

# **INDIGENESHIP, CITIZENSHIP AND THE NIGERIAN STATE: A PHILOSOPHICAL APPRAISAL**

**Onyeka Emmanuel Uzowulu**

**&**

**Rev. Fr. Prof. BonaChristus Umeogu**

## **ABSTRACT**

Colonialism is a scar on the face of many African nations, while underdevelopment is their common feature. The effects of colonialism still hunt many African nations and led to underdevelopment in many African nations especially Nigeria. Most Nigerians believe that colonialism is the sole cause of the disharmony experienced in Africa today. Argument centers on the fact that the colonial masters through their selfish gains amalgamated different ethnic groups into one entity. Another group argues that amalgamation of the various ethnic groups in Nigeria was done without consent from the various groups; due to the absence of consent, there is no national unity rather, what we have callsfor disintegration and ethnic clashes. This lack of integration has contributed hugely to the underdevelopment experienced in Nigeria. The Nigerian predicament arises; where does the loyalty of the people lie? Is it within their ethnic groups as indigenes or with the State as citizens? Why is the loyalty of citizens divided between their ethnic group and the State at large? This research advocate for the pursuit of national development through national integration and this can be achieved only if there is a level of 'Group Mind' that is held to be objective and superior over the subjectivity of the ethnic group. This research elaborates on the importance of a change from what used to be to what should be. The analytical undertone of this research underscores the Nigerian Predicament with a review concerning the paradigm from indigene-ship to citizenship.

**Key words: Citizenship, Indigene-ship, Group mind, True Federalism**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The debate on nationalism and patriotism in Nigeria has remained an unending one for the many decades of its independence. Till today, an average Nigerian is only a citizen by paper and words never by action. A vital character of a citizen is being patriotic to himself, other citizens, and to his country. The freedom and will to respect, defend, and uphold justice are necessary characteristics of a patriotic citizen. However the case may have been presented and a solution sought after, the problem of an 'Unpatriotic Nigerian' continues to prevail. This is not only paramount to Nigeria alone but the majority of other African nations. Most of these nations in Africa are referred to as third world countries. This is due to the level of underdevelopment evident in these nations. The high rate of corruption in these countries led to increase in poverty in Africa states and has hindered her progress in as much, reduced her image to nothing when placed on the global map. The continent keeps experiencing lack of infrastructures; deep-rooted corruption

practices with no penalties, bad and decayed health facilities which all sums to bad governance.

Since independence, Nigeria has struggled to find a bearing when it comes to the patriotic qualities of its citizens. Typically, a policeman in Nigeria cannot be trusted because his integrity could be questioned. Everyone is innocently pointing guilty fingers at the other accusing him/her of being corrupt and thus, unpatriotic. The average Nigerian is patriotic in the following sequence; himself, his family, his ethnicity, and finally, the State. The illusion that the 'subject or a particular' is more important than the 'universal' is the virus that has eaten deep in every Nigerian citizen and this, in the long run, begets corruption. One may wish to wonder, how a united nation during the era of colonialism with so much dedication to the State turn a new leaf when independence was achieved. At every level of responsibility, there is a lack of commitment. The State and the citizen are not committed to one another. The Nigeria predicament is a sad story in which lack of commitment begets unpatriotic individuals who seek for every opportunity to cheat the state on one hand, and on the other hand, the State is been unpatriotic to her citizens.

Nigeria as a nation held many promises during the struggle and early post-independence days. Today, everyone can observe that Nigeria is the opposite of what was promised by the nationalist agitators. As a nation, Nigeria since attaining lots of challenges which runs from civil unrest to coup d'état to outright civil wars to corruption; the height of them all manifest in inter-ethnic clashes. The ethnic clash is a result of an irreconcilable disagreement which its origin can be traced to both the colonial and post-colonial era.

Before the advent of the colonial masters, Nigeria was made up of small kingdoms which were independent and had their sovereign. These tribes or kingdom had different unique distinct culture peculiar to them as a way of life. Kings and subjects were the subjects of the day and both were patriotic to the other. For instance, the eastern part of Nigeria before colonialism was very much a democratic nation specially characterized by the executive power resting with the people (clans). The King represents the nations and owes his subjects security, justice, and peace. The subjects are patriotic to the clans they are born into. They stand to defend their culture, lands, families, and king; subjects were indigenes because of their ethnic nationality. However, the Europeans through colonialism introduced a new sovereignty. The advent of colonialism in Nigeria led to the amalgamation of 1914 where the southern and northern proletariat was merged into one. Nigeria became a State and thus individuals experienced a paradigm from being an indigene to citizens.

Pre-colonial Africa had its traditional methods of doing things. They had traditional political institutions that had the interest of the indigenes to protect. Indigenes by default were patriotic to their ethnic groups and functioned in unity and solidarity for the development of their ethnic groups. The colonial masters did not consider the indigeneship of the indigenes and forcefully instituted citizenship on them without consent. The battle for identity emanated from this mistake or mere-like intentional act of the colonial masters. The underdevelopment of Nigeria can be traced to the crisis of identity. Colonialism integrated new cultural practices and introduced a new culture in Nigeria. This change affected the worldview, language, beliefs, and dressings, and the political system of Nigeria. Today, the same individual is battling for identity with his loyalty

struggling between his ethnic group and his country. Nigerians judge that which is indigenous as inferior and this was injected into them by the Europeans who first saw them as people who lack both intellectual and moral inferior. As C. R. L James (1977) states,

Africans are, and always have been, a backward and barbarous people who have never been able to establish any civilized society of their own... These barbarous people were brought into contact with civilization by the brutalities of the slave trade. However, the un-happy slave trade is happily behind us, and as a result of their contact with European civilization, primitive Africans became a part of a unified world...

The fact remains that Nigeria as a nation cannot boast of patriotic citizens not because the individuals are not capable of being patriotic rather, it is a result of the unpleasant foundation upon which the nation was built. We have established that individuals in Nigeria struggle with identity crisis amongst being an indigene (patriotic to their ethnic groups) and being a citizen (patriotic to the State.)

Anyiam Osigwe (2012) in his wonder traced the reason for the under-development in Africa. He postulates that the problem with Africa's developmental challenges does possess a historical foundation. Nationhood according to him could not be achieved in Africa because the foundational bedrock of many African nations was faulty and myopic. If the foundation is faulty, the building cannot hold/stand. He further pinpoints the failure of the post-colonial African nation, blaming her struggles on the era of colonialization. The Europeans came into Africa with the sole intention to expand their markets. They colonized the Africans by introducing their cultures to indigenes. The 1914 amalgamation in Nigeria only served a subjective and personal interest. The Europeans in their selfish pursuit did not care about the future result of bringing different persons together, not minding their ethnic and religious background. Anyiam Osigwe (2012) states; "colonialism which engendered the present dimension of statehood in Africa, brought these various nationalities together under common political leadership. This political leadership was enforced and foreign."

The concept of national development is a continuous process. It involves the political, social, economic, legal, ethnic, demographic, and technological growth of a nation. On the contrary, these have continued to threaten our existence as African. Some crisis results from either ethnic clashes or religious clashes or political clashes, etc. Many lives are lost and development is at risk when there is no peace and common interest. Although Africa receives lots of aid from international organizations such as UNESCO, UNICEF, etc, she has failed to move out of the shambles of index poverty. African development has always been characterized by being slow-paced.

Nigeria today is regarded as a third world country. This is due to the level of underdevelopment evident in our country. The high rate of corruption led to increase in poverty in Nigeria and has her progress in as much, reduced her image to nothing when

placed on the global map (Uzowulu, 2020). Without an already proscribed identity, the average Nigerian continues to struggle between being a citizen, an indigene or both or none. Until the average Nigerian understands the role he plays as both an indigene and citizen, the country will experience all form of bad governance. Thus, this research undertakes to underscore the Nigerian as an indigene on one hand and as a citizen on the other. The Nigerian predicament could be remedied with proper application of the group mind.

### **INDIGENES AND CITIZENSHIP**

Jones (2012) defined the term 'indigenous peoples' as referring to the original or native inhabitants of areas that have been colonized by Europeans, especially in Africa, Asia, America, and Australasia. The category of indigenous populations was adopted for the first time in international law by the International Labour Organization in ILO Convention no. 107 of 1957 concerning the protection and integration of indigenous and tribal populations in independent countries. Different scholars have provided different interpretations of what they understand by indigene-ship. Etymologically, the word 'indigene' is derived to mean 'native' or 'born within'. In other words, an indigene is an indigene of a particular heritage where his/her paternal ancestry could be traced. Thus, by default of patrilocal ancestry of birth, a person becomes a native or indigene of a particular place. The phrase 'indigenous' is derived from two Greek words, 'indo' and 'genous' which both means, inside/within and birth/born/race respectively. A group of people with the same ethnic, traditional, and cultural background may be described as indigenes of that particular region. In other words, people are naturally by birth an indigene however, how do we reconcile indigene-ship with citizenship?

'What is citizenship?' is not an easy question to answer because it could mean differently in context and contest relying on the existing political tradition. However, we are to take a soft landing in other not to complicate things. The term "citizenship" is carved out from the word citizen which originates from the Latin root word 'civitas' which means a city, state or body of citizens. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy defines a citizen as "a member of a political community who enjoys the right and assumes the duties of membership." From the above, a citizenship bestows on a citizen rights that includes, civil, political, legal and social rights. A citizen has the legal right to act freely in accordance to the law; he possess the right to exercise his political franchise because he is a political agent living in a political community.

Iwuagwu (2015) asserts that citizenship as a concept 'involves an individual's link or relationship with the state or country in which the person is entitled to legal, social and political rights and in turn, owes duties ... and social responsibilities.' Citizenship is a collection of rights and responsibilities which is bestowed on an individual granting a formal/legal identity. Under the current legislation of Nigeria, citizenship could be gain either by birth, registration or by naturalization. The Nigerian constitution makes provision for models of citizenship and factors to determine it. It is the constitutional basic right of a citizen to be protected by the law irrespective of his tribe/ethnic background. However, the Nigerian experience portrays otherwise; where citizenship is disregarded and led into the slaughter house by indigenes.

### THE NIGERIAN PREDICAMENT

Nigeria is an entity comprising of different ethnic and cultural groups and as a nation continues to struggle in the quest to achieve unity because their priority is still in the search for identity; a search to reconcile the reality of the pre-colonial era and the post-colonial era. The problem with Nigeria's underdevelopment is no longer the amalgamation but the inability to create policies that would promote the 'Group Mind'. The mistakes of the Europeans have been noted but it is time Nigerians sat up and forge ahead. Osigwe (2012) a chief advocate for the adoption of the principle of 'group mind' states; "it is erroneous to seek to erode the indigene-ship status of the people... the proper approach is to reconcile the indigene-ship of the people with their citizenship status."

Nigeria as a nation continues to witness hardship, insecurity, disharmony, corruption, etc which in turn, has affected its development. Various governments have risen from both coups and elected processes with promises and ideas to better the lives of their citizens but they all wind up to the same table of mismanagement. You may be tempted to ask, is the problem of Nigeria's underdevelopment insoluble? What have our leaders done and are their actions in the right direction? What is expected from citizens as they are truly in reality, the government? The problem of Nigeria is not superficial but deep-rooted.

The Nigerian predicament runs deep exposing that the whole system is wrong. A building built on a shaky foundation will at some point lead to the collapse of the building. The problem of Nigeria's underdevelopment is not because of bad policies or governments or institutions. The problem is deep-rooted, deep-rooted not in Nigeria as a whole but the individuals. Everything centers on the individual who in this scenario is battling for an identity of being an indigene or a citizen due to the colonial effect. Ngozi Adichie (2006) vividly stated;

... my point is that the only authentic identity for the African is the tribe... I am Nigerian because a white man created Nigeria and gave me that identity. I am black because the white man constructed *black* to be as different as possible from his *white*. But I was Igbo before the white man came.

The multi-ethnic diversity in Nigeria presupposes that we can find with proper distinction at maximum, 350 ethnic distinct peculiarities and cultural practices. The tri-dichotomy between the individual, his ethnic background, and the nation is the bulk of the Nigerian predicament today. We shall look at a few scenarios related to the Nigerian experience under the following themes;

### CORRUPTION

In Nigeria, the term 'corruption' is recited more than the national anthem. It is a virus that can be found everywhere in the world. According to Wraith and Simpkins quoted by Onigu (2006), "corruption has been with societies throughout history." Corruption has remained an underlying factor in many African countries including Nigeria. It negates development and continues to remain its greatest enemy. Corruption can be defined simply as any form of dishonesty or fraudulent act which involves both giving and taking

of a bribe. It is the 'improper and usually unlawful conduct intended to secure a benefit for oneself or another.'

In Nigeria corruption has been adopted as a way of living. It is regarded as a survival instinct whereby what normally could be accomplished in a few minutes take hours, days, weeks, or even years if you don't 'roger' or 'rub hands'. This is what Dukor (2006) refers to when he opines that 'what is called corruption is an adaption of the traditional gift-giving'. An average citizen/individual in Nigeria is expectant of some sort of gift which mostly includes money or favors for helping another who was in desperate need. The problem with this receiving gifts for a duty one is expected to carry out based on one's obligation is that it has a way of infecting the intention and thus, may prevent or infringe on justice (rule).

An average Nigerian citizen is guilty of the double standard. The social standard in Nigeria encourages all to be greedy, selfish, and self-centered. The leaders steal from public funds by embezzling and siphoning funds meant for public projects that could progress development. For instance, contracts are not awarded to the best contractor/candidate and if they are awarded, the cost of execution must have been hiked up double or more of the original cost; students cheat in exams with most bribing their way through their teachers for grades; the customs officer allows contraband goods and services to be imported into the country as long as he gets his share from the spoils. All these and others are many forms of the corrupt practices that have eaten deep into the Nigerian citizen. Dukor (2006) states further that 'corruption is a cankerworm that needs serious control if Nigeria ever hopes to make any appreciable progress towards development.

Corruption thrives in Nigeria because of the misplaced priority amongst individuals who first identify themselves as indigenes against citizenship which may seem proper. However, the problem becomes, knowing when to be a citizen and when to be an indigene. Encyclopedia listed five themes which summarized the African predicament; the fourth theme, 'the culture and identity crisis where there is a gradual effort to show how the carving for an identity, other than African, depletes the collective humanity of the African people' explains the Nigerian predicament where he struggles for identity between being an indigene and a citizen.

If we decide to switch our attention a little bit to the issues of corruption in Nigeria which has remained a virus, we can accept that it has eaten deep into the 'Nigerian' that he sees it as a normal way of living. The leaders are all corrupt, the citizens are corrupt and this progress into '**an improper faction**'. An improper fraction is a situation where the subjective is given more credence above the objective. The subjective receives more focus and attention to the detriment of the universal and objective whole. The problem of corruption is not only stealing public funds or looting of the treasury of the states but the misplacement of honor for punishment. Events of records present evidence wherein expectance for corrupt individuals to receive condemnation and blame, they are praised

and honored. In this regard, some ethnic groups go as far as protecting their son or daughter who has been accused of corruption. Following from the above, corruption cannot be effectively eliminated in any country if there is an improper fraction. The improper fraction is that these ethnic groups who end up defending their sons/daughters are neglecting the Group mind which is universal and objective against their subjective interest. There should be a re-orientation whereby citizens are educated on the importance of the group mind by learning how to live as both citizens and indigenes.

### **THE CITIZEN VS THE INDIGENE**

Nigeria's development is a necessary goal but can only become a reality when an enabling environment is provided. This enabling environment can be put in place by making policies that would promote the interest of the individual as both an indigene on one hand and as a citizen on the other which could be interpreted in the bigger as - ethnic groups on one hand and that of the nation on the other. The idea of national integration implies that there is a need for internal harmony within the individual and then the nation; an internal harmony that will foster development at all levels. As aptly put by Dukor (2003);

The conflict of ethnic and civic nationalism in Nigerian nationalism is therefore not just a macro-conflict at the exterior national plane but essentially a micro-conflict within the interiority of the integrity and individuality of the human person...

Osigwe (2006) observes that 'the proper approach is to reconcile the indigene-ship of the people with their citizenship.' From the above, we have noted that indigene-ship is acquired through birth while citizenship is acquired through nationalization. Logically, an individual becomes an indigene of a particular ethnicity first before he/she could be regarded as a citizen of a nation/state.

A typical Nigerian has the problem of motivation when it comes to the most symbolic item of patriotism. The average American is both a stakeholder and postulator of the American flag. He is ready to defend the flag anywhere and anytime. One may be tempted to say that the Nigerian flag was forcefully inducted by the colonial masters. Consequently, more attention is given to secessionist ethnic groups such as Biafra Republic, Oduduwa Republic, Arewa, etc. They are all advocating for both self-identification and political liberation which is against the unity that stabilizes nationality. It is important to note that here lies the issue of the Nigerian predicament. The defining element that bounds a nation of multi-ethnicity is 'patriotism'. Patriotism promotes togetherness in such a way that it harnesses our differences without prejudice to foster unity and progress. However, Nigeria has been suffering from the plague of ethnic differentiation and distinction. The idea that some particular ethnic group is to remain rulers or that a part is more educated and civilized as against others who are seen as illiterates and barbarians. How can we achieve a 'One Nigeria' when the Igbo views the Hausa as an illiterate or one without standard education; the Yoruba man regards the Igbo man as greedy and money conscious; the Hausa describes the Yoruba as a saboteur and coward while other minority ethnic group are regarded as followers and low-class citizens?

There is in absence, a united front whose attitude is placed on being patriotic. Nigeria has recorded conflict clashes between ethnic groups. Odimegwu (2006) observes that;

These conflicts of ethnic and civic nationalism in Nigeria constitute, for the average Nigerian citizen, a conflict and dislocation of loyalties between the Nigerian State and the various ethnic nationalities in the State. When these conflicts and dislocations manifest in the political class, the matter is further complicated for the result is no longer a case of feeling of personal loyalty but of the practical privatization, ethnicization, and misappropriation of State's resources. This is, of course, looking at the matter from the perspective of civic nationalism as the ethnic nationalist sees such actions as both just and patriotic.

The Nigerian predicament between indigenes vs. citizens expands in such a way that before her political sovereignty, the country was divided into (North and South) based on ethnic similarities. Today, we have three major ethnic groups – Igbo, Hausa, and Yoruba. Each cultural identity is based on the people resident in a particular region. In as much that individuals see themselves as indigenes first then, there is bound to be 'factionalization' of loyalties along ethnic lines in many of these states. The consequences, in civil relations, have been lack of commitment of the citizens to the states i.e. lack of patriotism.” The desired attitude expected from the citizen by the State is on the negative impact on national integration. Odimegwu (2006) observes that there is a triangular relationship between the State, ethnic group, and the citizen. In his view, 'the commitment demanded by the State from the citizen is negatively affected by the centrifugal influence of the ethnic affiliation'.

Indigene-ship could easily be drawn from ancestral placement whereby an association of people move into a virgin area and conquer with their culture. By birth, indigene-ship is bestowed and received. Citizenship on the other hand runs into nationhood which involves socio-political developments. In the case of Nigeria, it is not without unnoticeable challenges that there have been great challenges when it comes to the ability to managing the relationship between different ethnic groups. The emergence of the State called 'Nigeria' was to satisfy the desire of the elite class of the colonial masters. There was indeed an absence of a natural bond that progresses unity. Iwuagwu (2015) points out that in “Nigeria it is more profitable to be an indigene than to be a citizen since “indigene-ship” carries with it all the rights and privileges of citizenship whereas Nigerian citizenship does not carry with it the rights and privileges offered by “indigene-ship”.” He recognized that there is an undue recognition and loyalty the ethnic groups enjoy more than the Nigerian state. Today, the individual is lost in his crisis of loyalty; how does he benefit from being an indigene and a citizen? The Nigerian predicament radically points out the fact that the citizens by natural freedom have given so much to the State but received nothing or only a marginal portion of what was given. The government is corrupt and shows zero concern for their citizens' welfare and by implication, the citizen runs back into his ethnic group for solace.



The Nigerian state owes some responsibility to the individual both as an indigene and a citizen (Onigu, 2005). Until the state (government) joins the individual as he struggles to find his way, seeking convincing grounds upon which he must be patriotic, there will always be continuous disappointments. So, the first step is to achieve and install good governance which will promote the interest of patriotism on the individual. Good governance which includes proper participation of citizens, the adequate manifestation of the rule of law, transparency, and accountability remains a mirage in Nigeria. For over 60 years of independence, the nation has continued to suffer and wallow in underdevelopment as a result of poor and bad leadership.

### **THE ROLE OF GOOD GOVERNANCE**

Post-independence Nigeria has been bedeviled by corruption and like other developing African countries, the problem of governance results in political instability, unaccountability, graft, etc. embezzlement. The absence of a natural evolution in the social contract that binds Nigeria with regards to patriotism, rule of law, justice, and good governance affects the Nigerian citizen individually and national integration at large. Good governance begets good and patriotic citizens. Dukor (2006) noted that 'the pinnacle of the collapse of citizenship in Nigeria is corruption.' Corruption in governance which is the absence of transparency and accountability has remained a plague aiding not only bad governance but crippling efforts engineered towards promoting national integration and development.

Despite how important good governance is to a nation's development, the successive governments continue to play deaf ears and turn blind eyes to it. Political leaders are not concerned about the greater good instead, they are concerned about their selfish gains. In Nigeria, political leaders are not interested in the group mind. They are in offices as gods, wealthy people, most influential persons, etc. forgetting the primary call to duty which is 'service'. They turn politics and leadership into a business enterprise where they trade lies, propaganda, and injustice in return for wealth and power. (Adegami & Uche 2016) asserted thus:

Most of the political leaders in Nigeria could best be described as political merchants. This is because; they see politics as a business deal that brings forth huge profits. Nigeria's political leaders do not believe in service to the people; instead, they are self-serving as they serve themselves more than the governed, hence always play politics of wealth acquisition. Many of these so-called leaders came to power without "shoe" but after spending few years in the offices, they would not only have acquired many shoes, but would have garnered a fleet of cars, private jets, and different mansions in choice areas of Nigeria and abroad. They equally would have owned fat bank accounts in Nigeria as well as foreign accounts across the world. This type of politics thus, becoming the bane of Nigeria's efforts at developments.

Naturally, people may disagree on the best form of governance but, they all accept that good governance is vital for socio-economic progress in a nation. If we dissect the phrase 'good governance', we will have 'good' and 'governance'. The question one may be tempted to ask is, 'what is good?' and what is 'bad'? Philosophically, the question of what is good and bad has been subjected to the ethical value of action but this is not the center of this discussion. The idea of good governance in summary is the promotion of the group mind. According to Taiwo (2020), good governance is a “relatively new term that is often used to describe the desired objective of a nation-state's political development. The principles of good governance, however, are not new.” What is advocated as Good governance by the United Nations is in short, anti-corruption whereas authority and its institutions are accountable, effective and efficient, participatory, transparent, responsive, consensus-oriented, and equitable.

### **THE GROUP MIND IN NIGERIA**

The basis of every community in every community is the family. This singular family placed together with other families forms a conglomeration of families which formulates a common descent and ancestry. They share a common language and belief system and they are born into a common identity. The difference between this and what the colonial masters did is that they did not respect the sovereignty of these different ethnic groups. There was no consultation or form of common interest among the various ethnic groups during the amalgamation. The foundation was built on all that is wrong. Anyiam Osigwe (2012) expressed; "the overriding objective was to enforce or compel loyalty to a superstructure that was, to all intents and purposes, entirely unreal and inapplicable."<sup>2</sup> Can Nigeria stand and sustain unity? If yes, for how long and through what means? The various conflicts in Nigeria from independence to date aids to buttress the weakness of the amalgamation. The Boko-haram terrorism, the farmers and Fulani herdsmen conflict, the Nigerian civil war, the police brutality against citizens, corruption, etc. are scenarios that expose the inability of these ethnic groups to function together as an entity. The 'group mind' as an entity becomes inevitable. It exposes an idea or prototype that explains how different parts are placed together but working as a whole.

### **A PHILOSOPHICAL EVALUATION OF THE MULTICULTURAL AFTERMATH AND THE GROUP MIND IN NIGERIA**

When we encounter the phrase 'group mind' what should narrow in our reflection should be the qualifiers of 'particular and universals'. According to **Claudio (2013)**, 'people often tend to form groups. They congregate at certain times and become propitious to tolerate each other and establish ties of friendship, which are only reaffirmed when intolerance is overlooked.' The adoption of a group mind in Nigeria is aimed to reconsider the individual Nigerian as an indigene (Hausa, Igbo or Yoruba); the various ethnic groups on one hand as 'particular', and the State on the other as the 'universal'.

Let us apply a simple use of logic of categorical proposition. If we assume that the practical case in Nigeria is, 'All indigene are citizens' and 'some citizens are indigenes', one can conclude without hesitation that this is obtainable after the amalgamation. The

sum of indigenes is ethnicity and the sum of the different ethnic groups is the entity Nigeria. Thus, we may ask, how does the Hausa, Igbo, Yoruba man see himself? Before the advent of the colonial masters, the available proposition in Nigeria was; 'All indigenes are indigenes'. The amalgamation introduced 'all indigenes are citizens' and the philosopher will ask, in the case of Nigeria, are all indigenes truly citizens? Do we have occasions where 'some indigenes are citizens' and 'some indigenes are not citizens'? An example would be, in Nigeria, do we identify individually as a Hausa man first before being Nigerian or firstly as a Nigerian and then as a Hausa man. On stronger reasons, an average Nigerian citizen can either be identified as a Hausa-Nigerian or a Nigerian-Hausa. This research recommends Hausa-Nigerian as it explains better the group mind analogy as well as provides a solution to the Nigeria's multicultural issues.

Nigeria is not the only nation on this planet with cultural differences. Every culture have their uniqueness with their plans and projects all based on different time zones. Multicultural nations naturally are prone to face difficulties due to their diverse nature. There is bound to be conflict consciously and sub-consciously and thus, the responsibility of any leader is to ensure justice, peace and most importantly, unity. The various Nigerian predicament which includes conflicts amongst ethnic groups makes it evident that Nigeria does not practice true federalism and if they do, it is on in paper and theories.

America is an example of a multicultural nation with a practice of true federalism. Both the 1979 and 1999 constitution captures Nigeria as a federal capital practicing true federalism. What is the problem with the Nigeria situation and why are we yet to get it right? Oyovbaire (1985) situated that 'true federalism' can be efficient only in a democratic setting. He further states that, 'federalism in a democracy is 'true federalism' because of the interrelatedness and complementariness of democracy and federalism. The 'group mind' has its foundation on 'true federalism' and democracy. Stephanie Dion as cited in Sagay (2004) agrees;

Without democracy, genuine federalism is impossible. To be sure, there have been dictatorships or totalitarian regimes that have claimed to be federations. Some still exist today. However, genuine federalism presupposes the respect of a division of constitutional powers between two orders of government. If all political power in the country is in fact under the control of a single party, it is difficult for the federative form of the state to be anything more than a façade. It is within a democracy that federalism finds its true meaning.

The group mind establishes a means where powers will be given to the various individual parts to function independently with little or the barest minimum interference from the central. The group mind as advocated in this research rests on true federalism because it encourages and permits non-centralization of government. The idea of indigene-ship and citizenship is the contention between the individual and the state as it relates being

patriotic. Though the Nigerian state is conglomeration of ethnicity, there is a division into states with aim of practicing true federalism, thus, brings the government closer to the people. However, the positive values of true federalism have not been felt in Nigeria. If we accept that federalism differs in accord to nations, we should also accept that federalism and its tenets are universal.

From the foregoing argument, it is enough pointer to the crisis circulating Nigeria revolves around the battle between indigene-ship and citizenship. The paradigm advocated by this research calls for a balance between indigene-ship which is natural, pristine, and embedded while citizenship is derived through the legal process. From the analysis, most Africans have their loyalty divided between their ethnic group and the nation. It is evident in a Nigerian reality, for example, an individual identifies as an Igbo man or Yoruba or Hausa man which is his indigenous group before identifying as a Nigerian citizen. This clash for an identity for the African man is because the colonial masters did not allow these ethnic communities to voluntarily co-commune. Thus, in Nigeria, the group mind is absent because there is no common agreement on the existing coexistence. The process of amalgamation which was to integrate smaller communities to arrive at a larger social nation backfired due to a lack of appreciation of the differences of the different ethnic groups. In the Nigerian situation, the individuals have their loyalty divided between being a citizen or indigene as against the State; between their ethnic group mind and national group mind. No one can serve two masters at the same time and be equally loyal to both at the same time.

The absence of a true representation of the group mind will lead to more conflicts, civic unrest, and damages such as destruction of infrastructures and the death of millions of lives. The idea of 'Group Mind' is absent in Nigeria and that has been the major cause of her underdevelopment. The Group Mind cannot be actualized because Nigerians are still battling with corresponding and committing to statehood. The 'group mind' in ensuring and guaranteeing a united Nigeria must respect the interest of the entire ethnic groups. It is from this unity in the Group Mind that we can then achieve the state of nationhood. An individual naturally identifies with his ethnic background before the State. The case should be that he is patriotic to the State through his ethnicity. This is the point of contention in the group mind.

This research evaluates the need for a united front through the group mind in Nigeria; this would speed up the process of development, encourage patriotism, and promote nationhood. A valid conclusion in logic can be found in a deductive syllogism. In deductive syllogism, Copi (2011) the flow of inference moves from the universal to universal/particular. The importance of the State supersedes that of the ethnic group. The subjective/relative is absorb and fused into the objective where the objective interest serves also the interest of the subjective. There is a similarity in what the researchers are advocating for in the group mind vis-à-vis Nigeria's development to what is obtained in the state of nature and social contract of Hobbes and Locke. The social contract according to Locke elaborates that man naturally seeks the other but in doing that, he surrenders his

interest in the good and peaceful co-existence in the State. Locke in his *Two Treatises of Government* (1980) states;

...we are naturally induced to seek communion and fellowship with others: this was the cause of men's uniting themselves at first in politic societies. But I moreover affirm, that all men are naturally in that state, and remain so, till by their consents they make themselves members of some politic society; and I doubt not in the sequel of this discourse, to make it very clear.

In light of our earlier exposition, one can understand the importance of the group mind. It summarizes the functions between the citizens and State on one hand and that of the State and citizen vice versa. From our deliberation, it connotes that the State and the ethnic groups are two sides of the same coin thus by implication, they both have to complement one another. At first glance, the ethnic group integrates into the State by submitting their identity, values, interests, and perspectives to the state; this does not mean submission to the State rather it will enable the State to identify the various peculiarities amongst the different ethnic groups. Just like in the social contract, this would be done in willingness, free from coercion; the ethnic nationalities will out its subjective nature to the State and for its sustainability. The State absorbs the ethnic groups by “elevating the consciousness of the citizenry beyond the limiting confines of ethnicity by ensuring that the interest of each ethnic group, which is subsumed in the overall interest of the State, is also assumed in that overall interest of the state.” The State encourages independent competitive functionality among the federating units. Federalism as exposed in the group mind is fit for multicultural nations because it produces a non-equilibrium political system. Therefore, the different ethnic groups in Nigeria through a referendum, accept the group mind and come together; with a bargaining voice for an intergovernmental relation where the central permits power and authority to the parts; the parts (various constituencies) in their bid to acquire a better life based on valued identity, promotes the economy and political freedom of the State.

With the proper implementation of the group mind, Nigeria can very much in her unity compete at the international stage. One thing that is clear at this point is that ethnic groups would better manage internal competition among themselves. From our submission, the various ethnic groups should form a strong cluster with a unified worldview and challenge at the international stage as one nation. Nigeria with lots of tribal differences should provide and enable an environment where the Igbo, Hausa, Yoruba, and other ethnic groups are independent and allowed to grow at their pace with little dependence on the central. Nigeria lays great dependence on the central so much that it diminishes the natural competitive nature of the different federating units. There is absolute dependence on the central by the various ethnic group which in turn eliminates creativity which begets healthy competition among the various ethnic groups. To ensure that indigenes are patriotic, the corresponding federal units (ethnic groups/state government) should be independent yet co-ordinate with the central government (State). If we compare what is

obtainable in Nigeria and what is obtainable in America, we will find out that the American federal system have continued to evolved based on the changing situations of things. America's federalism have metamorphosed from centralizing federalism, cooperative federalism, creative federalism, permissive federalism and now to new federalism. (Nsemba, 2015). The group mind here encourages true federalism in Nigeria with the clear picture that power resides more with the state while responsibilities and servicing resides with the ethnic groups. In other words, there should be a balance between physical federalism and fiscal federalism in Nigeria.

Another conception of the group mind as a determinant in Nigeria's development and national integration centers on core human values. From the recurrent philosophical debate, a society that wants to associate itself with development must never overlook the importance of values. There should be core values which stipulates what is vital and universal. The symbolization of values is evident in the expression of a core human identity, thus, there should be a common ground and that common ground is 'humanity'. These core values transcend ethnic, religious, and cultural backgrounds. If for instance there is a conflict between an ethnic group and the State, the State's values remain superior. In other words, according to Anyaim Osigwe (2012), 'where culture conflicts with these values that aspect of the particular culture has never survived against the moral strength of this universal culture.'

The controversy of how we can imbibe these core human values to indigenes produces a puzzle for another discourse. However, through assimilation of *proper education*, the core values can be imprinted into the individual as an indigene who should also embrace being a citizen. No nation can achieve development without 'proper education'. The core values can be taught in school from the youngest of an age whereby the curriculum of the little children must teach human core values because they are the future of a nation. They can only give what they received. If they are taught good patriotism, good patriot they will be. Human relations can only be maintained when they are born into the learning process where they become less sentimental about differences such as religion, language, tribe, etc. which are also learned in the school.

## CONCLUSION

The research from the beginning has traced the Nigerian predicament which has remained a puzzling problem fostering national development. Indeed, society is a complex social system that should be developing but this has not been the case in Nigeria. Nigeria as a nation blessed with both human and natural resources continues to climb down the ladder when it comes to development and advancement. Ethnic conflicts and wars have reduced citizens to indigenes. Lack of patriotism, corruption, ethnic clashes, and poor governance are the few predicaments facing the Nigeria State. The solution to these predicaments which in return will foster nationhood and development was suggested into the acceptance and adequate application of the group mind. Ethnicity has never aided national progress rather, it has caused more division which if harnessed properly would lead to the development of the State. Federalism as exposed in the group mind is fit for

multicultural nations because it produces a non-equilibrium political system. Trying to treat or assume equality amongst ethnic groups by providing a united central which supersedes all affirms by centralizing power will always encourage rebellious ethnic clashes. Power in the group mind is shared evenly, each according to the ability of their particular mind. Decentralization of power encourages competition and it is evident amongst developed nations; competition among the various groups projects more in interest for the State. However, ethnic conflicts are prominent in Nigeria's political sphere because many citizens do not participate in the political process and policy formulation process of the country, so they appear to be left out of the scheme of things (Ahagmelu 2016). Nigerians do not see themselves as a product of social change when they act as citizens. Today, many of the wars and crises have been instigated by ethnic and religious sentiments.

The authors call for the realization for national integration of the entire ethnic group mind which involves a movement from indigene-ship to citizenship. This does not mean total annihilation of the ethnic group mind but an inclusive national front which would provide despite the differences a sense of belonging, thus, a national group mind. A good analogy is a human body; whereby the head is different from the hand and the legs are also different from the ears and other parts. All are independent in functions differently for the good and growth of the body. None rebels against the other but rather aim for the holistic good of the body. The view of the authors includes that power at the central should be disturbed with trust amongst the various ethnic groups and in return, the different ethnic groups function together though independently for the objective good of the Group Mind (nation) and it is through such that nation-building can be achieved. Until we accept a humanitarian core value in Nigeria, it will continue to remain a difficulty to blend ethnic groups into nationhood.

**Onyeka Emmanuel Uzowulu**

Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

&

**Rev. Fr. Prof. BonaChristus Umeogu**

Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

**REFERENCES**

- Adegbami, A. & Uche, C. I. N. (2016). "Despotic democrats versus good governance: Challenges of administration of Nigeria's fourth republic," *Journal of Developing Areas*, 50(4).
- Adichie, C. N. (2009). *Half a Yellow Sun*, (HarperCollins Publishers).
- African Predicament/Encyclopedia of Philosophy (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.iep.utm.edu/afr-pred/#SH2d>,
- Aghameli F. C. & Aghameli H. U. (n.d.). *Ethnic Conflict In Pluralist Nigeria: Entrenching Participatory Democracy*. Retrieved from <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/jrhr/article/view/141465>
- Copi, I. M. et al. (2011). *Introduction to Logic*, (India: Pearson Inc.).
- Dukor, M. (2003) Ethnic Nationalism and a Theory of Nation – Building. In M. Dukor (ed.), *Philosophy and Politics*, (Lagos: Malthouse Press,).
- Dukor, M. (2016). Problem of corporate citizenship in Nigeria. In I. Odimegwu (ed.), *Philosophy and Africa*, (Anambra: Lumos Nig. Ltd.).
- Freud's Theory and the Group Mind Theory: Formulations Claudio Garcia Capitão. Reterieved from. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojmp.2014.31003>.
- Iwuagwu, E. K. The Concept of Citizenship: Its Application and Denial in the Contemporary Nigerian Society. Retrieved from. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327388390>.
- James, C. L. R., provides a summary of the system of ideas that served as the ideological underpinning of the colonial enterprise in his book entitled, *Nkrumah and the Ghana Revolution* (London: Allison and Bushy).
- Jones, M. (2002). "Playing the Indigenous Card? The Shetland and Orkney Udal Law Group and Indigenous Rights". *Geo Journal*, 77(6). Retreived from <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10708-010-9380-8>.
- Locke John. (1980). *Two Treaties of Government*, (Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis and Cambridge).
- (n.d.). Retrieved from, [www.britannica.com/topic/corruption-law](http://www.britannica.com/topic/corruption-law)
- Nsemba E.L., *Is There Any True Federalism? Revisiting the 'True Federalism' Debate in Nigeria*. Retrieved from, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299580344>.



- Odimegwu, I. (2006) Nigerian Nationalism and the Crisis of Patriotism: Conceptual Dialogics. In I. Odimegwu (ed.), *Philosophy and Africa*, (Anambra Lumos Nig. Ltd)
- Onigu, Itite.( 2006, Tuesday January, 17). "On the Sociological Study of Corruption" where is NEMA'S #470million? Daily Sun, p. 13.
- Osigwe, A. (2012). That Sense of Community Synthesis For Nationhood: Ethnic Policy and National Integration; From Indigene to Citizens,(Lagos: Osigwe Anyiam-Osigwe Foundation).
- Oyovbaire, S. E. (1985). The Theory of Federalism: A Critical Appraisal, *Nigeria Journal of Political Science*, 1 (1), June, Zaria: Ahmadu Bello University, Nigeria.
- Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy online (2020) Retrieved from <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/citizenship/>*
- Sagay, I. E. (2004). *Anatomy of Federalism, With Special Reference to Nigeria*", (A 15<sup>th</sup> Distinguished Lecture and Luncheon Delivered to The House of Lords, at Broking House, Ibadan, Nigeria).
- Uzowulu, O. E. (2020). A Review of Charles Nweke's "Social Stability within the Nigerian State". Retrieved from , [https://acjol.org/index.php/jassd/article/view/jassd\\_v3n1\\_10/241](https://acjol.org/index.php/jassd/article/view/jassd_v3n1_10/241).