

A Critical Appraisal of the Philosophical Foundation of the Concept of Internal Colonialism in Ken Saro-Wiwa

Alubabari Desmond Nbeta, Ph.D.

Department of Philosophy, University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

Abstract

Ken Saro-Wiwa is famous for his literary works and activities as an environmental rights activist. One dominant theme in some of his works is internal colonialism. He describes the Nigerian State as promoting economic strangulation, political marginalization and environmental degradation (in a manner and on a scale that is tantamount to ecoterrorism) of some groups or communities, all of which are by-products of a deeply entrenched phenomenon of *internal colonialism*. He also identifies the superimposition of a unitary system on a federal state structure as a major undoing of the Nigerian state. Following from that, he recommends what he calls “erectism” as a suitable model of political and fiscal governance for a multi-ethnic state such as Nigeria. This work adopts a *constructivist* approach in critically appraising the key postulates of Saro-Wiwa’s theory of internal colonialism in order to explore its philosophical foundation. I argue in defence of Saro-Wiwa’s rejection of internal colonialism as unjust or “evil.” The work also recommends the application of the key postulates of the concept of “erectism” in which is embedded the principle of true federalism, as a suitable model for the governance of multi-ethnic states.

Keywords: Internal Colonialism, Saro-Wiwa, Erectism, Control, political Marginalization, Economic Exploitation, and ecological degradation

Date of Submission: 26-01-2021

Date of Acceptance: 11-02-2021

I. INTRODUCTION

The main thrust of this work is to analyse Saro-Wiwa’s theory of internal colonialism and critically appraise the philosophical theories or principles on which his concept of ‘erectism’ as a paradigm for addressing internal colonialism in Nigeria is founded. This is a somewhat herculean task, more so, because Saro-Wiwa’s works were not primary intended to articulate a philosophical system or theory but to provide a pattern of framework of resource governance and principles of justice that would promote national development and cohesion. He was more of a writer, a political commentator and social critic than a dedicated theorist. However, the postulates of his theory verge on some major themes in philosophy, and his analyses are so penetrating that they warrant profound philosophical appraisal. This is particularly necessary in order to assess justness, suitability and universality or otherwise of the theory and its postulates. Pursuing the objectives of this study requires great caution such as urged by C. S. Nwodo in his prefatory remarks on the philosophical analysis of Chinua Achebe’s literary works, that “...one must avoid using Achebe as a platform to preach one’s own doctrine. Nor should one try to over-intellectualize him... However, there is need to draw out certain partially concealed and partially unconcealed philosophical principles in Achebe (ix-x).

We shall engage in an exposition of some basic philosophical theories, particularly theories of justice, and then analyse the concept of internal colonialism in Saro-Wiwa’s political thought within the context of these theories to see how much they square into a coherent matrix. The idea here is that Saro-Wiwa’s political thought can be seen, not as a comprehensive theory of justice, but as a conception of social justice, which is one dimension of justice.

Specific questions we shall grapple with in this work include the following: (i) Can Saro-Wiwa’s political thought be appropriately located within any existing theory of justice, or on the other hand can it be regarded as a valid theory in its own right? (ii) Can his thought be validly applied as a universal theory of justice? It is important to note that justice is such a broad concept that it cannot be comprehensively discussed in a work of this scope, and neither is such an effort necessary here. As John Rawls rightly notes:

Many different kinds of things are said to be just and unjust: not only laws, institutions, and social systems, but also particular actions of many kinds, including decisions, judgments, and imputations. We also call the attitudes and dispositions of persons, and persons themselves, just and unjust (*A Theory of Justice* 7).

However, like Rawls' theory of justice, Saro-Wiwa's thoughts on the phenomenon of internal colonialism and the concept of erectism relate more closely to social justice. In a preliminary elucidation of social justice, Rawls states that:

For us (that is, those concerned with social justice), the primary subject of justice is the basic 'structure of society, or more exactly, the way in which the major social institutions distribute fundamental rights and duties and determine the distribution of advantages from social cooperation. By major institutions I understand the political constitution and the principal economic and social arrangements. Thus the legal protection of freedom of thought and liberty of conscience, competitive markets, private property in the means of production, and the monogamous family are examples of major social institutions (*A Theory of Justice* 7).

In our discussion, therefore, we shall focus on certain permutations in politics and principal economic and social arrangements to evaluate their justness or otherwise. We shall, however, begin with an elucidation of some of the basic political and moral postulates.

Saro-Wiwa's Political and Moral Postulates

It would be pertinent to note that the postulates of Saro-Wiwa on justice and governance, which constitute his political cum moral thoughts, were not specifically articulated by him as comprehensive theory *per se*. He rather meant them to constitute a basic framework for promoting political order and for a *fair* regulation of social cooperation in terms of the distribution and acquisition of resources, and determination of right and wrong actions among individuals in society. It is clear, therefore, that my task at this point is to try to bring out both the partially concealed and the partially unconcealed philosophical imports of Saro-Wiwa's political ideas and postulations, and to raise salient philosophical questions about them where necessary in order to weave them into a coherent matrix of thought. All these constitute the philosophical foundation of his political thoughts which centre on the concept of internal colonialism as a phenomenon and erectism as an effective recipe for addressing it. Ken Saro-Wiwa coined the term 'erectism' from the word ERECT, which is an acronym for Ethnic autonomy, Resource and Environmental Control (*A Month and a Day* 193). According to Nbeta,

The concept, which can be regarded as the cornerstone of his political theory, has three key underlying principles or components, namely, *ethnic autonomy*, *ethnic resource control*, and *environmental control*. To put it more succinctly, the philosophy of erectism regards the various ethnic aggregations (nationalities and nations) that make up the Nigerian State as autonomous, co-equal, and as constituting the proper federating units within the State. Deriving from that postulate is the view that the ethnic groups should control the natural resources in their respective domains, including their physical environment (Nbeta, 'Ken Saro-Wiwa's concept of erectism' 187).

It would be a good starting point to highlight the basic problems and/or manifestations of internal colonialism in Nigeria as identified by Saro-Wiwa, and to proceed afterwards to show the inherent injustice in the phenomenon. The subsequent task, therefore, is to assess the justifiability of his concept of 'erectism' as a suitable measure for addressing the problems, namely economic injustice, political marginalisation, and environmental degradation, the last two also being forms of injustice. The point, as rightly posited by John Rawls, is that, "...other things being equal, for a conception of justice to be preferred to another it should be consistent with some other valid principle(s) or theories of justice and should have broader desirable outcomes (*A Theory of Justice* 6). Rawls further rightly posits that "We cannot, in general, assess a conception of justice by its distributive roles alone, however useful this role may be... We must take into account its wider connections" because "it is still true that, other things equal, one conception of justice is preferable to another when its broader outcomes are more desirable" (*A Theory of Justice* 6).

It is needless in this study to instantiate the phenomenon of internal colonialism in Nigeria as posited by Saro-Wiwa. It is rather to be taken as a given and, then, analysed as a fundamental basis for his concept of 'erectism.' Concrete instantiation of systematic and institutionalised injustice that smacks of internal colonialism would only be made where it is considered to be analytically and constructively useful. Thus, my first main task is to show that economic strangulation, political marginalisation, and reckless exploitation and degradation of the environment to the neglect of the rational interests of the most vulnerable persons or community of persons are unjust.

Key building blocks in Saro-Wiwa's analysis of internal colonialism in Nigeria include: (i) the discordance between a quasi-unitary system within a multi-ethnic and supposedly federal state; (ii) unjust laws and skewed policies that deprive politically disadvantaged communities and groups of their environmental and economic rights; (iii) the existence of weak (or rather absence of strong) democratic institutions; and (iv) institutionalised hegemonic state structure. The first three conditions have reinforced the fourth and all four conditions have combined to engender internal colonialism. Hegemony, unlike the first three conditions, has a somewhat different character – it does not only engender internal colonialism but also constitutes one of its manifestations.

Hegemony involves domination or the exercise of cultural, political, economic, and sometimes even religious and psychological domination by one group over the other(s). It is distinguished from mere accidental 'dominance' such as numerical preponderance of one ethnic group or nationality over the other(s). Central to the idea of hegemony is the domestication of power by the hegemonic group in order to gain undue advantage – chiefly economic and cultural – over others. This is one manifestation it shares with such other social phenomena as ethnicism (or ethnocentrism), tribalism and racism. It can be seen more clearly from this perspective, why hegemony can rightly be regarded as a form of injustice. C. S. Nwodo highlights two characteristics of racism identified by Chinua Achebe, which help us to see the similarity between it and hegemony.

Racism is characterized by deep-rooted insensitivity that is a lack of imagination. Racism prevents the racist from imagining what must be going on in the minds of its victims, what it feels like being the victim of racism... one more characteristic of racism ... is, that it is wilful (Nwodo 173-174).

Like racism, hegemony erroneously presupposes the superiority of the 'hegemon' over its victims and robs them certain basic political, cultural and economic rights. It is also a wilful act, which means that the relationship is foisted on the victim by the hegemonic group or region.

The other manifestation of internal colonialism is *political marginalization*. In Nigeria, political marginalisation is rooted in two main sources. One is unjust laws that transfer the economic rights of communities and regions to the federal state, which has been structured to be controlled by the politically dominant group(s). For example, the merging of the Middle Belt of Nigeria with the North gives the North perpetual numerical and, thus, political advantage over the South whilst the ethnic groups in the Middle Belt constitute minorities within the northern political equation. Mining rights are then vested in the federal state and the resources of the state are not only mismanaged but also distributed unjustly and unfairly among so-called federating units.

The second source of political marginalization arises from political injustice such as denying people of their constitutional rights occasioned by the absence of strong fairly structured institutions. The first source of marginalization relates to the *content* of the law, whilst the second relates to the *misapplication* of the law or non-adherence to constitutionalism. Both forms are, however, representations of injustice in so far as they involve unjustifiable denial of the rights and liberties of some persons or groups, be it natural, human or political rights. In John Rawls' As expressed in the first statement of John Rawls' "Two Principles of Justice" which have been widely accepted as fair and reasonable, "each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive total system of basic liberties compatible with a similar system of liberty for others" (*A Theory of Justice* 302). Contrary to this rule, the Nigerian public space is characterised by deep-rooted social and economic inequalities which do not also meet the concession made by the second statement which states that "Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both: (a) to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged, consistent with the just savings principle, and (b) attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity" (*A Theory of Justice* 302).

The second feature of internal colonialism, namely *economic exploitation* is used to refer to an inter-group relationship that is characterised by inequitable gain or profit by one group or some groups over another through the distribution, distribution and consumption of goods and services. It can arise from either a legitimate or an illegitimate transaction or a combination of both, and takes diverse ramifications. However, while it is easy to see the inherent injustice in the direct plundering of somebody's private property, it is not so easy in the case of "public" or "common" property. The view according to John Locke that one has property rights over only those things with which one 'mixes' one's labour, has a glaring limitation in this case. Locke's view negates the commonsense logic that the collective right of a group or citizens to a given common property entitles each member of the group or citizen to a definite and *fair* share of the property *as of right*. Although such right can rightly be said to be composite, one individual or group, ought not to exercise exclusive control over the property. It follows, therefore, that an individual member of a group has a derived property right to a common property belonging to his basic or primary social group. The right is derived from their membership of the group or community that collectively owns the property.

To be sure, the distribution of "common goods," such as revenue derived from the exploitation of natural resources, for the welfare of the community at large does not invariably amount to injustice *per se*. However, the situation in Nigeria involves organised fraudulent political manipulations, such as bloated census figures and electoral fraud and twists in the principles of resource distribution all of which combine to confer political and economic advantage on certain groups or regions. These include certain revenue allocation formulas, property laws such as the Land Use Decree of 1978 and the subsequent Land Use Act Chapter 202 Laws of the Federation of Nigeria 1990, the Onshore-offshore oil dichotomy, etc, all of which constitute

economic injustices. Those permutations and twists right from the pre-oil era to the present time are deliberate and calculated attempts to favour some groups at the expense of others which negate the notion of justice as “a rational principle of coherence and regularity” (Lloyd 123) and the conditions for *fairness* as enunciated by John Rawls which must situate free and equal persons fairly and must not permit some to have unfair bargaining advantages over others (Rawls, *Justice as Fairness* 15).

Contrary to the basic requirements of justice, revenue and resource distribution formulas in Nigeria have always been dictated or influenced by the interests of those who occupy the dominant position in the decision calculus within the state at any given time. It is pertinent to note that from the Rawlsian perspective, the legislative process, the moral foundation and the social content of the law are all fundamentally important in shaping the law. Fairness is a composite element of justice. Thus, the concept of justice as fairness as enunciated by Rawls derives from the “idea that the principle of justice are agreed to in an initial situation that is fair.

Some analysts consider Rawls’ ‘veil of ignorance’ thesis as fantastical and impracticable, but I think that is based on a rather myopic consideration. There are innovative ways of working out the process of legislation to actualise the result envisaged in the ‘veil of ignorance.’ Let me illustrate it by caricaturing a typical situation in traditional African households. A parent wants to share some fish, food or whatever it is that is meant to be shared among his three children. He gives it to the youngest of them to share it into the required three portions and, then, asks the oldest of them to choose first, followed by the younger and the one that shared it into portions takes the last remaining portion. Conscious of the fact that he would not be the first to choose, rather it is his fate to take the last remaining portion, the one that is called upon to measure out the portions would try to ensure that the portions are as equal as possible so that he would not be short-changed no matter which portion gets to him. Similar approaches can be adopted in making laws to achieve the fundamental objective of Rawls’ ‘veil of ignorance,’ which is fairness.

Economic exploitation involves the transfer of the resources of a disadvantaged person or group to the powerful, dominant or privileged person or group. Contrary to the requirements of justice Saro-Wiwa describes a pattern of economic exploitation in Nigeria that is neither aimed at or expected to be to everyone’s advantage nor is it attached to positions and offices open to all. Hence, it constitutes injustice.

Ecological degradation, which is the third manifestation of internal colonialism in Nigeria as analysed by Saro-Wiwa, is more or less a fallout of the reckless exploitation of environmental resources without due concern for environmental protection. It is stated in “Ogoni Bill of Rights” “that the multinational oil companies ... have severally and jointly devastated our environment and ecology” [and that] “the Nigerian elite (bureaucratic, military, industrial and academic) have turned a blind eye and a deaf ear to those acts of dehumanization by the ethnic majority (Saro-Wiwa, “Addendum to the Ogoni Bill of Rights” 91). The multinationals and the Nigerian political leaders are held culpable for the degradation of the environment on different accounts. The multinationals, which have recently been joined by few indigenous oil and gas companies, are direct and active perpetrators of the ‘evil,’ whilst the government is complicit in the ‘evil’ on accounts of failure on its part to enact appropriate legislations on environmental protection and also for its non-enforcement of sanctions against the perpetrators of existing legislations. On either account, the ruling elite are guilty of what is known in ethics as “cooperation with evil” (Cf. Fagothey 35). Although Nigeria’s economy depends largely on rents from oil and gas resources and the commercial activities of those corporations that so degrade the environment, that cannot be a justifiable reason for the government to either connive with or tolerate their irresponsible exploitation and outright pollution of the environment. Such a situation would be tantamount to contributing to evil in order to obtain good from it which, as stated above, is unethical. Both the companies and the government have a moral question to answer for failing to do what they ought to do to either prevent pollution or conserve the environment or better still adequately compensate for damages caused and remediate and restore it. The activities of the multinationals are not only unethical; they are also unjust because those activities fall short of their standard of operation in some other regions around the world.

Following many decades of environmental activism and advocacy, the Federal Government of Nigeria in 2010 commissioned the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to conduct an extensive environmental assessment of Ogoniland. The report of the assessment, which was published in 2011 revealed a mindboggling scale of devastation and, in response to some of its recommendations, the federal government established the hydrocarbon Pollution Remediation Project (HYPREP) in 2016 to, among other things, manage environmental issues in the country. While this is a welcome development, it is sad that not much has been achieved in terms of delivery of its core mandates and there is still a litany of complaints of sharp practices and inadequate participation of natives of the host communities in the remediation activities.

Erectism and Resource Distribution

Social justice, as I have previously stated in this work, is basically concerned with the establishment of sound principles for social cooperation, especially the fair distribution of rights, liberties and other values among people in society. In Saro-Wiwa’s considerations on politics and the Nigerian national economy, the term

‘erectism,’ which he coined from the acronym for Ethnic autonomy, Resources and Environment Control (*A Month and a Day* 193), constitutes both the basis of true federalism and a composite principle of social justice. It is, according to him, “the way forward for Africa (*A Month and a Day* 193).

The first element contained in the concept of ‘erectism’ is ethnic autonomy, and this is not to be confused with sovereignty. Saro-Wiwa recommends that within a multi-ethnic federal state every ethnic group should be allowed to be considerably “self-reliant,” “... grow at its own pace, politically and economically,” and “control its economy” (*A Month and a Day* 193). In his view, the ethnic groups or nationalities are the proper federating units. Saro-Wiwa advocates the restructuring of the Nigerian state into either a confederation of states or a federal system true to type and fit for purpose. It may be argued, and perhaps rightly so, that the number of ethno-linguistic groups that make up the Nigerian state, which is said to be about two hundred and fifty, is too large them to constitute the federating units. It is also possible to contemplate a reversal to the hitherto regional structure of the Nigerian state as it was before the regions were abolished and replaced with the twelve states in 1967. The twelve states were subsequently split into nineteen in 1976, twenty-one in 1987 (Abuja, the Federal Capital Territory was created in 1991), thirty in 1991 with the creation of nine new states, and thirty-six in 1996 in addition to the FCT as it is presently composed. Saro-Wiwa was yet to develop a clear structural blueprint of the Nigerian state in line with his political thought before he was sentenced by the then military government of Gen. Sani Abacha to death by hanging on trumped up charges bordering on treasonable felony.

Ethnic autonomy involves the right to self determination as group and is closely related to ownership and control of natural resources as well as management of the physical environment (including all its resources). Advocates of ethnic (or regional) control of resources argue that it is fair and just for people to own and control the resources which nature has wisely and purposefully placed at their disposal. By the same token, it is a people’s right to control their natural environment. There is a compelling argument that persons who stand to benefit the most from a healthy environment and to suffer the greatest harm from degradation of that environment are more inclined to manage it more responsibly, given adequate capacity, than those who would be or are less affected by its degradation, mismanagement and reckless exploitation. Such is the view of *free market environmentalists* such as Jan Narveson who opines that in free market societies,

... individuals own and may do what they want with things, without fear of interference by others. Free market society is *consensual* society: exchanges occur only when owners believe they will be better off from them, compared with any other use they could make of their resources.... The free market philosophy’s proposed moral rule for everything is: “No force or fraud, except to protect or compensate victims of force or fraud.” On environmental matters, then, it is: “Do not use force against persons’ utilization of the environment, except by way of this very rule.” (Narveson “For Free Market Environmentalism” in Mappes and Zembaty 485-486).

Free market environmentalism, no doubt, has its downsides but the point about it that is of interest here is that it justifies the right of ownership, control and management of the environment in the hands of individuals (and autonomous groups), who are most likely to harness it in their own best interest, unlike the state whose actors are substantially motivated by pecuniary interests.

It should be noted that I am not arguing that resources endowed within the confines of particular geographical areas should be exclusively appropriated by the ‘natural inhabitants’ of those areas. However, the same logic and considerations applied in international relations that confer territorial rights upon a sovereign state over resources within its geographical boundaries ought also to apply, as a matter of morality and logical extension, to ownership rights at the national and sub-national levels.

The concept of ‘erectism’ can, therefore, function as a mediating formula or regulative principle of justice. The concept excludes issues of foreign affairs, national security, immigration, and *et cetera* from the matters that should be ethnically or regionally controlled. It is, therefore, logical to deduce that Saro-Wiwa rightly recognises those matters as properly belonging to the province of national control as enshrined in the Nigerian constitution. To that extent, it would be correct to say that the concept of erectism can best be applied in a federal system of government. Federalism promotes concurrent involvement of national and sub-national authorities in certain duties while some duties are exercised exclusively by the central government and others are residual, that is, residing in the regions or local authorities as the case may be and as deemed appropriate. The adoption of federalism as a preferred structural arrangement recognizes that whereas some duties, services and responsibilities ideally belong to the province of the central or national authority, there are those that require concurrent involvement of the national and sub-national authorities and, yet, others that can be more efficiently handled at the sub-national level(s). Constitutional arrangements that take such understanding into account have often been seen to foster unity in diversity which is a crucial principle of federalism.

It follows, therefore, that a lopsided cum unfair distribution of powers, which include the control and allocation of natural resources, between the centre and the other tier(s) of government in a federation is to be considered as unjust on account of the fact that it amounts to dispossessing the units (states and local municipalities) of their residual rights, including right to ownership of, and control over, natural resources within their territories.

Saro-Wiwa on Self Determination

As a doctrine, erectism seeks to promote what can be considered to be the political, economic, cultural and environmental rights of individuals and groups within any geo-political territory. These rights are nested and collectively contained in the concept of 'self determination,' which can only be effectively guaranteed by the granting of a certain measure of political autonomy to the units of the federation.

The Ogoni Bill of Rights presents a clear picture of Saro-Wiwa's notion of political autonomy. It states as follows:

Now, therefore, while reaffirming our wish to remain a part of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, we make demand upon the Republic as follows:

That the Ogoni people be granted Political Autonomy to participate in the affairs of the Republic as a distinct and separate unit by whatsoever name called.... ("Addendum to the Ogoni Bill of Rights," Saro-Wiwa 91).

It can be inferred from the above passage that the Ogoni agenda, which Saro-Wiwa championed, was essentially a struggle for political autonomy and resource control rather than secessionism struggle such as the case of Biafra. Specifically, political autonomy of Ogoni people (and, by extension, of similar aggregations) as posited by Saro-Wiwa should guarantee the following rights:

- (a) Political control of Ogoni affairs by Ogoni people;
- (b) The right to control and use of a fair proportion of Ogoni economic resources for Ogoni development;
- (c) Adequate and direct representation as of right in all Nigerian national institutions;
- (d) The use and development of Ogoni languages in Ogoni territory;
- (e) The full development of Ogoni culture;
- (f) The right to religious freedom;
- (g) The right to protect the Ogoni environment and ecology from further degradation.

It further states that:

We make the above demand in the knowledge that it does not deny any other ethnic group in the Nigerian Federation their rights and that it can only be conducive to peace, justice and fair play and hence stability and progress in the Nigerian union.

We make the above demand in the belief that, as Obafemi Awolowo has written: in a true federation, each ethnic group no matter how small, is entitled to the same treatment as any other ethnic group no matter how large... ("Addendum to the Ogoni Bill of Rights," Saro-Wiwa 91).

Saro-Wiwa advocates the right of persons and groups to self determination. The practice of internal colonialism is seen as a negation of this right. While it enhances the chances of the colonizing group, it deprives the colonized group(s) of the means to full self-realization. To develop fully, people need access to those resources which nature has endowed them with. They also need an enabling social and political environment within which they can fully utilize those resources.

Furthermore, Saro-Wiwa's postulates can be justified on the basis of utilitarianism. As an ethical doctrine, utilitarianism stipulates that the right human actions are those that advance the greatest happiness of the greatest number of persons. We have pointed out that internal colonialism does not target the advancement of the common good of the community; it does not even benefit the entire members of the colonizing group, except through some kind of "spill-over effect." That is because even within the dominant group, some members are further marginalized or "minoritized." Internal colonialism primarily advances the interest and happiness of the few privileged class or group. On the contrary, "erectism" will promote a congenial political and social environment for collective growth, social progress and peaceful co-existence. Hence, it will promote the greatest happiness of the greatest of people in the society.

II. CONCLUSION

Our analysis reveals that internal colonialism is a morally unjust system. In Nigeria, the victims of internal colonialism, that is, the "internal colonies," suffer economic exploitation, political marginalization and abuse of their cultural and environmental rights. Despite the enactment of certain legal instruments that legalize some

forms of exploitation, the acts remain morally unjust. We understand that legal justice is quite different from and does not necessarily translate to moral justice. As Dennis Lloyd rightly points out, the former relates to the formal dimension of justice whilst the latter relates to the substance of justice (*The Idea of Law*, 125 – 133). To achieve both legal and moral justice, both of which are equally important, societies should choose morally sound principles of justice that are coherent and apply them regularly and impartially.

Political marginalization and economic exploitation are clearly unjust practices but ecological degradation borders more on ethics and morality than on a strict notion of justice. In the final analysis, the concept of “erectism,” though not complete in itself, constitutes a functional paradigm and a regulative principle for the distribution of natural resources among co-existing geopolitical units. It is compatible with the general principles of justice such as “fairness,” Rawls’ “Two principles of justice,” the principles of “regularity and coherence” among others. Furthermore, in Nigeria and such other states where the choice of operational principles and policies for the ownership, control, and distribution or allocation of resources have been subjected to various unwholesome manipulations and marred by vested ethnic interests, there is a compelling need for a moral evaluation and radical rethinking of existing laws and policies in relation to resource governance.

REFERENCES

- [1]. ‘Addendum to the Ogoni bill of rights,’ cited in Ken Saro-Wiwa, *A month and a day: A detention diary*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited, 1995.
- [2]. Asirvatham, Eddy and K.K. Misra. *Political theory*. New Delhi: S Chand & Company Ltd., 2005.
- [3]. Fagothey, Austin. *Right and reason: Ethics in theory and practice*. Saint Louis: The C.V. Mosby Company, 1976.
- [4]. Lloyd, Dennis. *The idea of law*, reprinted 1991. London: Penguin Books, 1964.
- [5]. Moore, Brooke Noel and Kenneth Bruder. *Philosophy: The power of ideas*, 5th edition (New York, etc: McGraw-Hill, 1990.
- [6]. Narveson, Jan ‘For Free Market Environmentalism,’ Eds. Zembaty, Jane S. and Thomas A. Mappes. *Social Ethics: Morality and Social Policy*, seventh edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2002.
- [7]. Nwodo, Christopher S. *Philosophical perspective on Chinua Achebe*. Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt Press, 2004.
- [8]. Nbete, Alubabari Desmond. *The Dynamics of internal colonialism in Ken Saro-Wiwa’s political theory*, Ph.D. Dissertation Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt, Nigeria, 2006.
- [9]. Nbete, Alubabari Desmond. ‘Ken Saro-Wiwa’s concept of erectism: A paradigm for sustainable national development and unity in Nigeria,’ *The international journal of humanities and social sciences*, 8(4), April 2020. 187-195
- [10]. --- ‘Ogoni as an Internal Colony: A Critique of Imperialism,’ *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, vol. 2, no. 10 (Special Issue), 2012. 50-61
- [11]. Plato. *The Republic*, 2nd edition, translated by Desmond Lee. London: Penguin Books, 1974.
- [12]. Rawls, John. *A Theory of justice*, Original Edition. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971.
- [13]. Rawls, John, Ed. Erin Kelly. *Justice as fairness*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001.
- [14]. Saro-Wiwa, Ken. *A month and a day: A detention diary*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited, 1995.
- [15]. United Nations Environment Programme. *Environmental assessment of Ogoniland*, 2011.