Northern Nigeria to the South, the tribes had largely escaped the consolidating influences of Emirate rule, and though there were some small and very interesting kingdoms, the majority were still dispersed in their small lineage groups amongst scattered villages.

The nature of inter-group relations in pre-colonial Nigeria was so diverse and characterized by conflict, and cooperation (assimilation and integration). Wars were fought but for economic and territorial gains and not about social identity difference. Trade was also an important means of fostering cooperation, as well as communal system of joke exchange and the communitarian system that evolved from long history of communal solidarity. It was against this backdrop that the slave trade emerged and



became integrated into the global commercial enterprise championed by European explorers, traders, politicians and missionaries. The era culminated into colonialism, which this research considers to have more profound impact on the reproduction of identities in Nigeria.

## **4.2 The Formation and Amalgamation of Nigeria**

### **4.2.1 The Imposition of Colonial Rule on the Niger Area**

The country now referred to as Nigeria is a product of the British colonial administrative enterprise which in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century was firstly motivated by mercantilist interest that later precipitated into an imperialist venture. Through treaties, cessions, negotiations, acquisitions, purchases, and outright conquests, the Nigerian federation was created by colonial fiat (Mangvwat, 2015:12). The appointment of John Beecroft as the British Consul for Bights of Benin and Biafra in 1849 marked the beginning, *willy nilly*, of the British conquests of Nigeria and its contact with the British system of government. His arrival to the area was facilitated by the early explorations of the territory by Mungo Park and the Lander Brothers in the 1830s. Beecroft became pre-occupied with the task of protecting British commercial interests in the coastal areas (Tamuno,2000:15). He encountered opposition by many kings and slave merchants who were opposed to his interference especially in the slave trade. Either through conquests, treaties and application of ordinances, he continued to make inroads into their territories. Beecroft was succeeded by other British officials who were appointed as Consuls. In particular, Consul Hewett penetrated the Lagos area and in 1861, he conquered and annexed Lagos, declaring it a Crown Colony. This episode marked the beginning of the formal colonial control over the Southern part of Nigeria.

In the Northern segment of the country, the whole process of imposition of colonial rule on the Niger Area continued with the commercial ambitions of the Royal Niger Company, which had come into the scene after acquiring the Charter of Administration from Britain in 1886. The Company became more interested in exploitation and expropriation of resources of the Africa in advancement of its trading interests. Sir George Dashwood Goldie of the Royal Niger Company (RNC) and Consul Hewett wanted the British Government to step in and declare the area of the Oil Rivers and the Lower Niger a British Colony. The liberal British Government, however, objected to this idea, believing such a venture to be an expensive waste of time. Although this Government had rejected the recommendation of the 1875 Royal Commission on West Africa which called for withdrawal from existing Colonies, it did not seem willing to set up any more (Perham, 1960: 362). This did not deter Sir George Goldie.

For five years, Sir Goldie was left alone to wage a two-front struggle on the one hand against the French traders which he had finally brought out under pressure by 1884, and on the other hand against apathy in Whitehall but the mood in Europe changed in 1884. Germany's Chancellor Otto von Bismarck having previously been as lukewarm as Gladstone to the idea of West African Colonies, called the Berlin Conference. In the same year, Germany annexed the Cameroons, lying to the East of present-day Nigeria. The purpose of the Conference was ostensibly to enable Bismarck to back French and Belgian demands for a cessation of British activities in the Congo Basin—activities being carried out by Baptist missionaries and merchants from Manchester and Liverpool.

European powers comprising Great Britain, Germany, France, Portugal and Belgium had converged at this historic conference to either acquire more colonies or to assert

their claims over “spheres of influence”. Sir Goldie attended the Conference as an observer. Not wishing to push French-German collaboration too far, the Conference had little hesitation in permitting Britain to be responsible for the Niger Area. The result of all this was the Berlin act, which provided that any European country which could show that it had a predominant interest in any African region would be accepted as the administering power in that region, provided it could show that its administration was a reality (Forsythe, 1970:14). The imperial and mercantilist drive of the European powers manifested visibly in their scramble for, and partitioning of Africa--a phenomenon which dominated the proceedings of the Berlin Conference. The “Niger Districts” fell under the dominion of the British, and in deference to the conditions of the Conference, Lord Lugard proclaimed in 1885 that:

It is hereby notified for public information that under and by virtue of certain treaties concluded between the months of July last and present date, and by other lawful means, the territories on the west coast of Africa, herein referred to as the Niger Districts, were placed under the protectorate of Her Majesty the Queen from the date of the said treaties respectively. The British protectorate of the Niger Districts comprises the territories on the line of coast between the British protectorate of Lagos and the right or Western bank of the north of Rio del Rey. It further comprises the territories on both banks of the Niger from its confluence with the Benue at Lokoja to the sea, as well as the territories on both banks of the Benue from the confluence up to and including Ibi [...] the Niger Districts [...] have come under the gracious protection of Her Britannic Majesty, Queen Elizabeth the First<sup>10</sup>.

The result of the conference proceedings was a patch-work of communities soldered into colonies purely for administrative and economic convenience of the super-powers. Ironically, the scramble for the “soul” of Africa and its partitioning did not take into consideration the opinions, yearnings and aspirations of the Africans. By 1893, there was an intensive tripartite wrangling amongst Britain, France and Germany for spheres

---

<sup>10</sup> The *London Gazette* of 5<sup>th</sup> June, 1885

of influence within the Niger territories, but by November 1894 Capt. Lugard had beaten France and Germany to it by signing these treaties with most of the areas.

#### **4.2.2 The Amalgamation of Protectorates into a Single Entity**

The foundation for the building of Nigeria as a modern multi-national state was laid with the implementation of the Lord Selborne Committee Report of 1898. The pivotal issues of fiscal policies, constitutional arrangements and organisation of local government were addressed therein. The Lord Selborne Niger Committee recommended that the amalgamation of the Niger Territories be carried out in instalments. The Colonial office agreed, hence the first, second and third instalments of amalgamation in Nigeria. Pragmatic, economy-based considerations became the *raison d'être* of the 1898-1914 schemes concerning amalgamations in Nigeria (Tamuno, 2000:15-17). In a parliamentary debate in 1899 at the British House of Lords, Lord Salisbury expressed great optimism in the prospects of the “Niger Area”, where he remarked that it is: “An enormous territory which I believe is full of wealth and full of inhabitants which is being gradually brought under the civilising influence of English Government and which I have no doubt there is every prospect in the future it will yield a rich harvest to the British empire”<sup>11</sup>. This was one of the mind-sets that guided the actions of the British Government in its various “spheres of influence”.

In its desire to administer the “Niger Territories” the British Government inaugurated the Selborne Committee in 1898 to recommend ways and means of administering the area. The Committee recommended that the amalgamation should be carried out in instalments, and the Colonial Office agreed. The scheme of amalgamation inaugurated by Lord Lugard was largely tentative and experimental. Pursuant to the Committee’s

---

<sup>11</sup> Parliamentary Debates (Lords), 1<sup>st</sup> August 1899, iv. 75, 1003

Report, the Northern and Southern protectorates were created, including the Colony of Lagos in 1900. This was the first phase of the amalgamation process. The Unification Proclamation by Lord Lugard on January 1<sup>st</sup> 1900 ensured that the territory was subsumed under a single British administration. The second phase involved the integration and unification of the colony of Lagos and its protected territory with the protectorate of Southern Nigeria, with Lagos as its headquarters, an act which occurred on 1<sup>st</sup> May 1906. The final phase of the series of amalgamations was that which took place at Zungeru on the 1<sup>st</sup> of January, 1914 when the Colony and Protectorate of Nigeria was formally inaugurated under the Royal Letters Patent and Orders-in-Council. Mechanisms for British control here, from the mid-century, took various forms. According to Flora Shaw:

On 1<sup>st</sup> January 1914, the amalgamation ceremonies were undertaken by Lugard in the spirit of dogged routine. The ceremony started sharp at 9 am at the Court House, with a speech and reading of the instruments of Government by Lugard, accompanied by a 21-gun salute, ushering the swearing-in, and then 17 more guns. After Lugard, Boyle and Temple had read out the King's and Harcourt's telegrams. Lugard addressed the populace from the balcony and proceeded to swear in James and the CJ at Government House, followed by the swearing-in of the Legislative and Executive Councils. The event terminated at about ½ past 12”<sup>12</sup>.

This was quite a momentous act of rare political midwifery by the British. But the Amalgamation Acts, like stated elsewhere, did not take into account the views and inputs of the indigenous people or the “Natives” as it was done in the manner of a peremptory fiat. “Amalgamation” theories of the 1898-1914 type were not the first to hit the political horizon in the territories that later became Nigeria.

---

<sup>12</sup> Report of Flora Shaw, in Margery Perham [1960]: *Lugard-The Years of Authority*, P.412.

### 4.2.3 Naming of the Territory

The challenge of naming the territory was glaring since the colonial administration tinkered with idea of naming it either as the “Niger Soudan” or “Goldesia” (after Goldie the founder of the Royal Niger Company). It was on the 8<sup>th</sup> of January, 1897, that a more appropriate name was ascribed to the area. Miss Flora Shaw (later Lady Lugard) had coined a name to be given to this entity, as revealed in the *London Times* viz:

As the title “Royal Niger Company’s territories” is not only inconvenient to use but to some extent is also misleading, it may be permissible to coin a shorter title for the agglomeration of Pagan and Mohammedan states which has been brought, by the exertions of the Royal Niger Company, within the confines of a British Protectorate and thus need for the first time in their history to be described as an entity by some general name. To speak of them as the Central Sudan which is the title accorded by some geographers and travellers, has the disadvantage of ignoring political frontier lines...The name “Nigeria”, applying to no other portion of Africa, may, without offence to any neighbours, be accepted as co-extensive with the territories over which the Royal Niger Company has extended British influence and may serve to differentiate them equally from the British colonies of Lagos and the Niger protectorate on the coast and from the French territory of the Upper Niger<sup>13</sup>.

Nevertheless, the move towards strengthening the British colonial foothold in the new country called Nigeria was accompanied by series of administrative reorganisations including a number of constitutional changes which manifested in the forms of the Clifford Constitution (1922) which allowed for political participation: Richards Constitution (1946) which established a single Legislative Council for the country, the Macpherson Constitution (1951) which recognised regionalism and the Lyttleton Constitution 1954 which ushered in the principle of Federalism as the system of Government for Nigeria. The last of the British colonial constitution-making exercises was at the 1957 London Conference where the issue of self-government and

---

<sup>13</sup> Flora Shaw: *London Times* 8<sup>th</sup> January, 1897

decolonisation occupied the front-burner. Nigeria eventually gained independence on 1<sup>st</sup> October 1960, and was declared a republic in 1963.

### **4.3 Formation of Political Parties and the First Electoral Process in Nigeria**

#### **4.3.1 How and Why Political Parties Were Formed**

Formation of political parties in Nigeria and other parts of the African continent was a product of the several factors, namely: the spill-over effects of the Pan-African Movement led by W.E.B. Dubois (1920s); the rise of political consciousness; the advent of education, the struggle for self-determination and the desire for independence and control of their own affairs by the elite. In this context, the formation of such parties was in response to certain political stimuli within the environment (Yahaya, 1980:297). The first political party in Nigeria was the Nigerian National Democratic Party (NNDP) which was formed in 1922 by Herbert Macaulay, and centred on Lagos. This political party, alongside the Calabar Indigenes League, were the first to participate in any electoral contest in Nigeria.

It is needless to say that all these developments were prompted by the introduction of the elective principle which was introduced by the Clifford Constitution of 1922 which created the Central Legislative Council for Nigeria and allowed for election of indigenous Nigerian representatives in the Council. In 1933, the Nigerian Youth Movement (NYM) was formed by graduates of Kings College Lagos comprising the likes of Ernest Okoli, H.O. Davies, Nnamdi Azikiwe, and this marked the first major attempt at establishing a truly nationalist party in Nigeria. It could be said that the first political parties in Nigeria prior to the Action Group (AG), Northern People's Congress (NPC), National Council for Nigeria and the Cameroons (NCNC), and others

were the National Democratic Party (NDP) and the Nigerian Youth Movement (NYM) (Sklar, 1983:50-52). These were the pace-setting political platforms not only in the South but in the whole country.

The period between 1946 and 1954 witnessed a more robust emergence of political parties in Nigeria. It was indeed a period of great political ferment which came on the heels of the tremendous constitutional reforms (especially the Richard, Macpherson and Lyttleton Constitutions) initiated by the colonial administration. The move towards decolonization and struggle for self-determination as manifest in the agitations by the minority ethnic groups became another strong factor behind the formation of political parties within that period. The first major attempt at forming political parties in the Northern region of the country came on the heels of ill-feelings by the minority ethnic groups of what is commonly referred to as the Middle-Belt over the second-class status accorded by the Northern Regional Government in active collusion with the Colonial Administration. This development could be said to have been sparked up by ethnic minority agitations in the light of feelings of marginalisation and discrimination in the distribution of amenities and opportunities. The last straw that broke the camel's back was the heated debates over the controversial motion seeking to restrict the activities of Christian missionary activities in the North.

The resentment of the Northern Christians against what they perceived as internal colonialism by the dominant Hausa-Fulani was what incensed their resolve to form political parties. The first one to be formed was the Non-Muslim League (NML) in 1949 under the leadership of Pastor David Lot from the Plateau Province. This was transformed into the Middle Zone League (MZL) in 1951 when more tribal



associations of the Tiv, Berom, Igala Jukun, Idoma, Northern Yoruba, Nupe and others in the Middle-Belt decided to join. In 1953 the Middle Belt Peoples Party (MBPP) was formed under the pressure of the NCNC to demand for a Middle-Belt State, but further political developments within the region caused the merger of the MZL, MBPP and several tribal unions to form the United Middle-Belt Congress (UMBC) on the 10th of June 1955 under the leadership of Mr. J.S. Tarka (Dudley, 1968: 200-205). According to M.Y. Mangvwat (1995: 302) “as a political party, the UMBC was a culmination of the ethnic solidarity of the non-Muslim people of lower North, initially aimed at redressing the Hausa-Fulani domination of the Northern region, which developed into a separatist movement; its members and leadership came from the rural elite of this area and trained by the Christian missions”. The UMBC became the leading light in the struggle for the creation of the Middle-Belt State out of the Northern region.

In the far Northern part of the country, political parties first emerged as cultural associations and later transformed into full-fledged political platforms. This was apart from what they largely regarded as “Discussion Circles” where public affairs were discussed amongst the elite, for example the Bauchi Discussion Circle championed by a Native Authority teacher, Mallam Saad Zungur in 1945. In a cause-and-effect manner, these phenomena were either sparked up by, or led to what A.D. Yahaya referred to as “the emergence of a counter-elite” (Yahaya, 1980:25). comprising educated elements who were mainly teachers, and Native Authority officials (clerks/scribes), etc whose widened horizon greatly influenced their demands for change in *status quo*. Some of them, especially Mallam Abubakar Tafawa Balewa and Mallam Aminu Kano were ardent critics of the indirect rule system and called for the reform of the Native Authority system.

In the wake of political developments in the North which J.S. Coleman referred to as the “Northern Awakening” (Dudley, 1968: 78-170), this crop of Hausa-Fulani elite decided to form a cultural association called *Jamiyyar Mutanen Arewa* in 1948 in Kaduna under the leadership of Dr. R. Dikko, a Hausa-Fulani Christian. This later transformed into the Northern People’s Congress (NPC) at the Zaria Convention of 1951 and its image as an all-embracing Northern political platform was boosted at the Jos Convention of 1954 during which Sir Ahmadu Bello was elected its President and its headquarters moved from Zaria to Kaduna. The Party commanded strong followership especially amongst the Emirs, Native Authority staff and the largely conservative rural population, a factor which gave it a great electoral advantage over other political parties in the 1960 general elections. The more radical elements in the North formed the Northern Elements Progressive Union (NEPU) in 1950 under the leadership of Mallam Aminu Kano who was more concerned about the plight of the *talakawa* (“commoners”). Dudley suggests that “the NEPU unlike the NPC was established as a movement dedicated to the political and economic emancipation of the common man” (Coleman, 1958:29). The nucleus of the Party was Kano where its founder enjoyed tremendous goodwill especially amongst the commoners.

However, the pattern of politicking in Southern Nigeria was galvanised by the more educated elements who had acquired high academic laurels from European universities and at home. Another factor was their earlier participation in liberation struggles at the Pan-African level. The pioneer Southern political parties were more interested in self-government and termination of colonial administration’s marriage of convenience with the Northern establishment. The pioneers of political movements in Southern Nigeria

included great nationalists such as Herbet Macaulay and Nnamdi Azikiwe who floated a political party called the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons (NCNC) in 1944. This party had strong appeal in the Eastern region where the Igbo people dominated. There was also Obafemi Awolowo who alongside Dr. Akinola Akelere, Dr. Saburi Biobaku etc also had attained high education abroad. They recruited mass followership from amongst their Yoruba kinsmen, first under the banner of a cultural association referred to as the *Egbe Omo Oduduwa* founded in 1945 and later transformed into a political party called the Action Group (AG) on the 12<sup>th</sup> of March 1951 at Ibadan.

#### **4.3.2 First Electoral Process**

The evolution of a Western election management in Nigeria dates back to the colonial era. Elective democracy was introduced in the country in March 1920 with the Townships Ordinance that provided for elected members of the Lagos Town Council. The Nigerian Legislative Council was subsequently established in September 1923 with four elected Nigerian members, three for Lagos and one for Calabar. The political parties that participated in these elections were the Nigerian National Democratic Party (NNDP) established by Herbet Macauley and Calabar Indigenes League. This Council increasingly became a platform for contest between early political associations for seats, practice that also largely formed the basis for bolder demands for constitutional reforms requiring the representation of Nigerians in the management of their affairs (INEC, 2017: 28)<sup>14</sup>. Subsequent elections took place in 1946, 1951, 1956 and 1960. Nevertheless, in 1946, as a result of the introduction of the Richards Constitution which promoted the idea of regionalism an indirect system of election was conducted

---

<sup>14</sup> Independent National Electoral Commission: INEC Strategic Plan (2017-2021), P.28

to fill seats into the regional and central legislatures. By this system, adult males elected their village representatives who in turn served as delegates in nominating the provincial representatives to serve in the Central Legislative Council. In that election, the country was able to produce 45 members for Central Legislature, 4 of who were elected and 24 nominated (Dudley, 1968:102). Other elections took place subsequently but the ones of 1951 and 1954 were largely appointed. It was in the 1960 general elections that the political parties fully participated in the general elections. Three major political parties namely the NPC, NCNC and the AG made their impacts felt in the election, but none of them won enough seats for outright control of Government hence coalition arrangement became inevitable. The NPC and the NCNC agreed to form a coalition Government.

#### **4.3.3 The Origin and Genesis of Minority Agitation in Nigeria**

Minority agitations which were a radical critique of the British colonial administration and its Hausa-Fulani props were socio-economic and political phenomena which gained grounds in Nigeria beginning from 1949. It is little wonder that R.T. Suberu has suggested that a key feature of recent Nigerian politics is the strident agitation by ethnic minority communities and other presumably disadvantaged groups, over what is now referred to as the “national question” (Suberu, 2003:1). These agitations arose largely on account of some factors such as: the feelings and fears of marginalisation/discrimination and their accompanying inequities and injustices; the move for self-determination/struggle for identity; and the impact of education and increasing political awareness amongst elites of the ethnic minority groups in the Nigerian Federation (Elaiwu, 2005:32). A segment of Nigeria which started such agitations were the people who constituted what is referred to as the Middle-Belt which, in terms of religious and other socio-cultural elements, consisted of a mosaic

of minority ethnic groups who were opposed especially to the over-dominating tendencies and hegemony of the Hausa-Fulani ethnic group. Turaki defines it as “a geographical unit consisting of tribes which are united by the commonness of religion, hence the Non-Muslim Group (NMG) (Turaki, 1994: 100). This area became the pioneer bastion of minority rights agitation in Nigeria.

Furthermore, Christianity and missionary education, with their liberationist impacts on the minority peoples of Northern Nigeria, were also instrumental to development of political consciousness and struggles for self-determination amongst the ethnic minorities. These further re-shaped their resentment to the exploitative and oppressive rule of the Emirate powers of the North ((Turaki, 1994:119-124). It was no doubt the religious factor that was the proximate cause of the first demand for separation on the floor of the Northern Regional House of Assembly by Pastor David Lot of the Plateau Province (Mangwat, 2013:100). Incensed by Christian liberation theology, their agitations were expressions of their objection to what they referred to as “internal colonialism” by the Hausa-Fulani (Turaki, 1994: 100). In this context, the Middle-Belt peoples formed political parties and associations which related to their own conceptions and aspirations. These became the platforms with which they pressed on with their demands for independence and inclusiveness in governance.

The whole thing started on the floor of the Northern Regional House of Assembly at Kaduna when Pastor David Lot countered a motion by Mallam Aliyu Makaman Bida who sought for the restriction of Christian missionary activities in some parts of the Northern region. This generated strong reactions by the Northern Christians who saw it as direct affront on their faith. Their anti-Islamic feelings thus precipitated into

political activities seeking for separation from the North and the establishment of political parties to advance their cause. In this wise, the Non-Muslim League (NML) was formed in 1949 with Pastor Lot as its President. In 1951, it transformed into the Middle Zone League (MZL) thereby incorporating more tribal associations from the North. The Middle Belt Peoples Party (MBPP) was also formed in 1953 by another segment of the Northern Christians. The year 1955 witnessed the formation of the United Middle-Belt Congress (UMBC), “an amalgam of ethnic associations, united in their opposition to Hausa-Fulani domination of the Northern region” (Mangvwat, 1995:303), which became the leading voice in the demand for the creation of a Middle-Belt State.

There were also strong demands amongst the ethnic minorities of the Eastern and Western regions for their own separate States. It was the alliances of the UMBC of the Middle-Belt with some southern political parties such as the AG, UMBC and NCNC which further sent such consciousness within the southern region especially the Niger Delta and Cross River peoples where demands for separate States also featured stridently. Amongst the demands of the ethnic minority groups across the three regions were: creation of states; self-government; involvement in highest level in decision-making; equal opportunities in distribution of amenities and resources, etc. In the Eastern Region in particular, the Calabar, Ogoja and Rivers Provinces had started demanding a separate Calabar-Ogoja-Rivers State. They were protesting against Igbo domination and neglect by the Eastern Regional Government in the distribution of amenities. The Action Group had supported the creation of a Mid-Western State in 1955 only on the condition that the Yoruba elements in Benin and Delta Provinces

agreed to it (Elaigwu, 2005:33). These were the trends of ethnic minority rights agitations in the country beginning from 1949.

On the 31<sup>st</sup> of March, 1953, Chief Anthony Enahoro a minority from the West moved a motion on the floor of the House of Representatives requesting, as a political objective, the granting of self-government in 1956. This could be said to be a watershed in the history of ethnic minority agitations in Nigeria. This development which came with great opposition by the Northern delegates ignited a looming political crisis in the country hence Oliver Lyttleton the then Governor-General of Nigeria convened a Constitutional Conference to revise the Macpherson Constitution of 1951. In 1954 the Lyttleton Constitution was given birth to, with guarantee of Federalism as a system of Government. This was meant to deafen the calls for self-government which remained strident until the London Constitutional Conference of 1957. One important issue which dominated talks at the 1957 London Constitutional Conference was the demand by ethnic minorities for their own states.

A high point of their agitations was the establishment of the Willinks Commission of Inquiry into the Fears and Grievances of Minorities of 1957/8 at the instance of the Colonial Administration, the Northern Regional Government and the three leading political parties of NPC in the North, NCNC in the East and AG in the West all of which also opposed to the idea of granting independence to the ethnic minorities of the three regions. The Commission held several sittings in Jos, Minna, Kaduna, Port Harcourt, Calabar and other parts of the country, to hear the grievances of the ethnic minorities. Though the Commission confirmed that there was a convincing evidence of fears amongst ethnic minorities as raised by the various groups, it recommended

that the creation of new states was needless since “it would not address the fears expressed in the country” (Willinks Commission, 1958:87)<sup>15</sup>. This did not kill the spirit of ethnic minority activism by various groups in Nigeria, as it speeded up decolonisation process which led to the granting of independence in 1960.

#### **4.4 The Neglect of Indigenous Minority Communities, Dispossession of Land and the Plight of Pollution**

##### **4.4.1 Capitalism in Nigeria**

The colonial project was arguably an enterprise carried out to source for raw materials to feed the growing industrial needs of Europe, a search for markets and possibly an outlet for investment outside Europe. This view is supported by both Karl Kautsky and Joseph Schumpeter. (Kautsky, 1961:104). V.I Lenin also views colonialism as the imperial stage of capitalism. These Marxist scholars view colonialism as capitalism. This research employs this understanding or such concept to view the colonial and neo-colonial enterprise in Nigeria as a capitalist enterprise.

Amzat and Olutayo, view the organization of production and the distributive system in Nigeria as challenged. Capitalism, they argue has entangled the same inherent contradictions of the bourgeoisie/proletariat dynamics into the different structures of emerging economies, which depends on the global capitalist system (Amzat and Olutayo, 2009:241). They argue that, during the colonial era, economic reorganization of the forces and relations of production reshaped the distribution of local opportunities to create wealth in such colonized entities. This also created a contradictory circumstance that gave rise to a revolutionary class. Before colonialism, ethnic groups

---

<sup>15</sup> Report of the Willinks Commission into the Fears of the Minorities and Means of Allaying Them 1957/58, P.87



existed, but the identity consciousness and distributive mechanism did not recognize ethnic identity. Arguably, contemporary tensions are created as a result of the reorganization of production in Nigeria along with the capitalist structure.

Also, the politicization of identity resonates with the capitalist ideological imaginations, as the reorganization of production with a differentiated role between the bourgeoisie and proletariat continues. However, ethnic identity before colonial rule in Nigeria was not a social demarcation for the exercise of influence and authority over pre-existing communities. The colonial rule introduced the practice that linked identity to belonging (like ethnicity, region or religion)<sup>16</sup> (Amzat and Olutayo, 2009:241).

Capitalism generally as a system thrives only on inequality, (Amzat and Olutayo 2009) maintained. This is a curious fact, as such, attention needs to be given to the understanding of the dialectical link between much of capitalist progress and the agitation for equality in any capitalist system, wherever it exists. The agitation for equitable access to resource contradicts the very essence of capitalist production. Therefore, it thrives on inequality. This inequality is found and still finds expressions in the lopsided distributive system, structure of domination and patterns of dispossession, which express itself as ‘grafted capitalism,’ in Nigeria, generating tension as it operates and reproduces itself (Amzat and Olutayo, 2009:239). Generally speaking, the capitalist enterprise thrives on value extraction.

The raw material extraction is the type of value extraction that is most pervasive in Nigeria. It is hinged on the appropriation of land for primary resources to which the

---

<sup>16</sup> The emphasis supplied in the parenthesis and examples are provided by this research

Oil and gas are the most significant resources in the Nigerian economy. The sector accounts for about 85% of the federal government's revenues and 95% of its foreign exchange earnings (Cayford, 1996:184; Obi, 2009). The Exxon Mobil, Total, Eni oil, formally Agip, Shell Royal Dutch, Indian Oil Corporation, Chinese National Petroleum Corporation, Chevron-Texaco and other oil companies, local and transnational operate both offshore and onshore oil fields (Obi, 2009).

#### **4.4.2 Minority Ethnic Groups**

Ethnic groups are a group of people that share certain ascribed identities that are usually constructed based on the claims of common ancestry, history, language, religion, culture or territory. It is specifically characterized by a unique identity that makes such a group different from other social groups. Most importantly, ethnic group is not just the identification of a group by its shared traits or cultural similarities, but how these identity characteristics are used to attain individual and the collective group goal (Ukiwo, 2005:8).

The ethnic minority is seen as a group within a socio-economic formation that experience systematic discrimination and domination because of their real or perceived numerical disadvantage relative to another group as a result of some historical and sociological factors. These minority groups are mostly identified by their political and social actions, which they take to project their collective interest (Osaghae, 1998).

Despite the foregoing characterization of the minority group(s), some minorities do not suffer or sometimes are not subjected to domination and discrimination like the white minority communities in South Africa and the Fulani in Nigeria. In some circumstances, the minority group transform their position in the power matrix like the Tutsi in the post-1994 Rwandan genocide. These categories of social groups are

sometimes excluded from being labelled properly as minorities in the context of the above-identified characterization of ethnic minority (Osaghae, 1998).

In the pre-colonial Nigerian societies, the notion of minority did not found relevance and therefore, the minority-majority dichotomy was absent. What existed was inter-group relations, which sometimes resulted in violent conflicts or wars. This is described international because each of these diverse groups that existed in the pre-colonial socio-economic settings maintained some degree of economic, social and politic autonomy relative to one another. The wars or violent conflicts that existed (or other forms of relations) were not engaged because of the diversities among the people or social identities or the dis-similarities of such identities but were carried out for economic and political gains ((Ukiwo, 2005:11). The colonial rule commenced in Nigeria in 1900 after the 1899 revocation of the Royal Niger Chatter, that hitherto gave trading companies the right to administer the native population, which engaged in trade with the trading companies. During colonialism, the British introduced the Native Authority System (NA). This constituted the main framework for the establishment of the colonial administrative system in Nigeria. It was based upon this framework that new ethnic groups were constructed and the ideology of majority and minority identity categories found significant expression. For example, in Northern Nigeria, the colonial authority preserved the pre-colonial political machinery (the Caliphate system). This approach led to the recognition of both the Hausa ethnic group and Fulani (Fulbe) as a homogenous identity, which was later referred to as the Hausa- Fulani. This new identity group are identified by their common religion, even though they have a different history and ancestry. This recognition by the colonial authority created in the North the concept of majority ethnic group, which intensified inter-group hegemony. The Hausa- Fulani found a new tool to consolidate on the imposition of Islam over the

non-Muslim areas that had resisted jihadist incursion before colonialism (Osaghae, 1998). Osaghae maintains that the creation of the native authority units and the centralization of the native authority system into regional authorities created a structure of domination, where the numerically small ethnic and social groups become subservient to the majority constructed entities or groups owing to the power configuration and the subsequent introduction of the majoritarian election under the regional arrangement contemplated by 1946, Sir Arthur Richards Constitution. Other groups that were not much in number (numerically disadvantaged by the colonial reconfiguration of identity demography), were marginalized as minorities of their respective regions: Northern, Eastern and Western. This structure of political regionalism elevated ethnic awareness, which later developed into full-blown ethnic consciousness in the forms they exist today in Nigeria.

Peter Ekeh argues that the classification of minorities based on regional and ethnolinguistic criteria is one form of minority identification in Nigeria. Other forms are dispersed minorities. These dispersed minorities are minorities that do not occupy a contiguous territory but share the common myth of history, ancestry, culture and language. Example of this can be found in Bayelsa, Delta, Edo and Ondo states of Nigeria. These groups include but are not limited to the Ijaw and Itsekiris. They were hitherto independent political identities before colonialism. The construction of the colonial state of Nigeria has forcefully welded them with other entities external to them. This other identity who have numerical advantage has transformed those hitherto independent groups into minority categories and hence, are subordinated to a new majority. (Osaghae, 1998).

Eberlein (2006) cited in Houeland (2015) argues that an ethnicity is a major tool, serving as the organizing principle around which, the claims to resources sovereignty in Nigeria and specifically, the Niger Delta is coordinated. The minority struggle and agitation for redress against structural disadvantage, and disempowerment continue to witness poor momentum because of the hegemonic influence of the big ethnic groups; Hausa-Fulani and Yoruba, on existing socio-political status quo in Nigeria (Osaghae, 2001).

These minority ethnic nationalities have over time been seeking accommodation. Their demands over time have changed into agitation for self-determination. The self-determination is characterized by the deep urge of the minority groups, especially those of the oil region areas, to make a demand for greater control over local resources and greater political autonomy. The demands also revolve around the protection of minority languages, cultures, religion, separate states and protection from assimilation and domination by larger ethnic groups. It is a demand for political autonomy of the minority groups; a weak central government within the Nigerian state project. This arrangement it is argued would ensure greater access to power and local control of resource by the indigenous people relevant to a given locality (Osaghae, 2001).

In this way, Obi (1997) maintains that the minority ethnic groups are conscientized to the social reality that they have lost out in the power and resources game. Therefore, the minority nationalities have no option but to use the same ethnicity to push back and make demands for self-determination, state creation and agitate for minority rights from the numerically dominant groups.

#### **4.4.3 Complex Dispossession as Essential to Racial Capitalism**

Appropriating land from the indigenous people commenced from the preceding colonial era. Earlier in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the Nigerian colonial authorities proclaimed the Mineral Ordinance in 1907 and later, the Mineral Act of 1914. Equipped with this regulatory mechanism, the colonial government granted oil concession in 1938 across the entire Nigeria mainland to Shell BP. The commercial discovery of oil and gas was realized only in 1958. Therefore, the new Nigerian ruling elites re-negotiated certain terms and allowed the oil companies to operate the Nigerian oil fields. Decree 51 of 1969 was promulgated to replace the 1914 Mineral Act, thereby shifting control of oil resources from the transnational capital to the Nigerian state (Obi, 1997:141; Obi, 2009; Ukeje, 2001:18). This ensured the incorporation of the new power wielders into the entire gamut of the global capitalist encirclement.

Appropriation stands for different ways employed to take away land from indigenous peoples. When the land is taken and commodify, the issue of access becomes critical. Most land that is taken in this manner through laws and practices mostly favours selected social groups, gender or class (Pulido, 2017). Those dispossessed become depeasantized (landless peasants). The creation of landless peasants is a significant formation stage of a new socio-economic identity, which often comes with the concomitant social and economic disempowerment. Pellow (2007:17) argues that the production of social inequalities by race, gender, nation, class and any form of differences is a normal functioning of the capitalist economy. Building on this premise, the creation of any form of difference to appropriate and expropriate the land belonging to the indigenous people is not a mistake at all, rather, such practice is an essential aspect of the capitalist economy.

This practice of land dispossession is not a new practice to capitalism nor a peculiar experience to Nigeria. Although, forms and quantities of capital may vary considerably from place to place and at different times in history, what we know about the importance of capital is always the same. It is always vital as a factor of production in the economic life of all known human societies (Bates, 1990). It tends to act in similar ways and manifest patterns that could be recognized, especially dispossession of other people, where capital goes of their resources (land and the mineral occurrences therein). This can be illustrated in the history of English colonization of Ireland. Robinson citing the works of James Anthony Froude "the English in Ireland" noted that the Normans using their military aristocracy invaded Ireland in the 12<sup>th</sup> century. The culmination of their defeat made the English introduce English civilization. By the 16<sup>th</sup> century under King James (1603-1625), the colonization took a new dimension, as the Irish lands in Welford, Langford and Leitrim was taken and the people alienated from it. In 1641, just some few years before the rise of the Westphalia state system, the Irish rebellion began, which was the first rejection of the English rule since the conquest. This development dovetailed into the religious wars between the Catholic and protestant Christian communities, which pervaded European societies. The Irish being predominately Catholics and the English being Protestants. The condition became worse as the suppression of Catholics and their execution persisted and the protestant privilege gained popularity. This then led to the alienation of the lands of the Irish labouring classes, with the associated representative legal mechanisms, which restricted and constrained the Irish people (Robinson, 2000).

Also, in England at the wake of agricultural mechanization, there was increase adoption of the reaping and threshing machine. This meant a significant drop in the use of manual labour for harvest, which increased manual unemployment. Between

1760 and 1810, agricultural Capitalism with the support of state entrenched the policy of land enclosure. This policy makes the peasants lose their fields to the large-scale cultivators, about five (5) million acres. Those commons (peasants) whose lands were taken away, it was assumed were people who could not utilize such field or be presumed to lack work discipline; hence, they were dispossessed of such lands. This event sparked unemployment in some places in Europe. The unemployment rate in Yorkshire, for instance, rose from 25% to 100%, in Scotland to 70%, Safford 50%, Bolton over 30% were out of work. Bluntly, 40% of the citizens were unemployed. The figures were reported by Hobsbawm stressed Robinson. The same, he maintained that E.P. Thompson estimated the working class in England to be 5million within the period under review. However, this number fluctuated depending in the season, but 1.5million people were constantly engaged in employment. It is significant to note argued Robinson that all these scholars measured only the condition of lives of the workers and not their ideological, social and moral content (Robinson, 2000).

The colonization of the Americas, the early 17<sup>th</sup>-century colonization of the Indian continent and the 19<sup>th</sup>-century African colonization were accompanied by land dispossession. Foster et.al (2020) stated that Marx indicated in the 31<sup>st</sup> chapter of his work on the “Capital” vol.1 that the discovery of Gold and Silver in the Americas, the extirpation, enslavement, the killing and burying in mass tombs of the American native population, the colonialization of India and the turning of Africa into a commercial warren for the hunting of black skin, marked the beginning of the era of capitalism (the primitive accumulation). Colonization as an aspect of the capitalist enterprise goes hand in glove with land dispossession of the colonized.



A similar process occurred in Nigeria as indicated earlier through different regulatory mechanisms that systematically robs the indigenous people of their economic heritage (land being the main means of production in pre-capitalist and pre-colonial Nigeria). In post-colonial Nigeria, commercial agriculture also has taken a good portion of land from communities. The Dangote farm seats on 32,000 hectares as peasants are resettled as labourers in five estates (Zekun, Gyawana, Lafia, Danto and Opallo (Gireh & Giroh, 2013) in (Obi & Zemba, 2016). Similarly, 13 Zimbabwean capitalist farmers were hosted in Kwara state in the Shonga community. The local farmers and herders are opposed to the policy, but the government have their way. A total of 13,000 hectares is allocated to the capitalist farmers with the government having equity participation of 2.5 billion nairas (Adewumi, Jimoh & Omotesho, 2013; Mustapha, 2011). This is also very true of oil and gas exploration and mining in Nigeria. A large portion of land is taken away from the native people of the Niger Delta region, who are indigenous to such lands. These people had been independent using these lands since time immemorial. However, colonial and post-colonial political economy has changed the landholding rights. This development gave rise to the giant oil industry and oil political economy in Nigeria.

The oil industry in Nigeria led to the taking away of the native land of the indigenous people and environmental degradation. The dissatisfaction of the indigenous communities created a complex web of conflicts and violent militant activities. The Nigerian state makes legitimate claims relying on all the statutory instruments available, both colonial and post-colonial (the 1907 mineral ordinance, the 1914 mineral act, its replacement, Decree 51 of 1969 and the 1978 land use Act), which all gave the state the legitimate entitlement to all the land and the resources. The transnational capital claims because of the legal agreements with the state. The

indigenous communities lay claims based on history and traditional attachment to such lands as indigenous people and hence, claim the deserved rights to control the resources. Who then owns the oil resources in Nigeria? Arguably, Omoruyi (2008) posits that the oil belongs to the federal government of Nigeria. He argues that section one (1) of the mineral ordinance of 1945 speaks it all, whereof, the ownership of property and control of all mineral and mineral oil, under or upon any land, rivers, streams or river courses in Nigeria, was vested in the Crown. All successors to the crown; the Nigerian state, preserved this provision till date. Even the provision for compensation is made only to the crops on top of the land and not the mineral nor the land.

This complex dispossession of the indigenous people produced a historical agent; the depeasantized or the new landless peasant. This landless peasant with other unemployed people in the region constitutes a reserved army of persons that populate the community-based social movements that pervade the entire oil-rich Niger Delta areas of Nigeria. The community-based social movement influences the social landscape against domination, expropriation and degradation.

#### **4.4.4 The Plight of Oil Induced Pollution in Nigeria**

The real or actual quantity of oil spills or in general, pollution-induced by the exploration and exploitation of oil resource since the discovery of the hydrocarbon deposits in Nigeria is very difficult to establish. This is so because of the multi-source through which this pollution could occur and the associated risk that could facilitate it; like pipe corrosion, criminal vandalization of the pipeline, leaks from the pipe joints and heads at extraction, transportation and the storage in depots (Iriagu, et al, 2016). Oil and gas are the most significant resources in the Nigerian economy. The exploration and exploitation activities of these multinational oil firms compromise

environmental standards. The environmental quality of the inhabitants of the oil-producing Niger Delta areas is a significant index that contributes to the life expectancy of the people. Pulido (2017: 525) calls attention to the problematization of the quality of the environment. This experience is similar to the General Motors' pollution of Flint, Michigan, a predominantly Black population (minority) Pulido (2017), the indigenous people of the oil-rich Niger Delta are predominantly minority ethnic nationalities in Nigeria, they suffer a similar fate.

Poor environmental quality places the indigenous peoples' health at a disadvantage relative to the rest of the social groups in Nigeria. The extraction of the oil degrades the environment and exposes the indigenous communities playing host to the oil firms to deleterious pollution (land, water and air). It is important to note that the indigenous people of the oil-rich Niger Delta Areas depend on the environment for their daily livelihood (Aregha and Irughe, 2009; Akpan, 2010). As the oil and gas mining activities expand, environmental degradation and pollution increases. These shrinks and dwindle space available for farming, fishing, traditional sites and many land-dependent sundry activities (Ukeje, 2001).

This implies that the rate of relative poverty among the land-dependent people will increase in the affected areas. Aluko (2004) argues that poor people are vulnerable to environmental changes, because exclusionary practices of all forms (political, social or economic), leave these exploited and expropriated people and locations with few choices when it comes to survival. The environmental changes in the Niger Delta equally respond to the general climatic changes radically because of the intensive oil and gas extraction. These corporations and the Nigerian state have little concern for environmental standards or the quality of the environment (land, water or in the air).

The land and water of the region of Nigeria are exposed to huge oil spillage. From 1976 to 2001, it is estimated that about 6,817 oil spills occurred involving approximately, 3million barrel of crude oil in the region (Aregba and Irughe, 2009). The Janelov report projected that the aggregate quantity of the oil spillage in the Niger Delta region for fifty (50) years is from 9 to 13 million Barrels. This implies that an estimated annual volume of one and a half (1.5) million tons of oil spill (Nriagu et al, 2016).

This fact was corroborated by the oil spill intelligence report presented from the 1992 survey, which showed that Shell Corporation alone recorded 14% of its global oil spills from the Nigerian oil fields, which accounts for about 26 out of the 67 world oil spills officially acknowledged by Shell Company for a decade (1982 to 1992). The company has spilt approximately, 1.6 million gallons in those 26 incidences (Ukeje, 2001).

The fresh drinking water in the areas is heavily polluted. The canalization was done by the oil firms in the region usually pollute the freshwater sources with salty water. This form of pollution usually occurs when oil firms build waterways to link the oil field to the production facilities (UNDP reports, 2006 cited in Aregba and Irughe, 2009). The seasonal floods also spread these oil spills to farmlands and significant areas occupied by people. This has tremendous health consequences and such effects are poorly documented and remain largely unknown (Iriagu et al, 2016). Petroleum mineral produces aromatic hydrocarbons like Naphthalene, Benzene and Pyrene. It also produces Asphaltenes like Phenols, Acids and Ketones, as well as Resins like Sulfoxide and Quinolines. These contaminants pollute the entire environment of the Niger Delta region (Ite et al, 2013:79). This contamination was made manifest when in 2012, the land and waters of the Ogoni communities were tested. The pollution

level was discovered to be significant and was up to about 10% with Benzene. This is considered dangerous and high by both the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). This pollution level Okorie (2018) argues, predisposes the communities to serious risk of cancer.

Gas flaring is one of the major sources of acid rain that induces the destruction of biodiversity. In the Niger Delta areas, there are about one hundred and twenty-three (123) flaring sites, which makes Nigeria one of the greatest emitter of greenhouse gas in Africa (Uyigue and Agho, 2007 cited in Aregha and Irughe, 2009) and the gas flaring generates 45.8 billion kilowatts of heat per day, burning on a deep crude gas reserve of about 1.8 billion cubic feet in the region (Aaron, 2006 cited in Aregha and Irughe, 2009). The oil companies operating in the Nigerian Niger Delta region emit thirty-five Million (35 million) tons of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) per annum and twelve million (12million) tones of methane gas every year (Cayford, 1996). The host communities are exposed to these tremendous wastes, which are poorly managed and most at times, victims are neglected. This is precisely a natural path for racial capitalism, argues (Pellow, 2007). The ecology of resource extraction, processing and disposal is a constituent part of economic formations. The poor attention given to the host communities and the poor waste management practices indulged by the state is fundamental to racial capitalism (Pulido, 2017).

#### **4.5 Community-Based Social Movements and Militancy in the Oil Producing Region**

The commercial discovery of oil in Nigeria in 1958 signalled the dawn of extensive degradation of the environment of the indigenous people. The Niger-delta region occupies a total land area of 75,000 square km, which is about 7 and a half percent of

the Nigeria's total land mass. There are about 800 oil rich communities bearing about 900 oil wells (Young, 2012; Boris, 2015:565). The area is inhabited by over 31 million people (Okurebia and Daniel, 2014:36). Since these discoveries, concerns have been expressed over the dwindling space for social and economic activities and the pollution of the remaining space in the environment of the hosts (Ukeje, 2001). This contradiction triggered the struggle against both the transnational capital and the state. Ukeje (2001) maintains that the indigenous communities hosting the oil-rich soil and water have continued to express unhappiness in the 1970s and 1980s by writing petitions, initiating litigations, sponsoring adverts drawing attention to their plights and sending delegations to meet with the state and the capitalist firms. These approaches Ukeje insisted was not sustainable considering the diverse landscape of dissatisfaction. Therefore, events took a new twist in the 1990s owing to the pressure felt by the indigenous communities from the expansion of new oil fields and intensification of resources extraction and the attendant pollution. The implications to this were the dwindling space for cultural, social and economic activities. The remaining space is daily being invaded with poisonous pollutants reducing fish stock, animal and plant species hitherto available to the communities. For instance, in Ogoni land, three local government areas (Khana, Gokona and Tai-Eleme) hold 120 people per square mile. This is approximately half a million people on four hundred and four (404) square mile, a population density considered very high even in the world's demographic distribution (Cayford, 1996). This plethora of unpleasant events provided the impetus for active community-based mobilization towards the establishment of social movements. These social movements become a significant historical agent in the demand for transformation. Isaac Idaka Boro in 1966 formed the Niger Delta Volunteer Force (NDVF) as a militant group drawing strength and inspiration from

community-based support and authority. Even though his activities were obliterated in 12 days, yet, this event became significant as the water-shed for violent agitation employed by the indigenous people in reaction to the reign of real and perceived injustices, which they felt (Ukeje, 2001). In the 1990s, Ken Saro Wiwa became the leader of the Movement for the Survival of Ogoni People (MOSOP). The “Ogoni Bill of Right” enjoyed wide appeal within the Ogoni communities and served as an example for other communities in the region. The Ogoni bill of right demanded equity in access to power, environmental restoration, the control of resource of the land and waters of the community and the right to self-determination. These demands were considered repulsive to the interest of transnational capital and its expansion, as well as the local power elites who are engaged in domestic accumulation. To this end, the MOSOP emerged in 1993 as a powerful social movement representing the interest of the Ogoni communities (Obi, 1997).

Consequently, the Ijaw ethnic nationality decided to re-invent the earlier struggle commenced by Isaac Boro, hence in 1998, the Ijaw Youth Council (IYC) held an inaugural conference in Kaiama, Bayelsa state Nigeria. Accordingly, on the 11<sup>th</sup> of December 1998, the Kaiama declaration was proclaimed (Ukeje, 2001). Just like the "Ogoni Bill of Right", the "Kaiama Declaration" adopted the right to self-determination, resource control and environmental sustainability. It added the preservation of Ijaw culture and stressed its significance and fundamentals to the Ijaw existence. The IYC became a powerful social movement. Ukeje (2001) argues that the entire region suffers from an authority crisis. The indigenous people have lost confidence in government for providing authority. They, therefore, relocated to the primary affinity and built traditional social networks, re-invent the various sub-cultural links, with which they have been historically connected. These social movements place

a high value on the links and it is these community-based organizations that emerge as historical agents and are engaged in mobilization towards mass actions; MOSOP, IYC and NDVF. They employ history, culture and tradition as tools to articulate their identity and foster the relocation of authority and loyalty to the community.

#### **4.5.1 The “Carrot” Response: Restitution**

The state and responded in a way that is problem-solving in character, instead of transforming the condition. In 1992 and 2000 respectively, the Oil Mineral Producing Area Development Commission (OMPADEC) was established and later renamed Niger Delta Development Commission (NNDC) charged with the responsibility of rehabilitating the oil-producing areas and also addressing the issues associated with ecological problems in the region. 1.5% to 3% of government monthly revenue from the states of the region is committed to meeting the goals of the commission. As of 1998, 3% represented 13.6 billion Naira (Omotola, 2007). This is essentially an institutional approach to solving the problem. Even though the Urhobo National Association in North America (UNANA) lamented that despite this huge sum allocated every month, corruption has impeded the effective utilization of the resources. This, they argue is evident by the preponderant rising and persistent violent conflict in the region (Omotola, 2007: 84).

The Federal Government in 2006, owing to the intense agitation by the community-based source movements and international NGOs as well as environmental activists, initiated an independent study to understand the degree of environmental degradation caused by oil exploration and exploitation. This independent study was carried out by the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP) to establish the degree of damage through pollution done to the Ogoniland. This study is part of the pre-condition for settlement and peaceful reconciliation between the Ogoni people, Shell Corporation



and the federal government of Nigeria. At the end of the study in 2011, the report indicated among other things that it could take up to thirty years to rehabilitate the Ogoni land back to its initial potential at the cost of one billion US dollars (Prince and Augustine, 2015).

In 2009, the Niger Delta Amnesty Program (NDAP) was proclaimed by the government of President Musa Yaradua. The administration aimed to mitigate the high level of economic sabotage and violent militant activities that pervaded the region. The violence was a demonstration of the grievances of the people of the region who over the years had been agitating over a conglomerate of issues associated with environmental security as well as political and economic concerns (Okonofua, 2016: 2). The NDAP is focused to achieve disarmament, demobilization and the reintegration of violent militants who enter the military formation or the civil society. Pugel (2009) sees the disarmament and the re-integration as a process where ex-combatants who previously took arms in defiance to the state monopoly of violence are pardoned with the goal and hope of preventing reoccurrence of the same situation.

#### **4.5.2 The “Stick” Response: Manipulation of Differences**

The Niger Delta people are also united in their agitation for a cause they consider common to the entire people. The cause, with which they all identify, include but is not limited to the struggles for access to power and resources on the one hand, and on the other, the demand for autonomy over resources. Yet, these communities who consider themselves the Niger Delta People make competing claims over the lands and waters, mainly around ethnic identity; Ijaw, Itsekiri, Urhobo, Isoko, Ogoni, Andoni and many other communities (Obi, 2009).

One of the key tools employed by the government and the firms is in the distribution of amenities or infrastructures. This activity often comes with a lot of disagreements and contest over claims of autochthony, ethnicity or communal difference.

A case in point is the conflict between Arogbu Ijaw and Ugbo Ilaje. The Ijaw consider themselves as autochthonous to the area, they see Ugbo Ilaje as people who migrated a long time ago to the Niger Delta region from Ile-Ife in southwestern Nigeria. The Ugbo Ilaje refutes this claim. This dichotomy is a corollary of the oil economy and both the federal government and oil firms tend to feed on this point of conflict (Akpan, 2010:72; Davies and Hammed, 2001 cited in Aghelino, 2009).

Again, the Eket and Ibeno communities in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria have become enemies to one another, because of the newly created local government, which gave them separate local authorities. The conflict over assets sharing persist. The Ibeno, where the old centre existed expect to benefit more from the oil benefits and employment quota. They are very close neighbours, just 4km apart, yet are in constant disagreement (Akpan, 2010). Also, the Kalabari and Bille in the year 2000 and early 2001 laid claim to the same piece of land. This controversy had arisen because Shell Company wanted to make payments of royalties on the land (Human Rights Watch Report, 2002 cited in Aghelino, 2009). Similarly, in February and July 2003 and early 2004, the Ijaws fought with the Itsekiris. The bone of contention was that the government and oil firms favour the Itsekiris by recognizing their indigenoussness, which shapes the flow of benefits accruing to the Warri communities belonging to both ethnicities (Ikelegbe, 2005). The crisis between Oleh and Olomoro communities erupted as a consequence of Shell Company giving both communities exhumed waste

pipes. The sharing culminated into a violent conflict that resulted in human carnage (UNDP Report, 2006 cited in Aghalino, 2009).

Another factor like status (chiefs) presents itself in a complex manner. Some persons see the chiefs as collaborators and are engaged in different levels of conflicts with their chiefs. The traditional ruler of Evreni in Ughelli North Local Government Area (LGA) of Delta State had a misunderstanding with the community's youths over benefits accruing from the mining activities of transnational firms. The youths alleged that the chief had enriched himself from the proceeds of rewards received on behalf of the community. Besides, the chief always colluded with the government and the multinational oil firms for his benefits. This disagreement led to his murder in 2000 by some armed youths from the community (Thisday Newspaper 2002:58 cited Ikelegba, 2005). Similarly, most communities accused their chiefs of personally taking a disproportionate share of the benefits from the government and the oil firms to themselves. They also collect most contracts and award them to their friends and cronies. These are sources of tension (Aghahno. 2009).

All these crises Aghalino (2009) argues, destroy the moral economy of affection and good neighbourliness between people who had lived harmoniously in peace for centuries. The new consciousness of differences between the indigenous people and ethnic "others", between the people and their ruler and amongst ethnicities are essentially shaped by this oil economy.

However, the role of the transnational capital, the state and the nature of the ruling class generate a complex force that relates to the indigenous people. This relationship disempowers and alienates the communities, as well, make it difficult to establish

channels of beneficial engagements. This difficulty in communication raised the prospect of the communities' engagement in collective violence against state assets in the Niger Delta oil Producing Communities (Ukeje, 2001).

In extreme cases, government resort to judicial and extra-judicial killings of the leading figures of the agitation. In 1995, the Military Government of General Sani Abacha through a tribunal tried and hanged to dead Ken Saro Wiwa and eight others of the MOSOP organization on the allegation of killing Chief Kobani and some prominent Ogoni personalities (Obi, 1997) and the civilian administration of President Olusegun Obasanjo, through the use of military destroyed the town of Odi in Rivers state leaving only the church, schools and hospitals standing ( Ukeje, 2001).

From the foregoing, the indigenous people suffer two forms of racialism; within the Nigerian state structure, they are a minority' and hence exposed to all form of neglect and they are exposed to the hazardous impacts of pollution. Within the Niger- Delta region, they are further divided along sub-ethnic, and some dialectical differences along which unity becomes difficult to forge. Nigerian capitalism, which is oil dominated produced a historical agent with the potential for transformation; the community-based social movements (MOSOP, NDVF, IYC). Yet, the social reality indicates that the Nigerian government owns the oil (Omoruyi, 2002). If Omoruyi's conclusion is anything to hold, then, the conclusion that capitalism is an organized mechanism for the dispossession of all sorts (social, economic and political) (Kelly, 2017) is reinforced.

The people of the Niger Delta area not just exposed to environmental pollution but also exploitation. The communities enjoy employment quota as indigenous people and

work for the oil firms. In this way, some of the indigenous people are not just exploited but their environment degraded and the resources expropriated. This gave rise to resistance in the region. The most significant being coordinated by the workers, which is class-based and then the community-based social movements, which are shaped by their traditions and culture. This culture is expressed in languages, ethnicities and historical ancestry. The state tends to employ these traditional characteristics as a type of division. Robinson (2000), argued that when any form of difference is instrumentalized, race relations will essentially ensue. The instrumentalization of difference in Niger Delta is exemplified by the violent conflicts in Warri, where the state recognised one ethnic group with the status of indigenes (Itsekiri) against another ethnic group, considered as non-indigenous (Ijaw).

Also, the Shell Company gave the same exhausted waste pipes to two different communities in the region. Both of these scenarios generated violent conflicts among the community groups that weakens inter-communal solidarity as both the state and capital consolidate over their grip of the resources. This instrumentalization of differences is precisely what Robinson considers as mitigating communal solidarity and promoting exclusionary practices that breed race relations. To reiterate, the Nigerian state responded to resistance movements with a combination of carrots and sticks very far from the genuine transformation of the plight of the exploited workers and the oppressed communities, who are severely exposed to these pollutions.

#### **4.5.3 Politics of Resistance and the Oil Workers Union in Nigeria**

The working class is not a darling of the capitalist entrepreneurs. The worker needs the capital as a means of survival, as much as the capitalists need the worker to ensure capital accumulation. Workers are the lifeline of the capitalist production enterprise. However, they are exploited in the course of the production process. This intensifies

exploitation, which is a contradiction of the capitalist economy itself. It makes workers to protest and make agitations. Capital responds to this contradiction by employing divisive politics among workers to ensure that solidarity is difficult to achieve.

The establishment of oil industry as a result of the discovery of oil and gas resources in Nigeria gave rise to the oil industry workers. The transnational oil firms recruited and still recruits workers but fail to respond to their needs. Capital resents worker agitation, yet, would be happy at workers supply of its labor power in the production process.

There are blue and white-collar workers in the Nigerian oil industry. The National Union of Petroleum and Natural Gas workers of Nigeria (NUPENG) (blue-collar), with about 100 branches and 10,000 membership spread across the oil industry in Nigeria. The white-collar workers on the other hand established the Petroleum and Natural Gas Worker, Senior Staff Association of Nigeria (PENGASSAN) (white-collar). They equally maintain approximately 20,000 members, with about 120 branches spread across the oil firms in Nigeria (Houeland, 2015). The NUPENG nurtures and expresses a more radical orientation and are much more readily tuned to resisting the capital and the state for its interest primarily and the general public to an extent, while the PENGASSAN relates more with the social Democrats (conservatives) thus less volatile but effective in their own right (Houeland, 2015).

Turner (1986, p. 45) argues that this division is deepened by the capitalist elites to ensure that internal solidarity among the workers is difficult to achieve. He maintains that there is observable collaboration between the radical senior staff and the junior

staff of the oil workers, as well as the visible split among the white-collar cadre. These categories of staff that compromise with the capitalist firm or the oil firms' management are often considered by their colleagues as traitors or "Black Sheep".

Another government antic against the unions to obstruct their attempt to forge a common front and solidarity is dabbling into the unionist leadership selection process and relating with them thereto. The state supports puppet leaders who are willing to compromise the interest of the working class and frustrate those considered to be radical in ideological disposition. For instance, the relationship between the then Nigerian Labor Congress (NLC) leader, Pascal Bafyau, and the then Military Junta of General Ibrahim Babangida was good, as the unions generally remain inactive even in the face of the annulment of June 12 presidential election, where every organized social movement were registering displeasure and demonstrating various levels of social action (Ihonvbere, 1997, p. 86). On the other hand, the state always goes to the extent of obtaining court injunctions to obstruct the emergence of leaders considered to be popular, radical and who express the wish of their followership. The federal government for instance secured a court order rejecting leaderships supported by the union members and foisted the government's choice on unions. During the Second republic, the government prevented J. E Dubre from participating in the NLC congress in the March 1984 convention in Enugu, South East Nigeria. The following year, the federal military government of the then General Buhari promulgated the antisabotage decree No. 35 targeting workers and their unions (Turner, 1986, p. 45).

All these obstructions did not completely stop the unions from forging ahead as an agency of change. NUPENG had severally opposed the state for adopting policies

considered to be anti-masses. During the June 12 annulment, even when the NLC called off the strike earlier embarked in support of prodemocracy campaigners, NUPENG refused to comply and continued, citing sliding exchange rates, fuel scarcity and general economic and political crises as the bases of its actions (Ihonvbere, 1997). NUPENG also challenged the constitutional conference organized by the then military government of General Buhari. They demanded the release of arrested activists, critics, journalists and politicians, failure of which it threatened to engage in mobilization, protests, and strike actions. True to the threat, on the 4th of July, 1994, the union ordered a sit-at-home strike indefinitely to members pending the resolution of the issues at stake with the relevant authorities (Ihonvbere, 1997, p. 90).

These unions are committed to the transformation of their situation under capitalist economy in Nigeria. However, they are challenged because cooperation with other social movements is weak. For instance, Aborisade (2010, p. 32) lamented the absence of solidarity or organized alliance between the oil workers (NUPENG and PENGASSAN) with other local resistance groups. This lack of solidarity Aborisade argues, encourages the state and capitalist agents to intensify domination, state terror, and expropriation on both social constituencies (p. 33).

#### **4.6 Making sense of the Oil Dependent Capitalism in Nigeria through Racial Capitalism**

The theory of racial capitalism developed by Cedric Robinson is novel despite its limitations. Robinson's main argument was that capitalist dynamics was accessioned both by matter and non-material factors like culture or social value. In his critique, Robinson argued that Marxism has failed to identify race and gender as structures of domination inherent in the capitalist mode of production. However, as it was



elaborated at length in the theory chapter, several Marxist scholars have criticised Robinson's readings of Marx as being too reductionist.

Even though one needs to be aware of these criticisms and the shortcomings of Robinson's critique, there is merit in taking into consideration the important contribution made by Robinson. In particular, Robinson's criticisms of the preceding black radical scholars about their understanding of racialism and the concept of race in the capitalist economic production system is very significant. These black radical scholars such as WEB Du Bois and Richard Wright understood and analysed racialism from the perspective of the differences among people's skin colours.

Using historical analysis, Cedric Robinson proved that racialism is not about skin colour discrimination neither did it start from the segregation of the people of colour by the white folks in Europe, the Caribbean and America. Rather racialism had been part of European civilization experience. Arguably, Robinson maintains that racialism or race is a structure of power exercised through operationalizing differences among people in a capitalist economic system to enhance greater reward and support the regime of capital accumulation.

In this way, any form of difference could be instrumentalized by the capitalist system and its bourgeois operators. Ethnic, gender or geographical space mean a different thing in time and space. Once these differences are instrumentalized among people, race relations ensue. The popularized differences would shape the evolution of specific exclusionary practices that breeds antagonism among people. This makes all forms of solidarity very difficult among victims of capitalist exploitation. This characterization of racialism is the novel dimension of Robinson's contribution and its utility to the

Nigerian example, is the novelty of this study. This research engaged the conversation about differences in Nigeria or specific terms, the differentiated social value placed on groups and individual, which was constructed essentially during colonialism and reproduced by the neo-colonial state and capital.

Available literature tends to point to different readings. The key available literature by scholars explains such differentiated social values along with the class, ethnicity, and the urban/village dualism.

Those scholars who share in the class division thesis argue that class division created by capitalism accounts essentially for the differences and differentiated access to social power and resources. The ruling class and the working class, always engaged in an antagonistic clash over resources. This structure of exploitation created by capital became possible during colonial, and neo-colonial era (Schalzt, 1984; Okome, 2006; Lobo, 2006; Amzat & Olutayo, 2009; Yeboah & Momobo, 2013; Mayer, 2016; Yeboah 2008).

For those scholars who rather see ethnicity as the causal factor argue that ethnicity rather than capitalism can best explain the differences in social power, social value and access to resources in Nigeria. The ethnic difference remains the source of animosity, tension and violence (Diamond, 1988; Osaghae, 2001; Ukeje & Adebani, 2008; Amuwo, 2010).

Arguably, Ekeh (1975); Arowosegbe, (2016), see it differently. To these scholars, differences in social value and differentiated access to social power and resource in the country as a result of the existence of dual publics; primordial and civic. The

antagonism between the two publics remain the sources of the unequal access by different groups to social power and resources.

The weaknesses of these theoretical frameworks require the nature of identities to be reinterpreted in a new perspective. These limitations could be summarised as thus:

The Marxist perspective, despite its strengths in identifying capitalism as the producer of division, has limitations in that it failed to identify other structures of domination in the capitalist system like culture, race, and gender. Rather it focussed on class division and domination, whereas, the Nigerian economy is largely less industrialised and predominantly agricultural, with the majority of the land holding indigenous population as peasants. This framework of analysis will offer very little clue into the understanding of the nature of identity formation, the character of division and other means or structures through which identity is created and used in the capitalist economy.

The ethnic theory approach has contributed to the understanding of the Nigerian ethno-cultural character and how identity is shaped and defined by these ethnic characteristics. The approach also highlighted the importance of ethnic social category as a tool in the capitalist tool box in Nigeria. The limitation of this discussion lies in the fact that ethnicity is really not a problem parse, rather the utility of the differences by capitalism. This theory views the ethnic social category as a natural character defined by the acquired similarity in socio-cultural traits that differentiates one group from the other. Whereas ethnicities like Hausa-Fulani, Yoruba and Igbo are produced by colonial political establishment.

However, Boas &Dunn, (2013:1-33); Lonsdale, (2008) cited in Arowosegbe, (2016:65) in argues to express the limitation of this understanding, suggesting that the mobilization of claims, especially reified essentialized claims about identities and lack of recognition that creates exclusionary practices are deep expressions of race relations, rather than such analysis seen as the 'We-Them' dichotomy analysis.

Hudis (2018) maintains that race relations are hinged on blocked recognition. Lack of recognition of the dominated by the dominant group, groups or state structure, as the case may be. This involves the assignment of a reified object that obscures the true attributes of the dominated. This could be seen in a way that dominated or subaltern groups are less human or perceived to possess some denigrating attribute, or simply being mirrored in the dehumanizing image. These perceptions create conflict that often degenerates into an existential crisis.

From the weaknesses identified from the theoretical approaches in explaining the production of identities, the reproduction and its use in a capitalist system. This research will participate in the conversation with a view to addressing this gap in literature and contributing to knowledge using the theory of racial capitalism.

From these weaknesses, the Robinson's racial capitalism will enrich the analytical landscape and provide additional theoretical lens through which these identities and the instrumentalization of the differences to support accumulation in the Nigerian capitalist economy can be described and interpreted. The novelty of employment of Robinson's concept of race in the Nigerian capitalist economy is a significant contribution because it introduces a new perspective to the conversation that analyses differences as racial categories. Therefore, the instrumentalization and operationalization of differences to weaken communal solidarity or obstruct any attempt to forge solidarity by victims of capitalist exploitation is a new dimension to the conversation of capitalist division in Nigeria. Robinson's racialism resonates precisely with the Nigeria State's responses (sticks) to the contradictions generated by capitalist production in Nigeria, especially in the oil-producing areas, where the chief primary raw material (crude oil) is being produced.

This study reflects and looks into the presence of capitalist production through the colonial and neo-colonial structures. The capitalist system of production generated two contradictions; the dispossession of land with the consequence of depeasantizing the peasants and the degradation of the environment. These contradictions gave rise to protest, resistance and eventually the formation of community-based social movements that engaged in violent militant activities.

The Nigerian state responded to this in two ways: the use of “carrot and stick” or incentives and disincentives. Through the use of carrot, they engaged in restitution through making attempts to redeem the environment and the amnesty program to pardon repentant militants with a view of transforming the community-based social movements into non-violent civil society groups.

Through disincentives, they tried to entrench race relations by creating differences, which would make solidarity difficult among groups or the indigenous people, who hitherto see each other as neighbours and have had a history of inter-communal solidarity, before colonialism. Even when differences occurred, it was essential for economic and political gains and not about social differences. It is Robinson's analysis of re-historizing race as a structure of power through difference that allows for a proper utility of such concept of race to be relevant as a conceptual tool that adequately characterizes the differences employed by the Nigerian state to structure exploitation and expropriation of people and resources in the oil-rich Niger Delta region in Nigeria. The worker and their unions are equally subjected to divisions and the promotion of ideological antagonism among the blue- and white-collar workers. This approach makes solidarity difficult.

Accordingly, workers and the community-based social movements lack cohesion and interaction in the anti-capitalism resistance, as the militant activities like kidnapping were initially directed at oil workers. This lack of understanding and synergy between the exploited categories resonates precisely with the capitalist playbook. The antagonism between victims is deepened with the implications that workers and the community struggle are defined differently, whereas, they are fighting and struggling against the same system that strip them of their humanity.

#### **4.7 Conclusion**

The capitalist firms in Nigeria are the tangible manifestation of capitalist interest. The states, therefore, are instruments of bourgeois rule and hence, its actions in Nigeria are in tandem with the capitalist production structure and infrastructure. This capitalist activities in Nigeria generated two key contradictions; the dispossession of peasants (the depeasantization of the peasants) and environmental pollution. These contradictions sparked the evolution of resistance politics by the indigenous people. This compelled the capital and the state to respond through the use of carrot and stick. An important facet of the response is the manifestation of the usual behaviours of capital through manipulation of difference. Differences that are instrumentalized and operationalized often breed exclusionary practice that ensues race relations. The antagonism generated by race relations supports the capitalist desire to accumulate capital, as solidarity becomes difficult to attain among victims of capitalist exploitation.

## **Chapter 5**

### **SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

This chapter aims to pull the strings together. It aims to summarize the conclusions of this thesis that aimed to apply Cedric Robinson's perspective of racial capitalism to Nigeria under the capitalist mode of production.

This thesis aimed to provide an answer to this research question: how are identities produced, reproduced and instrumentalized in the Nigerian capitalist economy? Its hypothesis was that the long capitalist history in Nigeria that started with colonialism witnessed violence, land dispossession and domination, creating and maintaining groups with differentiated access to social power and resource. These differences are produced in the colonial period, reproduced and instrumentalised in the post-colonial era to serve capital.

##### **5.1.1 Summary**

The thesis started with an assessment of the existing literature on differences and differentiated social worth in Nigeria. Chapter Two dealt with a review of relevant studies. This inquiry led us to three different perspectives: the class division, the ethnic division and civic-primordial dichotomy paradigms.

The first perspective is the class analysis, which is the Marxist or materialist approach. Some of these analyses include but are not limited to the works of Schatz (1984) on

types of capitalism and the classes and groups therein, he identified two types of capitalism in Nigeria history with each having its form of division and crisis; the 'nurture' and 'pirate' capitalism. The works of Amzat and Olutayo, (2009) explained how the distribution of local opportunities was shaped by the colonial state. Their argument is premised on the fact that the capitalist structure re-organized production along bourgeois/proletariat divide. They argue that politicization of ethnicity serves only as a vehicle in service of the capitalist production in Nigeria. Mayer 2016 argues that the division is three, the capitalist group, on the one hand, then the working class is sub-divided into two; the labour aristocrats and the lower rungs of the labour hierarchy. Most other relevant studies that employ the Marxist framework of analysis did not explain the difference in Nigeria outside of this framework.

The second category of studies involves mostly scholars from ethnic studies and constructivist perspective. The key argument these scholars tend to advance make claims to the contentions that differences along ethnic lines breed exclusionary practices, tension and collective violence among the diverse groups in Nigeria. Diamond (1998) sees ethnicity as a political category in Nigeria because it obscures state-society relations. Ethnicity is a vote-catching matching and not used as a cultural instrument. Amuwo's analysis (2010) on indigenous son of the soil versus ethnic stranger is significant and plays a great role in shaping opportunities, conflict and pattern of violence. Osaghae (2001) sees the tension as emanating from the majority/minority division. Especially the conflict over resource control by the minority indigenous people of the oil-rich Niger Delta region of Nigeria. Osaghae argues that colonialism constructed and politicized ethnic identities and other relevant cleavages like regions.



The third trend of studies in Nigeria about division is mostly led by the works of Ekeh (1975); Arowoegbe (2016). They explain that the deep-seated division, differences and animosity in Nigeria arise from citizenship/indigene ship dualism. The legal theory and practice of these two concepts remain the challenges creating differences and shaping conflicts and violence in Nigeria.

The shortcomings of these three perspectives led us to draw on an alternative theoretical framework that is referred to as racial capitalism. Chapter three analysed the theory of racial capitalism. The term racial capitalism was not first introduced by Cedric Robinson but South African scholars who used the term to describe and analysed capitalism in South Africa under the apartheid regime. However, Cedric Robinson, in 1983 published a seminal work on racial capitalism. The study re-historicized and theorized racial capitalism, elaborating the meaning of race as a form of structured power through differences. The idea of racialism or race relations had previously been understood and used to describe people of their differences in skin colour. This is expressed in the works of the preceding black radical scholars like WEB Du Bois, Richard Wright and CLR James. These scholars have their intellectual traditions rooted in the Hegelian and Marxist philosophies. They have however, distinguished themselves by identifying the weaknesses of Marxist literature as a result of its failure to fully account for the role of race as a structure of power in the capitalist economy. Robinson, 1983 went deep into history to expose a few salient facts about capitalism and its character. To him, race is not just about skin colour, rather a social practice of differentiation that has roots in medieval feudal Europe, which is covertly extended to modernity and modern capitalist practices. Race, he argues is used as a weapon to structure exploitation.

However, Karl Marx who made an enormous contribution to the understanding of capitalism identified class as the major fault lines or lines of the divide in the society and remains the sources of antagonism and conflicts. Marx maintains that the hitherto history of existing societies are histories of class struggle. The struggle between those that "have" and those who "do not have". Again, the emergence of capitalism from feudalism occurred through revolutionary change occasioned by technical progress.

However, Robinson, 1983 argued that capitalism was not a revolutionary opposite of feudalism but the extension of the feudal social and economic practices of racial exclusion into the modern capitalist system. This explains why Robinson argues that racial capitalism is the same as modern capitalism. Robinson, then added another layer to our understanding of race, which encompass the instrumentalization of differences that could vary in time and space.

The role of the state is an important category in supporting capital to create difference and structure exploitation. Essentially, the theory premised its arguments on historical facts to elaborate on the meaning of race as a form of not just identity but structured power through differences. shows how race intersects capitalism, identify the role of differences(race) in structuring exploitation, the role of state agencies in supporting capital to create social categories, along which social power is exercised through it and the instrumentalization of these differences have implications for profitability and capital accumulation.

This theoretical framework provides the tool that shapes the presentation and analysis of data on the production of differences, differentiated social value and the

instrumentalization of these differences by capital and the state, through which huge returns is realized to the detriment of the deprived social category.

Robinson's theory of racial capitalism has provided the basis for understanding race in a broader term which helps us to understand the concept of race as a structure of domination and its utility as an analytical tool in the analysis of capitalist political economy. Having elaborated this alternative framework, the thesis proceeded with analyzing the Nigerian case. The clarification of the meaning of race, enabled this research to apply the understanding of how identities are produced, reproduced and instrumentalised in the Nigerian political economy.

Chapter four focuses on the production and reproduction of differences by the transnational capital with the active support of the state to structure exploitation. It starts with the structure of the formal and informed labour force, showing how categories are created like paid and unpaid labour unto hierarchies of social power (labour aristocrats and the rest). These have implications for social power and resource access.

The general role of the transnational corporations is viewed considering that 95% of the foreign exchange earning of Nigeria comes from oil and gas, it becomes clear that the transnational corporations are oil-related companies. This takes us to explore two dimensions of racial capitalism; the exposure on the neglected segment of the society to deleterious pollutions and the instrumentalizations of differences among people.

The aspect of pollution has implications to a form of structured violence, which has implications to the health of those exposed to it. This causes the question of life expectancy and existential threats emanating from such pollution.

The second dimension is the direct violence where indigenous communities are exposed to all forms of identity manipulation that creates social distance, and violence among the indigenous people and impliedly in Nigeria.

The third and very important factor is the creation of the social category of landless peasants through the dispossession of the indigenous communities of their land. Since land is an important resource and most rural economy in Nigeria are land-based, dispossession for social power and access to resources especially by such social categories in the capitalist economy operated by power oil and gas corporations with the support of state agencies.

The non-oil sectors are not left out in Nigeria. Commercial agriculture takes away lands from peasants in rural poverty and depeasantized the farmers as it pushes them to the margins of the capitalist economy. Women have no direct access to land resources as their access is mediated by the male folk. The female gender in a rural economy in Nigeria can access land only through her father, son, male cousin or husband. This also restricts their potentials, just because they are female.

The creation of these landless peasants and traditional practices of women not having direct access to land affects the social power available to these social categories. These differences created by the capital and other differences that are exaggerated among indigenous people breed exclusionary practices of all forms (political, social and

economic) that lead to social distance, violence and supports the profitability and accumulation of capital in Nigeria.

So, what does this discussion about Nigeria reveal? The theoretical weaknesses of the theory of racial capitalism by Cedric Robinson, especially his reductionist readings of the Marxist literature as well as its failure to appreciate the diverse effects of capitalism on the world stage was underlined earlier. Nevertheless, these weaknesses notwithstanding, the utility of his theory as a conceptual and theoretical tool is enormous. It has enabled this study to appreciate and interpret divisions and differences in the Nigeria political economy in a new perspective.

To this end, this thesis aimed to make sense of the Nigerian case from the perspective of racial capitalism. This analysis revealed how the colonial state produced identities and the post-colonial state reproduced it. We also found out that colonial political economy dispossesses the indigenous communities of their land's resources. This fact is elaborated in chapter four where communities, through colonial and post-colonial land policies disposed their inherited land holdings. The state used "sticks" in the form of creating and instrumentalizing the differences in the Niger Delta.

This instrumentalization promoted irreconcilable differences that destroys communal solidarity among people and communities, as exemplified by the Ijaw and Itsekeri violent conflict in Delta state Nigeria and several other violent conflicts in the region. The communities have been pitched against one another. This instrumentalization enabled the state and by implication the capital to enjoy the continuous exploitation of resources and enhance both revenues from the oil resources and profitability from the entire process of production.

The question as to how identities are produced is addressed by showing how the colonial political establishment created identities like Hausa-Fulani, Igbo and Yoruba as well as. Also, the creation of majority and minorities identities categories. For instance, the minority identity is the common nomenclature ascribed collectively to the respective numerically disadvantaged nationalities. The theory of racial capitalism has provided additional perspective to help make sense of the divisions and differences in the capitalist mode of domination and accumulation in the extant literatures about capitalism in Nigeria.

## **5.2 Major Findings**

1. This research has identified a limitation in the black radical tradition's (racial capitalism) analytical focus, where the idea of the rest of Europe, or centre-periphery is a fictitious space that puts the rest of the world beyond Europe as a monolithic space, whereas, they are not.
2. The theory of racial capitalism can be utilized to study differences in African political economies, an endeavor that was hitherto absent except South Africa.
3. I found out from the study that the capital, colonial and post-colonial states in Nigeria configured minority, majority, Hausa-Fulani and other identity categories.
4. The oil economy in post-colonial times dispossessed the indigenous land landholder
5. The oil economy also degrades the environment
6. Community-based social movements were direct responses to capitalist modes of accumulation
7. The state adopted restitution to solve the violent militant agitations.

The instrumentalization of differences makes communal solidarity difficult and enhances capital accumulation.

### **5.3 Conclusion**

The theory of racial capitalism advanced by Cedric Robinson has made it possible to extend a theory that was hitherto employed to explain capitalism in one country, that is South Africa under Apartheid to the general history of modern capitalism. The theory also introduced a novel conceptualization of racialism. Racialism is not about differences in skin-color but it is a means of structuring power through difference. This new understanding would allow for the use of the theory in the analysis of capitalism in many other countries other than South Africa under Apartheid and in countries where the capitalist system promotes antagonism through difference that leads to exclusionary practices of all sorts, which has implications for the enhancement of profit and capital accumulation.

## REFERENCES

- Aborisade, F. (2010). Petro-capitalism, Neoliberalism, labor and Community Mobilization in Nigeria. *Labor, Capital and Society*. 43(1), 31-62.
- Achebe, C. (2016). An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad's Heart of Darkness. *The Massachusetts Review*, 57(1), 14-27.
- Amuwo, A. (2010). Between Elite Protectionism and Popular Resistance: The Political Economy of Nigerian Fractured State Since the Juridical Independence. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*.
- Adewumi, M.O., Jimoh, A. and Omotesho, O.A., (2013). Implications of the Presence of Large-Scale Commercial Farmers on Small Scale Farming in Nigeria. The Case of Zimbabwean Farmers in Kwara State. *Knowledge Horizons Economics*, 5(4), 67.
- Afigbo, A.E. (1974), Pre-colonial Links Between South-Eastern Nigeria and Benue Valley, Niger-Benue Valley Seminar, Department of History, ABU.
- Afigbo, A.E. (1980), Pre-Colonial Links between South-Eastern Nigeria and Benue Valley, Paper Presented at the Niger-Benue valley Seminar of the Department of History, A.B.U. Zaria, at Jos, 26<sup>th</sup> – 28<sup>th</sup> April, 1974, see – Meek C.K. p. 28. Although Aku-Uka Shakarau Angyu Masa-Ibi in an Interview granted on 31<sup>st</sup> April 1981, emphasized the use of Horse and Spears by the Jukun in their Wars. See Gbande D.D. Trade and Settlement



in the Middle Benue Basin, 1850-1960, *Unpublished M.A. History Thesis*,  
Department of History, A.B.U. Zaria, 130.

Aghalino, S.O., (2009). Oil Exploitation and the Accentuation of Intergroup Conflicts  
in the Niger Delta, Nigeria. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 28(3), 153-159.

Agozino, B. (2014). The Africana Paradigm in Capital: The Debt of Karl Marx to the  
People of African Descent. *Review of African Political Economy*, 41(140), 172-  
184.

Ajayi, J.F.A., (1971), Economic Development and Inter-Group Relations in Nigeria  
Before 1800; *17<sup>th</sup> Congress of the Historical Society of Nigeria*, Kano.

Akpan, N.S., (2010). Governance and Communal Conflicts in a Post-democratic  
Nigeria: A case of the oil-producing Niger Delta Region. *Journal of African  
Studies and Development*, 2(3), 65-74.

Al-bulushi Y. (2020), Thinking racial Capitalism from Africa: An Intellectual  
Geography of Cedric Robinson's World System, *Geoforum*, Elsevier.

Alexander, N. (2007). Affirmative action and the perpetuation of racial identities in  
post-apartheid South Africa, *Transformation: critical perspectives on  
Southern Africa*, 63(1), 92-108.

Alli, M.C. (1997). Federal Republic of Nigerian Army—The Siege of a Nation, 229.

- Aluko, M.A.O., (2004). Sustainable development, environmental degradation and the entrenchment of poverty in the Niger Delta of Nigeria. *Journal of human ecology, 15*(1), 63-68.
- Amaeshi, K. (2015). *Why Africa Needs Capitalism that ia Aligned with it Development Needs*. United Kigdom: The Conversation (Business and Economy).
- Amar, P., Shohat, E., & Stam, R. (2014). The Middle East and Brazil: Perspectives on the New Global South.
- Amzat, J. and Olutayo, O., (2009). Nigeria, capitalism and the question of equity. *The Anthropologist, 11*(4), 239-246.
- Anderson, K. J. (1987). The idea of Chinatown: The power of place and institutional practice in the making of a racial category. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 77*(4), 580-598.
- Ashman S. (2004). Resistance to Neoliberal Globalization: A case of Militant Particularism? *Politics. 24*(2), 143-153.
- Asiyanbola, A. (2005). Patriarchy, Male Dominance, the Role and Women Empowerment in Nigeria. In *Poster presentado en la XXV International Population Conference Tours, Francia*.
- Basit, T. (2003). Manual or electronic? The role of coding in qualitative data analysis. *Educational research, 45*(2), 143-154.

- Bates, R.H., (1990). Capital, kinship, and conflict: The structuring influence of capital in kinship societies. *Canadian Journal of African Studies/La Revue canadienne des études africaines*, 24(2), 151-164.
- Beckert, S. (2014). Slavery and Capitalism. Washington D.C: *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Beckman, B., (1982). Whose state? State and capitalist development in Nigeria. *Review of African Political Economy*, 9(23), 37-51.
- Bell, E., Bryman, A., & Harley, B. (2018). *Business Research Methods*. Oxford University Press.
- Bengtsson, M., (2016). How to plan and perform a qualitative study using content analysis. *NursingPlus Open*, 2, 8-14.
- Berberoglu, B., (1994). Class, Race and Gender: The Triangle of Oppression. *Race, Sex & Class*, 69-77.
- Berry, S.S., (1984). Oil and the Disappearing Peasantry: Accumulation, Differentiation and Underdevelopment in Western Nigeria. *African Economic History*, (13), 1-22.
- Berthoud (2019). The Aten of Ganawuri, 56.

- Birkhold, M. (2011). Doing for Our Time What Marx Did for His: Constituting the Boggsian Challenge to Marxist Praxis. *Souls*, 13(3), 235-255.
- Bonacich, E. (1972). A Theory of Ethnic Antagonism: The Split Labour Market. *American Anthropological Review*. 37(5), 547-559.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (1997). Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation. *American Anthropologist*, 62(3), 465-480.
- Bonnett, A (1998). Who was White? The Disappearance of Non-European white Identities and the Formation of European Racial Whiteness. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 21(6), 1029-1055.
- Burawoy, M. (1981), The capitalist state in South Africa: Marxist and Sociological Perspectives on Race and Class, *Political Power and Social Theory*, 2(81), 279-335.
- Calathes, W., (2017). Racial Capitalism and Punishment Philosophy and Practices: What Really Stands in the way of Prison Abolition. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 20(4), 442-455.
- Cayford, S., (1996.) The Ogoni uprising: Oil, human rights, and a democratic alternative in Nigeria. *Africa Today*, 183-197.
- Chabal P. & Daloz P. (1999). *African Works: Disorders as Political Instrument*. London, James Curry.

- Cheng, W. (2013). Strategic Orientalism: Racial Capitalism and the Problem of 'Asianness'. In *African Identities* 11 (2), 148–158.
- Chitonge, H. (2017). Capitalism in Africa: Mutating Capitalist Relations and Social Formations. *Review of African Political Economy*, 45(155), 158-167.
- Cole, M., (2012). Critical Race Theory in Education, Marxism and Abstract Racial Domination. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 33(2), 167-183.
- Coleman, J.S. (1958) Nigeria-Background to Nationalism, 29.
- Collins P.H. (1997). On West and the Fenster Maker's Doing Difference In Walsh, M.R. ed., 1997. *Women, men, & gender: Ongoing debates*. Yale University Press.
- Cox, K.R. and Negi, R., (2010). The state and the question of development in sub-Saharan Africa. *Review of African political economy*, 37(123), 71-85.
- Croce, B. (1922). *Historical Materialism and the Economics of Karl Marx*, Transaction Publishers.
- Dalrymple, M., (2002). *Gender and Land Tenure in Rural Asante*, Ghana (Doctoral dissertation, University of Calgary).
- Davies, R. H., O'Meara, D., & Dlamini, S. (1988). *The Struggle for South Africa (Vol. 1)*, London: Zed Books.

De Almeida, J.B.L., (2014). *Kosher Feijoada and other Paradoxes of Jewish Life in Sao Paulo*.

Denzin, N.K., (1989). *Interpretive Interactionism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (2013). *Black Reconstruction in America*. Transaction Publishers.

Dudley, B. J. (1973). *Instability and political order: Politics and crisis in Nigeria*. Ibadan University Press. 22-30.

Dudley, B.J. (1968). *Politics in Northern Nigeria*, London, Frank Cass, 200-205.

Edwards, Z. (2020). *Applying the Black Radical Tradition: Class, Race and the New Foundation for Development Studies*. In *Rethinking Class and Social Difference*, Emerald Publishing.

Edwards, Z. (2021), *Racial Capitalism and Covid-19*, *Monthly Review*, 72(10).

Eghosa E. Osaghae (2001). *From Accommodation to Self-determination: Minority Nationalism and Restructuring of Nigerian State*. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 7(1), 1-20.

Ekeh, P. P. (1975). *Colonialism and the two publics in Africa: A theoretical statement*. *Comparative studies in society and history*, 17(1), 91-112.

Elaiwu, J. I. (2017). *The politics of federalism in Nigeria*. Adonis & Abbey Publishers Ltd, 32.

- Elo, S. and Kyngäs, H., (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 62(1), 107-115.
- Eregha, P.B. and Irughe, I.R., (2009). Oil Induced Environmental Degradation in the Nigeria's Niger Delta: The Multiplier Effects. *Journal of sustainable Development in Africa*, 11(4), 160-175.
- Ezeibe, C. C., Aniche, E. T., & Iwuoha, V. C. (2018). *Political Inquiry and Research Methodology. Logics, Design, Processes, Methods and Approaches*, Parakletos Creatives, Enugu-Nigeria.
- Falola, T. (1989). *History of Nigeria: Nigeria before 1800 AD* (Vol. 1). Longman Nigeria, 22.
- Fayemi, J.K. (2020) Unfinished Greatness—Towards a More Perfect Union in Nigeria: Text of an Address at the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Centre for Historical Documentation and Research (Arewa House), Kaduna.
- Feldman, K. P., (2016). The Globality of Whiteness in Post-Racial Visual Culture. *Cultural Studies* 30(2), 289–311.
- Shaw, F. (1897). *London Times*.
- Forsythe, F. (1977). *The Making of an African Legend: The Biafra Story*. Penguin Books, 14.

- Foster, J., Clark, B., & Holleman, H. (2020). Marx and the Indigenous. *Monthly Review*.
- Frank, C. (2018). The Time for Reconciliation is Over: South African Parliament Has Backed a Motion to Confiscate Land Owned by White People. *Australia News*. Retrieved from <http://www.news.com.au>
- Fraser, N., (2018). Roepke lecture in Economic Geography—from Exploitation to Expropriation: Historic Geographies of Racialized Capitalism. *Economic Geography*, 94(1), 1-17.
- Fuchs, C. (2018). Capitalism, Patriarchy, Slavery, and Racism in the Age of Digital Capitalism and Digital Labour. *Critical Sociology*, 44(4-5), 677-702.
- Fuchs, C. & Monticelli, L. (2018). Repeating Marx: Introduction to the Special Issue Karl Marx: Debating Capitalism & Perspectives for the Future of Radical Theory. In *Triple C*, 16(2), 406-414.
- Gaitskell, D., Kimble, J., Maconachie, M., & Unterhalter, E. (1983), Class, race and gender: Domestic workers in South Africa, *Review of African Political Economy*, 10(27-28), 86-108.
- Gills S. (2000). Towards a Post-Modern Prince? The Battle of Seattle as a Moment of the New Politics of Globalization. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. 29(1), 131-140.



- Gimenez, M.E., (2001). Marxism, and class, gender, and race: Rethinking the trilogy. *Race, Gender & Class*, 23-33.
- Godwin, O. (2013). Cultural Interfaces of Self-determination and the rise of Neo-biafran Movement in Nigeria. *Review of African Political Economy*, 40(137), 428-446.
- Goldstein, A., (2017). *On the reproduction of race, capitalism, and settler colonialism. Race and Capitalism: Global Territories, Transnational Histories* (ed Davis, W), University of California, Los Angeles, USA, 42-51.
- Gordon, L.R., (2005). Through the Zone of Nonbeing A Reading of Black Skin, White Masks in Celebration of Fanon's Eightieth Birthday. *The CLR James Journal*, 11(1), 1-43.
- Gordon, W, (1997). Capitalism and Violence. *Medicine, Conflict and Survival*. 13(1), 63-66.
- Graneheim, U. H. & Lundman, B. (2004). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse education today*, 24(2), 105-112.
- Grant, K. (2014). *A Civilized Savagery: Britain and the New Slaveries in Africa, 1884-1926*. Routledge.

- Guyer, J.I., (1980). Food, cocoa, and the division of labour by sex in two West African societies. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 22(3), 355-373.
- Haber, S., (2014). Emancipation from Capitalism? *Critical Horizons*, 15(2), 194-205.
- Hall, R., (2004). A Political Economy of Land Reform in South Africa. *Review of African Political Economy*, 31(100), 213-227.
- Hanna, G. (1965). V. I. Lenin collected Works, March –August 1919. Translation by Hanna George. Progress Publishers, Moscow.
- Harris-white, B. (2012). Capitalism and the Common Man: Peasants and Petty Production in Africa and South Asia. *Agrarian South: Journal of Political Economy*, 109-160.
- Hart, G. (2007). Changing concepts of articulation: Political stakes in South Africa today. *Review of African Political Economy*, 34(111), 85-101.
- Hartmann, H. (1976). Capitalism, Patriarchy, and Job Segregation by Sex. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 1(3, Part 2), 137-169.
- Hartmann, H.I. & Markusen, A.R., (1980). Contemporary Marxist Theory and Practice: A Feminist Critique. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 12(2), 87-94.

- Harvey, D. & Williams, R. (1995). *Militant Particularism and Global Ambition: The Conceptual Politics of Place, Space and Environment, in the Works of Raymond Williams*. Duke University Press. 42, 69-98.
- Harvey, D., (2001). *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography*. Routledge.
- Hewitt, C. L. (2002). Racial Accumulation on a World Scale: Racial inequality and Unemployment, *Review (Fernand Braudel Centre)*, 25(2), 137-171.
- Hirsch, A. (2013). Africapitalism Promises New Model of African Self-empowerment. *Guardian*.
- Hodgkin, T. (1975). *Nigerian Perspectives: an historical anthology* (No.283). London: Oxford University Press.
- Hodgkin, T. (1960). *Nigeria Perspectives—An Anthological History, Introduction*. vi-ix.
- Horne, G., (1986). *Black and red: WEB Du Bois and the Afro-American response to the cold war, 1944-1963*. SUNY Press.
- Houeland, C., (2015). Casualization and Conflict in the Niger Delta: Nigerian Oil Workers' Unions Between Companies and Communities. *Revue Tiers Monde*, (4), 25-46.

- Hsieh, H.F. and Shannon, S.E., (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative health research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.
- Hudis, P. (2018). Racism and the Logic of Capital: A Fanonian Reconsideration. *Historical Materialism*, 26(2), 199-220.
- Hugh Clifford: Proceedings of a Meeting of the Legislative Council of the Colony of Nigeria, 29<sup>th</sup> March, 1922, in Nigeria, 100 Years of History—Voices of Our Leaders, 2014, (ed.) Jide Amaikwu, 63.
- Ian E.A. Yeboah (2018). Capitalism and Sub-Saharan African Human Capital. *African Identities*. Routledge.
- Ihonvbere J.O. (1997). Organized Labour and the Struggle for Democracy in Nigeria. *African Studies Review*. 40(3), 77-110.
- Ikelegbe A. (2001). Civil Society, Oil and Conflict in the Niger delta Region of Nigeria: Ramifications of Civil Society for a Regional Resource Struggle. *Journal of Modern African Studies*. 39 (3), 437-469.
- Ikelegbe, A., (2005). The economy of conflict in the oil rich Niger Delta region of Nigeria. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 14 (2), 208-234.
- Ikime, O. (2018) Can Anything Good Come Out of History? —Lectures and Papers on Nigerian History, 90-200.

Independent National Electoral Commission: INEC Strategic Plan (2017-2021), 28.

Issar, S. (2020). Listening to Black lives matter: racial capitalism and the critique of neoliberalism. *Contemporary Political Theory*.

Ite A.E., Ibok U.J., Ite M.U., and Peters S.W. (2013). Petroleum Exploration and Production: Past and Present Environmental Issues in the Nigeria's Niger Delta. *American Journal of Environmental Protection*. 1(4). 78-90.

James, C.L.R. (1989). *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution, second Edition Revised*. Vintage Books, New York.

Jauch, H. (2011, June). Chinese investments in Africa: twenty-first century colonialism?. In *New Labor Forum* (Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 49-55). Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

Jermiah O. Arowosegbe (2016). Citizenship and Resource Competition in Nigeria. *Anthropology Forum*, Routledge.

Jimoh Amzat & Olanrewaju Olutayo (2009). Nigerian Capitalism, and the Question of Equity. *The Anthropology*, 11(4), 239-246.

Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Bargaining with patriarchy. *Gender & society*, 2(3), 274-290.

Kautsky, J.H., (1961). JA Schumpeter and Karl Kautsky: Parallel theories of imperialism. *Midwest Journal of Political Science*, 5(2), 101-128.

- Kelley, R. R. (2017). *What is Racial Capitalism and Why Does it Matter?* Seattle, Kane Hall, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, United States of America: UW Simpson Center For Humanities.
- Kiely, R., (2002). Actually, Existing Globalization, Deglobalization, and the political economy of Anti-capitalist protest. *Historical Materialism*, 10 (1), 93-121.
- Leacock, E., (1981). History, Development, and the Division of Labour by Sex: Implications for Organization. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 7(2), 474-491.
- LeBaron, G. and Ayers, A.J., (2013). The rise of a 'new slavery'? Understanding African unfree labour through neoliberalism. *Third World Quarterly*, 34(5), 873-892.
- Lentin, A. (2016). Racism in public or public racism: Doing anti-racism in post-racial times. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39(1), 33-48.
- Leong, N. (2013). Racial Capitalism. *Harvard Law Review*, 126(8), 2151-2225.
- Lipo, C. P., O'Brien, M. J., Collard, M., & Shennan, S. J. (2006), Cultural phylogenies and explanation: Why Historical Methods Matter. Mapping our Ancestors: Phylogenetic Approaches in *Anthropology and Prehistory*, 3-16.
- Lovett, M.L., (1989). Gender Relations Class Formation and the Colonial State in Africa.

Lukacs G. (1972). *History and Class consciousness. Studies in Marxist Dialectics.* MIT, 55-73.

Magubane, B. (1996). *The making of a racist state: British imperialism and the Union of South Africa, 1875-1910.* Africa World Press.

Maharajh, R. (2011). *Innovating beyond Racial Capitalism: A Contribution towards the Analysis of the Political Economy of Post-Apartheid South Africa.*

Makama, G. A. (2013). *Patriarchy and Gender Inequality in Nigeria: The Way Forward.* *European scientific journal*, 9(17), 115-144.

Mangvwat, M.Y. (1995) *Oral Sources and the Reconstruction of Party Politics on the Jos Plateau 1950-1966*, in *Inside Nigerian History--Events, Issues and Sources* (ed.) Yusuf Bala Usman and George Amale Kwanashie, 303.

Mangvwat, M.Y. (2015) *Preface: Centenary History of Plateau State (1914-2014)*, (ed.) Monday Mangvwat & Chris Kwaja, 12.

Mangvwat, M.Y. (1994) *Oral Sources and the Reconstruction of Party Politics on the Jos Plateau (1950-1966)*, in *Inside Nigerian History—Events, Issues and Sources*, (ed.) Yusuf Bala Usman & George Kwanashie, 302.

Mangvwat, M.Y. (1994) *Oral Sources and the Reconstruction of Party Politics on the Jos Plateau 1950-1966*, 100.

Manuh, T., (1988). *Women the Law and Land Tenure in Africa*.

Marx, K. (1972). *The Marx-Engels Reader* (Vol. 4). New York: Norton

Marx, K. (1995). *Capital Volume One: the process of production of capital*. Progress Publishers, Moscow. P. 1-608.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1902). *Wage-labour and Capital*. New York Labour News Company.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1942). *Wage-labour and Capital*, Workers' Literature Bureau, 203-217.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1970). *The German Ideology*, International Publishers Co., 1.

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. (1848). *The Communist Manifest*. In *Marx and Engels Collected Works*, London, England: Lawrence and Wishart, 6, 477-519.

Matlon, J., (2016). Racial Capitalism and the Crisis of Black Masculinity *American Sociological Review*, 81(5), 1014-1038.

Mayer, A., (2016). *Naija Marxisms: Revolutionary Thought in Nigeria*. London: Pluto Press.



- Mayer, I., (2015). Qualitative research with a focus on qualitative data analysis. *International Journal of Sales, Retailing & Marketing*, 4(9), 53-67.
- McCarthy, M.A., (2016). Alternatives: Silent Compulsions: Capitalist Markets and Race. *Studies in Political Economy*, 97(2), 195-205.
- McNally, D. (2009). From Financial Crisis to World Slum: Over-accumulation, Financialization and the Global Slow-down, *Historical Materialism, Brill*, 35-83.
- Meyerson, G. (2000). Rethinking Black Marxism: Reflections on Cedric Robinson and others. *Cultural Logic*, 3(2), 3-182.
- Monteiro A. (2018). South African Law Makers to Review Constitution on Land Seizure. *Bloomberg Politics*.
- Mustapha, A.R., (2011). Zimbabwean farmers in Nigeria: Exceptional Farmers or Spectacular Support? *African Affairs*, 110(441), 535-561.
- Nattrass, N., & Seekings, J. (2001). "Two Nations"? Race and Economic Inequality in South Africa today, *Daedalus*, 130(1), 45-70
- Ndlovu-gatsheni, S. J. (2014). Global Coloniality and the Challenges of Creating African Futures. *Strategic Review for southern Africa*, 36(2), 181-202.

- Nriagu J., Udofia E.A., Ekong I., and Ebuk G. (2016). Health Risk Associated with Oil Pollution in Niger- Delta, Nigeria. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 13(3), 347.
- Obi, C., (2009). Nigeria's Niger Delta: Understanding the Complex Drivers of Violent Oil-related Conflict. *Africa Development*, 34(2).
- Obi, C.I., (1997). Globalization and Local Resistance: The Case of Shell versus the Ogoni. *New Political Economy*, 2(1).
- Odolonu Happy Boris (2015), The Upsurge of Oil Thief and Illegal bunkering in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria: Is there a way Out? *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences MCSEER Publishing*, 6(3), 52.
- Okolie, A.C., (2003), The Appropriation of Difference: State and the Construction of Ethnic Identities in Nigeria. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 3(1), 67-92.
- Okonofua, B. A., (2016). The Niger- Delta Amnesty Program: The Challenges of Transitioning from Peace Settlement to Long Term Peace. *Sage Open*, 1-16.
- Okorie, V.O., (2018). From oil to water? The deepening crises of primitive accumulation in the waterscapes of Nigeria's Niger Delta. *Africa Spectrum*, 53(1), 113-128.

- Okurebia S. and Daniel E. (2014), Management of Amnesty Program for Sustainable livelihood in the Niger-delta Region of Nigeria: Challenges and Policy Action, *Journal of Business and Management*, 14(3), 36-42.
- Omoruyi, O., (2002). The Politics of Oil: Who Owns Oil? Nigeria, States or Communities.
- Omotola J. S., (2007). *From OMPADEC to the NNDC: An Assessment of the State Responses to Environmental Insecurity in the Niger Delta Nigeria*. *Africa Today*, Indiana University Press, 54(1), 73-89.
- Onouha, R.A., (2007). Discriminatory Property Inheritance under Customary Law in Nigeria: NGOs to the rescue. *Int'l J. Not-for-Profit L.*, 10, 79.
- Onuoha, G., (2013). Cultural Interfaces of Self-determination and the Rise of the Neo-Biafran Movement in Nigeria. *Review of African Political Economy*, 40(137), 428-446.
- Oriji, C. E. (2019). From Biafra to police brutality: challenging localized Blackness toward globally racialized ethnicities of Nigerians in the US. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 1-18.
- Osaghae E.E. (1998). Managing Multiple Minorities Problem in a Divided Society: The Nigerian Experience, *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 36(1), 1-24.

- Osaghae, E.E. and Suberu, R.T., (2005). A history of identities, violence and stability in Nigeria, *Oxford: Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity*, University of Oxford, 6.
- Ouma, S. (2017). The difference that ‘capitalism’ makes: on the merits and limits of critical political economy in African Studies. *Review of African Political Economy*, 44(153), 499-509.
- Parliamentary Debates (Lords), 1st August 1899, iv. 75, 1003
- Patton, M.Q., (2002). Two decades of developments in qualitative inquiry: A personal, experiential perspective. *Qualitative social work*, 1(3), 261-283.
- Pellow, D.N., (2007). *Resisting Global Toxics: Transnational Movements for Environmental Justice*. MIT Press.
- Perbi, A., (2001). Slavery and the slave trade in pre-colonial Africa. Retrieved August, 20, 2014.
- Perham, M. (1960) *Lugard: The Years of Native Authority-1898-1945*, London; Collins, 362.
- Prince, M. & Augustine, I., (2015). Challenges and Prospect of Environmental Remediation/Restoration in the Niger- Delta of Nigeria: A Case Study of the Ogoni land. *Journal of Energy Technologies and Policies*. 5(1), 5-10.

- Pugee, J. (2009). Measuring Re-integration in Liberia: Assessing the gap Between Outputs and Outcomes. In R. Muggah (ed), *Security and Post-conflict Reconstruction: dealing with fighters in the Aftermath of War*. New York, Routledge, 70-102.
- Pulido, L., (2017). Geographies of Race and Ethnicity II: Environmental Racism, Racial Capitalism and State-sanctioned Violence. *Progress in Human Geography*, 41(4), 524-533.
- Report of Flora Shaw, in Margery Perham (1960). *Lugard-The Years of Authority*, 412.
- Report of the Willinks Commission into the Fears of the Minorities and Means of Allaying Them 1957/58, 87.
- Robin D. G. K., (2017). *What is Racial Capitalism and Why Does It Matter?* Recorded November 7, 2017 at Kane Hall, University of Washington, Seattle, WA. Sponsored by the UW Simpson Center for the Humanities.
- Robinson, C. J. (2000). *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*. University of California Press.
- Robinson, William I. (2017): Debate on the New Global Capitalism: Transnational Capitalist Class, Transnational State Apparatuses, and Global Crisis. In *International Critical Thought* 7 (2), 171–189.

- Rodney, W. (1972). *Now Europe underdeveloped Africa*. Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications, London and Dar es Salaam, 52.
- Saheed, A. (2018). Empire Day in Africa: Patriotic Colonial Childhood, Imperial Spectacle and Nationalism in Nigeria, 1905- 1960. *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 46(4), 731-754.
- Said, E.W. (1985). Orientalism Reconsidered. *Race & Class*, 27(2), 1-15.
- Sauls, J. S., & Leys, C. (1999:17). Sub-Saharan Africa in Global Capitalism. *Monthly Review*, 51(3), 13-14.
- Schatz, S.P. (1984). Pirate capitalism and the inert economy of Nigeria. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 22(1), 45-57.
- Scrapanti, E. (1999). Capitalism and the Essence of Capitalism. *Review of African Political Economy*. 6(1), 1-26.
- Selwyn, B. (2013). Karl Marx, Class Struggle and Labor-centered Development. *Global Labor Journal*, 4(1), 48-70.
- Sklar, R. L. (2015). Nigerian political parties: Power in an emergent African nation (Vol. 2288). Princeton University Press, 50-52.
- Sklar, R.L. (1983). *Nigerian Political Parties—Power in Emergent African Nation*.

- Smith, A. (2020). Passing Through Difference: CLR James and Henry Lefebvre. *Identities*, 27(1), 38-52.
- Stephanie, H. (2014). Emancipation from Capitalism. *Critical Horizons*, Taylor and Francis, 15(12), 194-205.
- Stoler, A.L. (1989). Making Empire Respectable: The Politics of Race and Sexual Morality in 20th-Century Colonial Cultures. *American Ethnologist*, 16(4), 634-660.
- Stuckey, H. L. (2015). The second step in data analysis: Coding qualitative research data. *Journal of Social Health and Diabetes*, 3(01), 7-10.
- Suberu, R. (2000). States' Creation and the Political Economy of Nigerian Federalism. In: Amuwo, K., Agbaje, A., Suberu, R. and Herauit, G. *Federalism and Political Restructuring in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited, 276-295.
- Suberu, R. T. (1996). *Ethnic Minority Conflicts and Governance in Nigeria*. Institut français de recherche en Afrique.
- Suberu, R.T. (2003). *Ethnic Minority Conflicts and Governance in Nigeria—Introduction*, 1.

- Tamuno, T. (2000). "Nigerian Federalism in Historical Perspective Overarching Issues." In Amuwo, K., Agbaje, A., Suberu, R. and Herault, G. *Federalism and Political Restructuring in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited, 15.
- Temitope, B. O. (2006). Biko Agozino and the Rise of Post-Colonial Criminology, *African Journal of Criminology and Justice*. 2(1), 104-131.
- The London Gazette. (1885).
- Thomas, D.C. (2013). Cedric J. Robinson and racial capitalism: Africana liberation resistance structures and black internationalism in the twenty-first century. *African Identities*, 11(2), 133-147.
- Turaki, Y. (1993). *The British colonial legacy in Northern Nigeria: A social ethical analysis of the colonial and post-colonial society and politics in Nigeria*. Turaki, 100.
- Turner, T.E. (1986). Oil workers and the oil bust in Nigeria. *Africa Today*, 33-50.
- Ukeje, C. (2001). Oil Communities and Political Violence: The Case of Ethnic Ijaws in Nigeria's Delta Region. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 13(4), 15-36.
- Ukeje C. & Adebani W. (2008). Ethno-nationalist Claims in Southern Nigeria: Insight from Yoruba and Ijaw Nationalism Since the 1990s. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 31(3), 563-591.



- Ukiwo, U. (2005). The Study of Ethnicity in Nigeria. *Oxford Development Studies*, 33(1), 7-23.
- Umukoro, N. (2014). Democracy and Inequality in Nigeria. *Journal of Developing Societies*, 30(1), 1-24.
- Usman, Y. B. (1994), "The Federation of Nigeria and the Lessons of Historical Experiences of the People of Nigeria," in Elaigwu, J., et al (eds.): *Federalism and Nation-Building in Nigeria*, NCIR, Abuja, 17.
- Van-Maanen, J. (1979). Reclaiming qualitative methods for organizational research: A preface. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(4), 520-526.
- Vanhaute, E. (2012). Peasants, Peasantries and (de) Peasantization in the Capitalist World-System. In *Routledge handbook of world-systems analysis*, Routledge, 313-321.
- Verdinelli, S. & Scagnoli, N. I. (2013). Data display in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 12(1), 359-381.
- Virdee, S. (2019). Racialized Capitalism: An Account of its Contested Origins and Consolidation. *The Sociological Review*, 67(1), 3-27.
- Wally, G. (1997). Capitalism and Violence. *Medicine, Conflict and Survival*, 13(1), 63-66.

- Wiegratz, Joerg. (2018). Silence in Academia About Capitalism in Africa. United Kingdom. Retrieved June 15, 2019, from <https://africasacountry.com/2018/12/the-silences-in-academia-about-capitalism-in-africa>
- Wimmer A. (1997). Explaining Xenophobia and Racism: A Critical Review of Current Research Approaches. *Ethnicity and Racial Studies*, 20(11), 17-41.
- Wolpe, H. (1975). The Theory of Internal Colonization: The South African case. In *Collected Seminar Papers, Institute of Commonwealth Studies*, 18, 105-120.
- Wright R. (1937). *Native Son*. Jonathan Cape Ltd. Bedford Square, London.
- Yahaya, A. D. (1980). *The Native Authority System in Northern Nigeria, 1950-70: A Study in Political Relations with Particular Reference to the Zaria Native Authority*. Dept. of Political Science, Ahmadu Bello University, 297.
- Young, E. M. (2012). *Food and Development*, Abingdon, Oxon, Routledge.
- Zhang, Y. & Wildemuth, B. M. (2009). Qualitative Analysis of Content. Applications of Social Research Methods to Questions in Information and Library Science, 308-319.