



1914 Amalgamation, Resource Control and its Implications for Nation Building in Nigeria: An Assessment

S.T. ABEJIDE
Al-Hikmah University Ilorin, Nigeria

Abstract. The current socio-political and economic problems confronting Nigeria had been linked to the form of administration left for the country by the British colonial government. Incessant agitations by ethnic nationalities, most especially the minority groups, for being marginalised in politics, gainful employment, ministerial appointments, access to education, infrastructures, unequal sharing formula of the nation's resources are serious issues yet to be addressed by the government since the restoration of democracy in 1999. This paper discusses the demand for resource control by the oil producing region of Niger Delta and other ethnic groups. The author integrates the use of both primary and secondary sources. It explains that many Nigerians have consciously and continuously asked the question of the genesis of Nigeria's socio-political problems and why the process of national integration is still many miles away from actualisation since independence. This paper further argues that the acceptance of Lord Lugard's proposal in 1914 with the establishment of colonial mercenaries to achieve their goals, the role of Lord Lugard as a Governor General in Nigeria, his objectives and reforms for the amalgamation or lumping together of existing protectorates by the British government in the colonial period laid the foundation for the ethnic power struggle and crisis in the country. However, the relevance of the amalgamation to nation building are also examined. Thus, certain recommendations are made that all Nigerian citizens should be treated equally no matter their ethnic background, to enhance patriotism, integration and sustenance of the present democratic dispensation. It concludes that a re-direction of government policy to ensure resource control, restructuring, and a true federalism would, to a large extent, usher in peace and socio-economic progress for the nation.

Keywords: Nation Building, Colonialism, Amalgamation, Democracy, Resource Control.

1. Introduction

Abi-nito, it is imperative to note that before the colonial state creation there were multiple ethnic groups with complete system of government each operating independently within what is to later be called Nigeria. For instance, the Kanem-Borno Kingdom, Fulani Emirate which rules the Savannah of Northern Nigeria, the Ife Kingdom, Benin Kingdom, Yoruba Emirate of Oyo. The city states of the Niger delta as well as the politically decentralize but culturally homogenous Ibo peoples of the Easter region and the small tribes of Plateau. They had different cultural diversities and which are merged as one entity or nation (Nmadi and Martins 1992:44).

It is clear that the incursion of the European largely depend on the early contact with Africans most especially in transnational trade network in slaves and their struggle over land in Africa after the 1884-1885 Berlin Conference in Germany.

Besides, these European merchants abolished trade in human slaves due to the development of industrial capitalism in the 1800's where labour intensive economy was transformed into capital industrial development, hence, there was urgent need for raw materials readily available in Africa. Also, certain factors like, Global strategies, national prestige, maintenance of status quo in the World economy, Evangelical mission, adventurism and economic expansionism facilitated the white men's decision to move into the interior part of Africa, utilized the ignorance of African chiefs, conquered, subjected them to force rule of which the kingdoms mentioned

above later became Nigeria or nation-states (Micheal Crowther 1977).

There are forms of stiff residence against British infiltration into the sub-region by various kings like; king Kosoko (1861) when Lagos was annexed, Jaja of Opobo, Nana of Itsekiri, Attaihu Ahmadu (in the North) and others could not match the maxim guns of the imperialist. Thus, the British imperial company's (Royal Niger Company) charter was revoked to usher in the actual British colonial mercenaries and polices put in place to feature their administration, exploitation of the resources to their home industries.

2. Establishment of British Colonial Mercenaries

Between 1900-1914, the British sought to secure central direction of policy and pool economy resources together for easy administration has adopted policy of gradual amalgamation of its various units in Nigeria, for instance in 1906 the Lagos Colony and Protectorate was merged with the Southern protectorate to smoothen its economics ambition, that is, the British government utilized the financial position of the South to cover the cost of administration and development in the financially weak colony and protectorate of Lagos saddled with white elephant of a railway in need of extension since 1901 though administrative fusion was not attained.

The British equally adopted the doctrine of a dual mandate for the administration of the colonies they had acquired. However, expansions of trade are the primary instrument for carrying out the dual mandate policy in Nigeria. Dual mandate means the British administrative policy where by the resources of the colony was develop in a way to assist the natives but mainly to developed the metropolis of the colonial center.

Research have shown that no real infrastructure for internal industrial development existed, except of course that which aided the production of exportable agricultural staples to enhance the British self-enlighten motives in Nigeria (Michael Crowther 1971:50).

3. The Role of Governor-General Lord Lugard

Fredrick Lord Lugard was appointed as the first High Commissioner of the Northern Nigeria in 1900. He had no civil service experience and was a military man through and through. Therefore, his new position as the High Commissioner was seen as a

military task that should be carried out with military precision, he gives order and prompt obedient follows. He did not allowed constructive criticism from any resident officers in the North. Most especially those who are against his indirect rule system in the Emirates are sanction and sent to non-emirates part of the North as reward those who supported him (Perham Margery 1960:40-65).

In addition, given his military experience, Lugard would prefer to work with military officers to seasoned administrators to serve in the political department. In fact, he believed that "army officers are an admirable class of men. They are gentlemen, their training teaches them prompt decision. Their education in military law gives them a knowledge of the rule of evidence and judicial procedure".

Besides, Lugard administrative system in the North revealed the incapability of military with governance, he made blunder especially his strained relationship with the staff and frequent administrative change and transfer of staff officers, this is made clear in Lugard's assertion (1904-35) thus;

"Every resident or assistance resident shall be removable from one province to another and the area included without his jurisdiction shall be liable to diminution or alteration from time to time at the discretion of the high commissioner"

This policy of Lugard virtually lower the morale of the political officers in the Northern Nigeria.

Lugard's attitude and military action which are non-democratic could be view in his policy of indirect rule, it was adopted to off-set the high cost of administering the vast Northern Nigeria later turn to administrative policy system which made it difficult to discipline corrupt and erring emirs in the North. In fact, any administrator who insulted the emir are either sanctioned or transferred to a non-emirate areas for anti-direct rule system (Hannah 1969).

Accordingly, his returned from Hong Kong in 1913 enhanced the formulation of policy of amalgamation which led to 1913 memorial protest of the Northern political officers against bias nature of certain clauses in the policy on welfare of staff. (Crocker Watter, 1971:50). Also, his preference to stay in the North and for the relative success of indirect rule manifested in his decision to merge the developed Southern protectorate with the financially poor Northern protectorate in 1914.

4. The Inevitability of Amalgamation

4.1 What is Amalgamation?

Amalgamation in accordance with oxford advanced learner dictionary meaning, is bringing together classes, societies, races of people to forms union. It is a combination of two or more people of heterogeneous entities into new one. It could be described as the lumping together under the same administration groups of mutually incompatible peoples. That is, merging together the existing protectorates in Nigeria before 1914 are as follows:

Protectorate of Southern Nigeria: This was in the Niger coast. The British officials then administering it were responsible to the foreign office in London.

Protectorate of Northern Nigeria: The British officials charged with its administration were directly responsible to board of directors of the Royal Niger Company, the Headquarter at various time located in Lokoja and Kaduna.

Protectorate and Colony of Lagos: The British officials administering the colony of Lagos were responsible to colonial office in London.

Thus, these separate administrative units are too vast for effective control and cumbersome to administere them differently, therefore the inevitability for merger became the only option for a desperate colonial power to suit their interest. In 1914, the three protectorates were lumped together and named Nigeria, and Lugard assumed the title of Governor General till before he left the county.

4.2 Objectives and Reasons for Amalgamation in 1914

It is pertinent to note that various reasons for lumping together of the protectorates in Nigeria stand clear considering the urgent need which they felt burdensome. Some of the reasons are as follows:

Exploitation and Self Enlighten Motive: That is the British colonial desire or interest not in the interest of the country or communities, they did not take Nigerian into cognizance before lumping different cultures together into one nation, and to reduce the burden of administration or high cost of administering Nigeria in units enhanced the amalgamation.

Another Cogent reason Was Political: For easy control and administration, it became expedient for British government to have one single unit of political system.

The Decision to Merge the three protectorates together was Economic Expediency: The Northern protectorate was running to severe deficit, they had no direct access to the sea, large area, high population and are being subsidies from the Southern protectorate, imperial grants-in-aid from British of about \$300,000 per annum, the British find a way of fine-tuning the administrative system by way of merger for efficient use of available recourses to develop the Nigeria nation (Morns et al 1970:23).

Another reason for British desire to lump together existing protectorates was the harmonization of railway line, there was pressing need to co-ordinate railway policy which are not in existence at that time, the Southern tract had taken effect in 1901 and by 1906, there is need for an extension Northward to Jebba, Bida, Minna, and further North like Kaduna, Kano, Niger, and Daura, hence by 1969, has been extended to River Niger in the Northern protectorate at Jebba, it extend to Mina, where a Northern line was being constructed to reach Kano, by 1912, there were two competing system, the Minna-Baro-Niger system rivaling the Minna- Jebba- Lagos system. Therefore, it was essential that effective coordination could be achieved through amalgamation. (Ojo 1973: 19).

Exploitation of local raw-materials for unward shipment to Europe is another factor for the merger of territories in the protectorate by 1914, for instance, the construction of rail lines from Lagos → Ilorin → Jebba → Minna → Kano → Enugu Port Harcourt are deliberately undertaken due to the availability of raw materials in these areas.

Literacy is a foundational basis for socio-economy development of any country, where reasonable part of the population are trained to become professional in any field of study to attain society growth and development, therefore the literacy level in Nigeria during the colonial period was very low, there were enough personnel for effective administrative control in the units and too costly for the British government, there could be reduction in the staff strength if the unit are put together to formed central control for the country (Habibu 2003:14).

Inadequate finance capital for proper maintenance of the protectorates facilitated the lumping together, precisely, it was not cost effective to maintain the protectorates differently hence, the lumped territories would drastically reduce the capital to administer over a single units. However, one is force to view the process of amalgamation strategy as a plan for eventual decolonization of the county and to hand

over a united nation to Nigeria nationalist, which manifested in 1960.

4.3 Criticism and Reactions against Amalgamation

The above discussion has shown that the intentions of the British colonial government in Nigeria for amalgamation was not genuine but self-enlightened, and self centred, there has been a lot of criticism by scholars over the years, some of the reactions shall be examined.

For instance, the 1906 amalgamation of Lagos Colony and Protectorates of Southern Nigeria though could not materialize has been criticized by scholars because the colonial power failed to consider the views of the colonized people to ascertain if the decision for lumping together was acceptable. (Eluwa, 1988).

Also, it is unbelievable but in reality, just like the 1906 unchallant attitude of the British colonial power which did not sought for the consent or opinion of Nigeria before the fusion, the 1914 lumping together was undertaken in the same vein, they are not consulted during the process and establishment of the Nation – States.

The contemporary reactions of scholars over the years have argued that the 1914 decision of the British government to merged the independent territories together no matter how beneficial laid the basis for political upheavals in the country during the post – colonial rule (Okonjo, 1974:35) for instance some of the political conditions witnessed in Nigeria between 1960 and 2020 could be enumerated thus:

- Barely six years after the British had left the actual control of Nigeria, there was the first military coupe de tat and counter coup, which continued unabated until 1999.
- Ethnic clash and rivalries characterized the nation’s sociopolitical system between 1960 and now.
- The marginalization of minorities by the majority group has caused incessant political crisis as a result of strife to free themselves from political stagnancy which had enjoyed before the 1914 events.
- Favouritism, nepotism, despotism, and tribalism has eaten deep into the nerves of every Nigerian leaders and people against the political philosophy to maintain a virile, dynamic and integrated nation state in Nigeria. The country was equally thrown

into 32 months of Civil War, which started as a resistance to the Federal Government of Nigeria to prevent the Biafra secession between 1967 and 1970.

- Ethnic power struggle and unequal sharing of national cake and revenue are built on what the colonial power, after the amalgamation stood for. Lord Lugard prefers the North rather than the Southern part. This attitude sowed the seed of ethnic power struggle of which the nation is yet to be free.
- External manipulation and intervention in the nation’s political system is continuous, especially the British government which signed a defense pact with the new nation after independence. This action has incessantly hindered stable political system in Nigeria.
- The new political system and administration by 1999 are manifestations of the impact of amalgamation since 1914.

It is noted that civilized countries like Britain could lumped people of ethnic diversities, beliefs, cultures with heterogeneous socio-political background together, they had favoured the Northern element with no or little education at that time to promote their economic and political interest in Nigeria compared to the Southern part with more enlightened elites. Obaro Ikime noted that the British official involved in formulating and executing the policy of amalgamation were convinced that through it they would obtained a convenient and political means of securing the colonial administration. This have shown the attitude and ulterior motive, the selfish desire of the colonialist, which did not consider the convenience of the people from difference cultured under one nation. Hence, the Lugard’s administration revealed the inefficient nature of military governance in human society. His personality as a military man, trained to protects external aggression and invasion, he had no civil service ethics to control a vast nation like Nigeria. By extension the period of military regime in the country were similar oppressive and despotic, inefficient until the nation returned to democracy in Nigeria since 1999.

5. Ethnic Agitations, Resource Control and Revenue Distribution in the Post-Independence Nigeria

It is noted that before the lumping together of heterogeneous ethnic nationalities in 1914 by Fredrick Lord Lugard, each had absolute control over their resources. All minerals and non-mineral resources were directly under the leadership of those

ethnic groups. Revenue accrued from such resources were used toward the growth and development of their communities. Evidence has revealed that their ability to maximize their resources enhanced socio-economic transformations experienced prior to colonial rule and eventual amalgamation in 1914.

Furthermore, the marginalization of most minority ethnic groups in the post-colonial Nigeria precipitated the agitations for resource control, particularly in the oil-producing communities in the Niger Delta. Resource control within the context of the Niger Delta people was interlinked fiscally in a federal system of government, particularly the case in the Nigeria's First Republic between 1960 and 1966. The country was initially divided into three regions (four from 1963 onwards) that exemplified a self-governing system, at the same time allowing for agreement on the common defence and protection of the country. Section 140 of the 1960 Nigerian Constitution stipulated that the sharing of revenue allocation to the regions shall be based strictly on derivation (Oziegbe, 2009). Each region had its own constitution, attached to the federal constitutional document in particular Part 2 of Chapter 9 of the 1960/1963 Constitution, that allocated the revenue derived from natural resources such as palm oil and rubber in a particular environment to the government, and shared the federally collected revenue among other federating units (Oyovbaire, 1985). This was in line with Wheare's (1953) vision of a federal system in which there is no hierarchy of authority that permits central government to impose itself on other federating units, as all levels maintain horizontal relationships. The debate on resource control explains the failing promises on the part of the federal government to permit the Delta region appropriate the oil revenue generated from the area.

According to the 1958 Raisman Commission Report, petroleum profits were to be divided, with 50 percent allocated to the Niger Delta communities, since oil was located in their territory (derivation principle), 20 percent to the Federal government, and 30 percent to a distributive pool for sharing among other regions in Nigeria, based on population and equality (Ejobowah, 2000). Nwabueze's study on this revealed that the relationship between the central government in Nigeria and the component units rested upon a balanced division of power and resources found in the environment, where each possessed the power over its natural resources without interference from the others (Nwabueze, 1995). More importantly, the demand for resource control by the Ijaw people, up to 1966, was tied to the same principle during the First Republic, a period

when the federating unit had control over agricultural produce and shared about 50 percent of its sale based on derivation. According to Duru (1999), the power politics played by the federal military government toward the end of 1966 to a large extent impeded the practice of a true form of federalism, that is, one that recognises the states' access to a fair share of the natural resources on its land.

Similarly, the intervention of the military forces in Nigerian politics in 1966 had implications for the entire Niger Delta region, namely, the suspension of the people's rights and control over the entire land, the cancellation of the 50 percent revenue allocation to the Delta area, and neglect of the environment. The Federal Military Decree no, 23 of 1966 reverted the existing laws that guaranteed the state's control over its resources, and vested the same in the Supreme Military Council and the Federal Executive Council (Alafuro, 2010). It is noted that the civilian government before the military government must be blamed for environmental problems in the Delta, because petroleum decrees promulgated by the military government became the principle adopted in the oil-producing area by successive government in Nigeria.

Similarly, the Colonial Mineral Oil Ordinance of 1914 that vested ownership and control of minerals with the British Crown was restated in the 1946 Mineral Act. The 1916 Mineral Ordinance re-affirmed the control and ownership by the British Crown over mining and oil rights found in the Nigerian environment (National Archive Ibadan, NAI 1290/1916). Section 3(1) clearly stated:

The entire property in and control of the minerals, and mineral oils, in and under or upon any land in Nigeria, and of all Rivers, streams and water courses, throughout Nigeria, is and shall be vested in the Crown, save in so far as such rights may in any case have been limited by the express grant made before the commencement of this ordinance (National Archive Enugu, NAE, 422/1916).

Although all minerals found on land belonging to the crown in Nigeria were vested in the Crown, non-Crown belonged to the surface owners, individual owners and the native communities (Public Record Office, PRO, 2688). The Crown also retained the mineral rights on all lands alienated before that date, as they had passed to the surface owners. This explicitly revealed that all mineral rights found in the earth belonged to the colonial government, while the native landowners had rights to compensations. Similarly, this legislation has been repealed and

replaced by the Petroleum Act of 1969, which reaffirmed the ownership of mineral resources in the post-colonial Nigeria government. At independence, the power of ownership was automatically transferred to the Federal government. More importantly, some mineral rights were ceded to the United Africa Company (the Royal Niger Company's successor) by the colonial government. As Flint writes:

...the company was to receive one-half of the royalties which the government undertook to impose on all minerals mined in an area between the main Niger and the line through Yola and Zinder, providing they were exported through a British customs house. The concession was to last for 99 years (Flint, 1960).

Protests by the Zikist movement and other nationalists in 1946 made the British colonial government to reverse this decision by the end of 1949.

According to Section 162 (2) of the 1999 Nigerian Constitution, the petroleum decrees passed by the military government, such as the 1969 Petroleum Act, re-emphasised the exclusive ownership of the government over oil extracted in any part of the country, particularly in the Delta. For example, the 1969 Petroleum Act already regulated community access to communal land and restricted their rights over mineral resources, making it possible for the multinational oil investors to have unrestricted access to explore for oil, despite the problem of pollution associated with their operations (Ibeanu, 2001).

The period from the 1970s through to the 1980s witnessed the awakening of the local consciousness to the environmental pollution and degradation in the Niger Delta communities. The state's ineptitude in dealing with the environmental situation according to experts like Frynas (2011), fuelled unrest and agitation against the centralised control of oil, especially the few military leaders and local civilians. Decree No. 13 of 1970, specifically permitted the federal military government to retain 55 percent of the royalties from crude oil sales, whilst 45 percent was paid to the state producing the oil, based on derivation. By implication, the alteration made by the Supreme Military Council in 1970 deprived the oil-producing states of ownership in terms of revenue and export duties, which were shared between them by a ratio of 3:2. (Oyovbaire, 1985)

A British Petroleum (BP) record shows that the Niger Delta people's rights and control over their environmental resources were further weakened by the Federal government under its 1971 Decree No. 9,

which nationalised mineral resources and vested the power over oil found in the continental shelf on the federal government (PRO, 554/2109). Continental Shelf as used in this paper meant an area adjacent to the coast of Nigeria where off shore oil exploration and production was permitted. These offshore oil productions were declared the Federal government's matters. By implication, the Niger Delta oil-producing areas were not entitled to any proceeds from the sale of oil found in such area. This practice, according to Dibua, (2006) and Oyovbaire, (1985) did not account for the derivation funds allocated to the oil-producing areas. The provision of this decree thus signified that all oil exploration and proceeds from the offshore or territorial waters belonged to the federal government.

The complexities surrounding the 1978 Land Use Act Section 544, show that it was enacted to redefine the legal claims of ownership and control over all the mineral land found in the Delta region. It took away the community's rights to negotiate directly with the oil companies over access to land and compensation payment. World Bank study has revealed that the people were mindful of their limited rights imbedded in the Land Use Act that nationalised all land, both urban and rural, for the state and Local Government Areas (World Bank, 2008). Section 28(1) of the Land Use Act expressly permitted the occupancy and 'overriding public interest' of the state over oil wells in the Delta environment. It is noted that based on the provision of the Land Use Act, the oil companies until 1978 paid compensation on land directly to the land owners for damaged crops, but as a result of its enactment, the rights were invested in the Federal Government. This explains why Shell Nigeria argued that the problem in the Delta escalated when in 1978 and 1979, as two laws were passed which gave the 36 States and the Federal government control over all land and minerals (Aghalino, 2000; African Insight, 1999). It also illustrates the unfair distribution of income derived from minerals by the government during this period, laying the foundation for intensive agitation for resource control by the Niger Delta people.

The federal division of financial resources within the context of the Nigerian revenue-sharing formula between 1960 and 1975 was based on sharing a fixed proportion of the revenue collected in the local area where the resource was found (derivation). Agitation and debate on how this formula was determined began in 1966, when the Gowon government led administration abrogated the 50 percent allocated to the oil-producing area of the Delta (Eghosa, 1998; Suberu, 1998). The allocation of revenue to the oil-

producing region was further reduced to 45 percent and 55 percent between 1969 and 1975 for the federation account (Government Gazette, 4221/95). Evidence from the Africa Confidential (1997) revealed that Government's exclusive right to offshore resources increased its allocation to 80 percent in 1979 and 20 percent for the oil-producing areas. The Delta areas were mostly affected by this sharing formula since the non-oil states had a greater share than the oil-producing communities.

Section 1, 2(2) of the Revenue Allocation Act of 1981 which took effect from 22 January 1982, specifically addressed the payment of compensation to the oil-producing states:

"The amount standing to the credit of the Federation Account (as specified in subsection (1) of section 149 of the constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria shall be distributed by the Federal government among the various governments in Nigeria..."

Based on this provision, it become clear that the Federal government would share 55 percent, the state government 32.5 percent, the local government

council 10 percent, the fund meant for resolving ecological problems 1 percent, and the physical development of oil-producing communities 1.5 percent.

Section 2(4) of the Revenue Allocation Act of 1981 states that:

...an amount equivalent to the revenue accruing to the Federation Account derived from minerals extracted from the mineral producing areas of Nigeria shall be paid into a fund to be administered by the Federal government for the development of the said mineral producing area...

This illustrates that the entire Delta oil-producing communities had specified allocation from the oil revenue derived from their land. In 1982, the 20 percent allocated to the oil regions was decreased to 1.5 percent based on derivation, then increased to 3 percent in 1992, and again to 13 percent in 1999. The violent nature of the agitation for resource control in the 1990s probably compelled government to shift from 3% to 13% during the Obasanjos' civilian era.

Table 1: State and Federal shares of petroleum proceeds 1953-present

Years	Producing states %	Federation Account including DPA %
1953-1960	100	-
1960-1969	50	50
1969-1971	45	55
1971-1975	45 minus offshore proceeds	55 plus offshore proceeds
1975-1979	20 minus offshore proceeds	80 plus offshore proceeds
1979-1981	-	100
1982-1992	1.5	98.5
1992-1999	3	97
1999- 2005	13	87

Source: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 2006, p.150

Table 1 above illustrates the unstable policy on derivation in Nigeria from the 1950s to 2005. The Distributive Pool Account (DPA) was being used by the Federal government for the sharing of oil revenue among the states, local governments, and the oil-producing areas of the Niger Delta. World Bank document (2008) revealed that in 1982, the Federal government had 55 percent, the states, 30.5 percent, the local government areas 10 percent, and the oil-producing states an additional 4.5 percent.

By implication, the revenue-sharing formula in Nigeria thus emphasised the Federal government's self-interest, which encouraged uneven distribution of oil proceeds in the country (Oyovbaire, 1985). To a large extent, this was to pitch the ordinary people of the Niger Delta, such as the Ijaws and Ogonis, against the non-oil-producing states in Nigeria (Ejobowah, 2000). In short, the marginalisation, deprivation, poverty and long neglect suffered by the oil-producing communities of Delta was an

underlying factor behind their demand for total resource control. It explains why land became the most contentious issue in the Delta region as from the 1990s (International Crisis Group, 2006).

6. Salient Reasons for Resource Control

The perpetuation of environmental pollution and neglect of the Niger Delta by the Federal government, Shell Nigeria and Chevron Nigeria created a perceived need to take violent action especially by the youths from the early 1990s. At this time, the destruction of the Delta environment, especially agricultural land that became unproductive, and pollution of the water courses had encouraged the local people's demand for the control of oil resources found on their land (Ikporuko 1999).

Problematic distribution of oil resources in Nigeria provided further motivation for the Delta struggle. Other protagonists of resource control like, Itse

Sagay, Nnimmo Bassey, Ebeku and Saro-Wiwa, argued that the state's 50 percent of the proceeds should be paid to the state in which it was produced, especially on the continental shelf off its land (Itse, 1995, NAE, 32/1 Allocation of oil Revenue). It is noted that in order to perpetuate its central control and ownership of the oil wealth, the Federal government (both military and Obasanjo's civilian Fourth Republic) reacted to oil agitation from the 1990s onwards by attempting to suppress it through violent means. For example, the politicisation of oil through militarisation or armed occupation of the Niger Delta oil-producing area by the central government in the early and mid-1990s was required for effective maximisation of the production and sale of oil.

The Federal government's repressive action shows its negative response to the demand for resource and environmental control by the oil-producing areas of the Niger Delta (The Guardian, 2001). Their demands were portrayed as secessionist and resistance movements that had to be crushed, as was the case in a repressive attack on Ijaw protesters in Yenogoa in December 1998. Despite the repressive means employed by the Federal government, resource-related demands have increased among the Delta people, because many believed it was their fundamental right to have a clean environment and sustainable income for survival

7. Conclusion and Recommendations

This paper has examined the 1914 amalgamation, resource control, and its implications for nation building in Nigeria. It was found that the post-independence policies of the federal government have continued to hamper the desired growth and development of Nigeria. Peace and stability required for a sustainable economic vibrancy of the nation has been toiled with by the political elite. Hence, it is necessary to argue that the above discussion on the policy and strategies of British colonial administration in Nigeria to merge the existing protectorates under a single government to some extent was a mistake which has continued to hunt the political peace and process of national integration till date. The motive of the British government was not genuine, but to satisfy their interest, especially the 1914 constitution which arrogated more power to the Governor General to reject and accept any advice given to him by the council. The nominated members, who are Nigerians, were figure head and bench warmer with little contribution in the council's deliberations. It is reasonable to fault certain clauses and strategies in the 1914 constitution. The 1914 lumping together of these territories has nothing to

offer the emerged nation states, it has not achieved anything but rather deepened the political crisis in the country. The attitude of Lord Lugard marred the process of 1914 fusion. It was a mistake that came to reality. In fact, amalgamation of Nigeria was an artificial creation of the British.

The post-colonial agitations for resource control by some ethnic nationalities in Nigeria like the Niger Delta region presented a very important information of the negative impact of amalgamation of these sovereign entities in 1914. Evidence has revealed that the Niger Delta oil-producing communities despite their contributions to the total national revenue, and due to oil spillage and soil degradation, have experienced poverty more than the non-oil producing states. The post-colonial formula for sharing revenue was not favourable. Therefore, the agitations for resource control, restructuring has continued in the area and other part of the country. The process of nation building has been hampered through this injustice in sharing of revenue.

It is however, noted that despite the flaws imbedded in amalgamation, the process hastens and enhanced the existing structure of nation building in the region. That is the amalgamation facilitated socioeconomic growth and development of the county, especially the construction of railway lines and extension from Lagos to the northern part and Enugu to Port-Harcourt which are still existence till date. It has also enhanced politically in the international politics the nationality of the citizens anywhere in the world.

8. Ways to Peace and Sustainable Stability and Nation Building in Nigeria

- Despite the flaws in the amalgamation, Nigeria government could achieve virile socio-political system through constant review of the constitution to suit the various ethnic groups that made up the country. Military regime should be discarded totally in this new dispensation. That is democracy must be embraced by every Nigerian for a lasting and sustainable political development.
- Marginalization of the minorities should be checked for the attainment of sustainable democracy. This is required to give them sense of belonging in national appointment, wealth sharing on equal terms etc.
- Equality of every members of the society is required for sustainable national development and democracy. All tribes and

- people must be treated with equity and justice to facilitate nation building.
- There should be participation of all sectors in decision processes within the country, that is, industry and technology, agricultural sector, education, energy resource etc.
 - National integration could be accelerated if government is patriotic and liberal to all and sundry, bias and favoritism should be jettisoned, accountability and spirit of love for the nation will enhanced nation building.
 - The present political system could be sustained and durable if the political leaders are transparent in governance; absence of self-centeredness, as well as been resolute to forge ahead with laid down principles of democracy for accelerated growth and development in Nigeria present political dispensation.
 - The issue of sharing of national revenue should be addressed. It is only when these suggestions are taking into consideration by the government, that Nigeria would achieved the quest for social, economic and political development of the nation.

References

- Aghalino, SO, 'Combating the Niger Delta Crisis: An Appraisal of Federal Government Responses to Anti-Oil Protest in the Niger Delta, 1958-2000,' Maiduiguri Journal of Historical Studies, 2004, pp.20-30
- Alafuro, E, 'Taming the Monster: Critical Issues in Arresting the Origin of Youth Restiveness in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria' in Ojakorotu, V, et al., ed. Check-Mating the Resurgence of Oil Violence in the Niger Delta of Nigeria, 2010, pp.13-14.
- African Insight, 'The Oil Fields in Nigeria', Vol 29, No, 1-2, 1998, p.36-39
- Crocker, W. A(1974) Critique of British Colonial Administration. New York
- Dibua, 'Citizenship and Resource Control in Nigeria: The Case of Minority Communities in the Niger Delta', African Spectrum, 78 (3), 2006, pp.5-28.
- Duru, EJ, Oil Multinationals and the Niger Delta Crises: Issues and Perspectives. Owerri: African Scholars Publishing Company, 1999, pp. 29-34
- Ejobowah, JB, 'Who Owns the Oil? The Politics of Ethnicity in the Niger Delta of Nigeria', Africa Today, 47(1), 2000, pp. 35-36.
- Eghosa, E, 'Managing Multiple Minority Problems in a Divided Society: Nigeria Experience' *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 36(1), 1998, p11.
- Eluwa, G.Y.C. A History of Nigeria for Schools and Colleges, African, 1988
- Flint, JE, Sir George Goldie and the Making of Nigeria, London: Oxford University Press, 1960, p. 307.
- Frynas, JG, 'Corporate and State Responses to Anti-Oil Protests in the Niger Delta', African Affairs, 100, 2011, pp. 27-54,
- Frynas, JG, Oil in Nigeria: Conflict and Litigation between Oil Companies and Village Communities', Hamburg LT, 2000 p. 27.
- Ibeanu, O, 'State-Making and Internal Population Displacement: Factoring the State into Forced Migration in Nigeria during Military Rule: Africa at Cross-Road: Complex Political Emergence in the 21st Century', UNESCO/ENA, 2001, pp.1-22.
- Itse, S, 'True Federalism, Resource Control and the North', Vanguard Newspaper, June 23, 1995, p.34.
- Habibu Angelu: S. (2003). Rural and Urban Administration in Nigeria Second Edition, Tutu Publisher Okene Nigeria.
- Hannah, R.W. (1969). The Origins of Indirect Rule in Northern Nigeria 1890. 1914. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis Michigan State University.
- Ikporuko, CO, 'Petroleum, Fiscal Federalism and Environmental Justice in Nigeria' Paper Delivered at IFRA Monthly Seminar, UI, 7 July 1999.
- Michael, C. (1973). The story of Nigeria. Faber and Faber London.
- Michael, Crowther: West Africa under colonial rule.
- Michael, Crowther; Hutchinson publishing group Ltd. London Morris Jones and George Fisher (Ed) Decolonization and After. London.
- Nwabueze, O, Issue of Federalism in Nigeria, London; Oxford University Press, 1995, pp.23-54;
- National Archive Enugu (NAE) War Prof, CSO, Lagos, Mineral Ordinance 422/1916
- Nmadi Aduba and Martins O.G "Constitutional and Administrative Law "University of Jos Plateau state 1992 pp 24-29.
- Kk greene A. (1968): "Lugard and the Amalgamation of Nigeria: A document record" Frank Cass Co. Ltd London.
- Oziegbe, O, 'Quest for True Federalism in Nigeria', The Nation Newspaper, 11/8/2009, p36-40, <http://thenationonline.net/web2>
- Oyovbaire, SE, Federalism in Nigeria, the Study of Development of Nigerian State, London, Macmillan Publisher, 1985, pp. 8-23.

- Obaro Ikimi (Ed). (1980) *The Groundwork of Nigeria History*. Heinemann Educational Book.
- Ojo A. O. (1973) *Political Science and Government of Nigeria for West Africa*, Published Jan,
- Okonjo, I. M. (1974) *British Administration in Nigeria 1900-1950*. New York.
- Oxford Advanced Learner Dictionary pg. 26.
- Perham, M. (1960) *Lugard Years of Authority 1898-1945*. London.
- Taiwo, T.N. (1982) *The Evolution of the Nigerian State. The Southern phase 1898-1914* Longman U.K.
- Suberu, RT, (1998) 'Public Policy and Natural Unity in Nigeria', Monograph, Ibadan, Development Policy Centre, p. 19
- The Guardian Lagos, 19 Feb 1998.
- Wheare, KC (1953) *Federal Government*, London, Oxford University Press, 5th Edition pp. 20-38.
- World Bank Document, Republic of Nigeria, Niger Delta Social and Conflict Analysis' Sustainable Development Department African Region, May 2008, pp.12-28.