

The settler has nowhere to feed and the indigene has all the pastures: Re (visiting) the indigeneity-settler crisis in Nigeria

SEUN BAMIDELE

Institute of Peace, Security and Governance, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria

E-mail: oluwaseun.bamidele@gmail.com

Abstract

Indigeneity and regional control is an unavoidable truth even among creatures, nay, all living things. As things remain in Nigeria today, the 1999 Constitution ensures the advantages of citizenship to all Nigerians paying little attention to where they move and settle. All things considered, it neglects to give close attestations in regard of indigeneity rights for the, without a doubt, more fragile parts of the nation – the autochthons! It is here endorsed, accordingly, that as an issue of need, there ought to be an unmistakable refinement approach among citizenship and indigeneship statuses by a considerable system establishment that ensures the unprotected run of the mill advantages of indigenes. The issue of settlers and indigenes has incessant in Nigeria. It is representing a considerable measure of risk to the corporate presence of the Nigerian state. The investigation along these lines looks at the indigeneity status of residents in multi-ethnic and multi-social Nigerian culture, and the accentuation is on settler and indigene emergency in the nation. The study adopts historical analysis to inspire data on the issue. It observes that the settlers and indigenes' wonder is a noteworthy issue equipped for undermining and pulverizing the solidarity of the nation. Such a significant number of emergencies in the nation that had shaken the country to its establishment could be followed to such wonder. The investigation presumes that for Nigeria to gain ground as a single entity, it must discover a method for handling the issues related with settlers and indigenes.

Keywords: Citizenship; Indigeneity; Settler; Nigeria; Constitution.

1. Introduction

The crisis between indigene and settler divisions in Nigeria has been evident for quite a while, occasionally creating confusion and brutality in many communities in the country. The trigger to the contentions is a challenge over the access to resources, and the rejection of basic assets that being an indigene gives. As opposed to the impression in a few quarters, the indigene and settler crisis is found over the length and breadth of the nation. It is, however, more politicized in a few states (for example Benue, Nassarawa, Plateau, Zamfara State) on account of the conversion of such divisions by different markers of identity, for example, ethnicity and religion. In 2010, the National Assembly managed the crisis when a Bill was passed, which gives Nigerians the privilege to be indigenes of any nearby government area in Nigeria if that individual or the individual's children relocated to that Local Government Area before October 1, 1960.¹ The Bill was passed to confine the experts for the issuance of 'indigeneship' authentications to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, rather than the present practice where it must be issued by state governments and Local Government Councils.

The above mentioned bill was a radical one like a portion of a current proposition, being submitted to the National Assembly ahead of a arranged survey of the 1999 Constitution (Anifowose, 1999). One of the strong recommendations presently making waves is for any Nigerian, who has lived in a region for a long time, to claim to be an indigene of that place. In a nation like Nigeria, where the country building process has slowed down and where doubt is largely installed in the consciousness of virtually every individual, what is logical or strongly intellectual may not generally be what is fitting. This is by all accounts the case with the indigene and settler crisis. It is essential to feature the qualification between 'Citizenship' rights and 'Indigeneship' rights – as these tend frequently to be stirred up. For the previous, there are as of now certain established certifications for all Nigerians in the country. For example, Section (4) of the 1999 Constitution stated the Fundamental Human Rights of all Nigerians, including the rights to be free from separation, while Section 41(1) gives each national the rights to 'move uninhibitedly all through Nigeria and to dwell in any part thereof' (Federal Republic of Nigeria Constitution, 1999). Section 43 ensures each native 'the rights to procure and possess undaunted property anyplace in Nigeria' (Federal Republic of Nigeria Constitution, 1999).

¹ State Bill,154, A Bill for an Act to Make Provisions for the Right of Persons to be an Indigene of a Locality in Nigeria, 2001; House Bill (2010).

There are no protected arrangements that upgrade the rights of settler to indigene status. Indigeneship rights then again are to a great extent social, familial and genealogical. In extremely customary social settings, the indigenes are the ones who might know which divine beings to pacify, if the startling occurs in the group. Years after freedom from the colonial government, the way toward remaking Nigeria from insignificant land articulation, and remedying the misstep of 1914 remains extremely overwhelming and challenging (Omonigi, Adegbiya and Awonusi, 2007). With numerous endeavors in constitution making and sovereign country gatherings, the Nigerian venture has neglected to deliver a positive outcome in the real social building of its multi-ethnic and multi-plural society. While diverse excuses have been given for this disappointment, a contemporary instance, out of the numerous, stays memorable. This is the vexatious and quarrelsome crisis of indigenes and settlers who the crafters of the Nigerian constitution have embedded into the constitution. The obscure meaning of who an indigene is as against the settler has raised the stake on social, economic and political rights. The political issues of indigenes and settlers, generally called political identity issues, have penetrated the ethnic orientation of the country's political life, as a stiff hindrance. Interestingly, the issue of settler and indigene has remained a clog in Nigeria's wheel of progress, significantly inspiring major clashes that have shaken the commonwealth of the nation. The focus of this article is to examine the crisis over indigeneship and citizenship, to clarify the status of the indigene as against that of the settler (identity political issues) in the Nigeria.

2. Historicizing Nigeria's antecedent of Indigene and Settler Crisis

The genesis of indigene and settler crisis can be traced to the year 1861, when the then King Dosunmu of Lagos surrendered Lagos to the British Crown, which later became known as the Colonial Government of Nigeria (Adesoji and Alao, 2009). The cession of Lagos in 1861 was mistakenly considered as the giving over of Lagos area, when in sureness what was surrendered was the political association of Lagos (Rinyom, 2011). This understanding became evident later on, after a couple of court cases in the region of 1900 and 2000 AD. It was finally surrendered by a couple of court cum privy board of trustees' judgments that the Lagos managers, known as 'Idejo'² Chiefs, were the Lagos proprietors, not King Dosunmu or any past rulers before him (Osaghae and Suberu, 2005).

² Idejo simply means Chiefs during the pre-colonial era in the colony of Lagos.

Moreover, in 1914 after the amalgamation of Northern and Southern Protectorate of Nigeria took place under Sir Lord Lugard, Lagos transformed into the official capital of Nigeria though it had actually been acting in a similar capacity since 1861.³ Amusingly, after paying heed somewhat to the earlier blunder of the 1861 secession, Governor Carter advanced toward the then Chief Onikoyi of Ikoyi, to lease a touch of the royal property towards a resettlement project of ex-warriors and experts in 1864 (Isichei, 1983). As indicated earlier, despite the way Governor Carter had asserted through his actions that early Lagos arrivants had a place with the Idejo Chiefs, Lagos was still seen as ‘a no man’s land’ by scholars. This perspective was foregrounded by the fact that Lagos, as the capital of Nigeria, had a place with every Nigerian (Ukiwo, 2003). This deceptive interpretation was extended further to infer that there was no such thing as an ‘Indigenous Lagos People’. Inside the broader Nigerian setting, all Nigerians would have spots of source beside the Indigenous Lagos people. Instead of indigenes of Lagos, all other natives from all over the country would share equal rights with whoever claimed Lagos origin. He called the people who remained, having no other home, Lagos people. Most Nigerian scholars would not assume that a couple of individuals had lived in Lagos for over 400 years. It was not until this point in time in the generation of Lagos State in 1970 that the insidious witticism, ‘Lagos is a no man's land’ was effectively tried (Isichei, 1983). Despite this and regardless of what happened in 36 states, most Lagosians and including others from different states the country, still need to challenge their rights in their own specific locale (Falola & Heaton, 2008). It has been seen that the ‘new’ state capitals would unavoidably face a similar issue to that the Lagos indigenes were experiencing. Moreover, those in some other state capitals are going up in protests against related concerns. In Lagos State, the previous national capital, a substantial non-indigenous populace has offered to ascend to conflicting selective and comprehensive propensities. The Lagos State government as of now has numerous settlers in senior political offices. In the meantime, a similar government has been extraditing poor settlers to their conditions of the origin starting warmed level-headed discussions over the established privileges of settlers in the state.

Nigeria is a multicultural, multi-religious, multi-ethnic and multilingual country. Consequently, after 1960, an immense number of Nigerians have

³ It proves the British colonial specialists were the first to explain a formal qualification amongst indigene and nonindigene groups, that is, locals and outsiders. It is obvious, for instance, Nigerian Native Authority Law, 1954. These groups were liable to various legitimate and managerial frameworks and urged to settle in independent groups. Scholars of history have likewise discovered no precolonial Nigerian custom of basing political units around ethnicity.

moved to various states of the country for distinctive reasons (Ibrahim, 1999). The Nigerian socio-political and urban class has a mixture of population. Routinely, these are divided into the 'indigenes' of such gatherings, and tenants beginning from various other states of the country, who are considered as 'settlers', even after an extended base for as long as two generation. Notwithstanding the length of residency in an area, being an 'indigene' or a 'settler' can be an advantage for one, concerning access to social and political positions. These social and political offices are oftentimes thought to be honest and good to the 'indigenes'.⁴

The 'settler's' access to these benefits can be at once denied. The division among 'indigenes' and 'settlers,' thus, poses stiff challenges for a run of the mill Nigerian citizenship. Once in a while, the 'settlers' may even feel that its social and political rights are under threat. The way the Nigerian state has managed the coordinated effort among 'indigenes' and 'settlers' is a bit of an issue. Sub-Section 25(1) of the Constitution ensures a single Nigerian citizenship (Anifowose, 1999), while Section 42 unequivocally forbids the exploitation of distinctive Nigerians in the light of their states of origin.⁵ Regardless of this, concerning portraying the support of one of Nigeria's 36 states, Section 318 (1) of the 2011 Constitution (As Amended) propels the unprecedented interests of that 'indigeneship by birth' (Anifowose, 1999). This specific headway of nativist rights started with the 1979 Constitution in the country.

The criteria of indigeneship are about the 'proprietorship' of the state. Nonetheless, this ownership is not limited to the juridical sentiment concerning owning private property, yet insinuates rather to the other side to affirmation as the pre-acclaimed ethnic assembling inside the unit. It is about the benefit to choose the measures of engagement in the middle of ethnic relations inside the unit being alluded to, and the benefit to deal with the pecking demand for acknowledging social and political issues related with the Nigerian state. Indigeneship in this way sufficiently displays a two-level citizenship in Nigerian's 36 states and 774 Local Government Areas (LGA). Some can put forth a defense for an innate relationship with the earth, and in this manner acknowledge 'indigeneship'

⁴ A 2004 House bill allowed all "rights and advantages collecting to indigenes" to Nigerians who live in state consistently for a long time and pay taxes.

⁵ Section 42(1) of the constitution prohibits the state from segregating based on "group, ethnic gathering, place of origin, sex, religion, or political conclusion." Courts by and large have not connected the condition to indigene-settler separation, however. A fizzled bill in the national gathering additionally attempted to criminalize victimization taxpaying non-indigenes who lived in a given place for a long time or more. Nationals Residency Rights Bill, 2004.

rights, while others have no such familiar claims, and ought to thus, persevere through differing degrees of political and social evasion (Dibia, 2010). Various settlers are in this light denied access to significant affirmation where they may have lived for a very long time and to which they pay their charges. Some state governments have gone to the degree of purifying their basic administrations of non-indigenes, even of those from a near ethnic background, simply because they are not particularly from the state.

Indigeneity is to a great degree exceptional at the state and federal levels, where political work environments are most brutally tested. Be that as it may, these two upper levels of government lacking adequate residence data, lack the ability to make sense of who is really indigenous to a location. Thus, Local Governments are left with the legitimate task of affirming who an indigene is to the various Wards. While the Constitution describes an indigene of a state as an ancestral, native 'having a place' to the state, administrative standards have tended to leave the valuable significance and identity of an 'indigene' in the hands of neighborhood government officials.⁶

According to the Guiding Principles of the Federal Character Commission (GPFCC), an indigene of a Local Government Area (LGA) is anyone 'recognized' after due consideration and investigation by the Local Government (Kyernum & Agba, 2013). This leaves monstrous discretionary powers in the hands of Local Government officials. A further administrative multifaceted nature is displayed by various versions of the Electoral Acts (EA) of the country which tend to surrender gauge to indigeneity and residency in choosing the individual's privilege to the political strategy within the Local Government Area (LGA). While the Electoral Acts (EA) states the proportional rights of indigenes and settlers, the Constitution tends to propose the amazingness of indigenous rights.

The strange measures of administrative mindfulness comprehended in making sense of who an indigene is makes escape provisions for affirmation, politicization, and uneven application the country over. This has realized different groups of non-indigenes acknowledging changing degrees of citizenship rights and paying little respect to what is entrenched in the Constitution. While some non-indigenes have been totally recognized in their host groups and given indigeneity presentations, others have had to face ethnic

⁶ In characterizing who an indigene is, especially with regards to the Federal Character principle, the 1999 Constitution underscores indicating confirmation of having a place with a group indigenous to a state or neighboring government through one's folks or grandparents which as a result recommends the participation of a nearby ethnic and semantic group.

and linguistic partition. In any case, insignificant exact confirmation exists on these normal experiences across Nigeria (Amaza, 2012).

For instance, Agaba and Akintola (2012) contend that ‘today indigenes and settlers crisis have moved toward becoming multiplied in Nigeria, basic the vast majority of the contentions is the issue of indigene and settler rights and that the development and nature of the Nigerian state is established in the pioneer family, tend towards the regulation of ethnicity and rights, which makes separated and unequal status of citizenship’. Therefore, at the core of the lingering inconsistencies of the Nigerian state is the wonder of citizens’ identity as against that of indigenes and settlers who lay equivalent claim to Nigerian citizenship, and who have been occupied with social and political space. It is along these lines basic characteristics of the indigene-settler is formulated in this article.

3. Indigene and Settler within the Nigerian Societal Space

One of the logical inconsistencies of the Nigerian state is the division and grouping of citizenship into indigenes and settlers. The term indigene is synonymous with local and autochthon and alludes to the credited identity of being conceived in a specific area under a particular ethnic and linguistic group considered as geographically and politically within a ‘country’ (Sha 1994). To be considered as an indigene of a place in this manner implies that one can point to a region as one’s ‘local land’ where one has its parentage.

It acknowledges individuals whose parents as well as grandparents were indigenes or individuals acknowledged as indigenes by the board. When one is an indigene of a nearby committee in a state, he is naturally an indigene of that state (Sha, 2005). This position is all the more trenchantly communicated by scholars who declare that ‘Indegeneity’ of a state is conferred on a man whose parents, guardians or grandparents were individuals from a group indigenous to a specific state’ (Adetutu, 2012). In this way, Nigerians, who have their ethnic parentage somewhere else, regardless of whether they were conceived in a specific state or experienced every day of their lives there, are viewed as ‘settlers’ (Momoh, 2001). A settler who may have been conceived in an area, however, is viewed as a feathered creature of entry who might at last go ‘home’. Indigenes demand settlers have a home where they occasionally visit for festivity and where the dead are taken for entombment (Mamdani, 1996).

The majority of the local population characterized and regarded as settlers do not see themselves in that light. In the Nigerian experience, being an

indigene or a settler is inconsequential, as there is no arrangement for the latter to change over to the previous. In the continuous interactions within the social space, the arrangement of the local population into indigenes and settlers just shows who is local to the specific territory and who is not. It raises issues in light of the fact that the order is a reason for citizenship rights. In every interaction among Nigerians, there are stories of segregation of a few groups with particular viewpoints, thus, due access, incorporation and a feeling of belonging is denied them by other groups.

4. Citizenship, Indigene, and Settler Crisis

The idea of citizenship is characterized based on a connection between the individual and his shared rights in the state. This idea of state and citizenship has been an age-long hypothetical discourse that has engaged the established historical, sociological and political scholars (Mamdani, 2005). In the perspective of Aristotle, a state is only 'a compound made up of settlers' (Ibeanu, 2012). In this manner, in the present conceptualization, citizenship must be determined in relation to the state.

Each state in the country distinguishes a specific arrangement of the local population as its inhabitants, while characterizing others as non-indigenes. A juxtaposition of this, stated by Alubo (2004) on Nationalism, proposes that national images develop in the consciousness of the general population characterized as natives, constituting of new feelings and propensities and also some sort of national identity that would influence them to examine 'alternate' as kindred residents.

Moreover, citizenship will, in this manner be an instrument of social conclusion through which the state characterizes and makes a case for its power and identity (Shut, 2007). The basic idea behind the word 'citizenship' is a socio-political antique through which the state constitutes and never-endingly imitates itself as a type of social association. It is the methods through which the cutting-edge state made of different nationalities looks to fashion a typical identity and an aggregate understanding for its kin. Citizenship is consequently a type of interest in the running of the state (Rinyom, 2007).

In the discourse of national character and that of citizenship in Nigeria, there is the need to take a gander at the situation of the constitution with regards to the settler of citizenship (Jibrin, 2006). As spelt out in the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, Section 25(1) (a) unmistakably characterizes citizenship in Nigeria is a resident of Nigeria conceived in the country before the flagship of independence both of whose guardians or any of grandparents

have a place or had a place with a group indigenous to Nigeria (Citizen's Forum for Constitutional Reform, 2001). Given this, a man cannot, therefore, turn into a resident of Nigeria by mere adherence of ethics within his resident segment, if neither of his folks nor any of his grandparents was conceived in Nigeria. Every individual conceived in Nigeria after the flagship of independence both of whose guardians or any of grandparents is a national of Nigeria or every individual conceived outside Nigeria both of whose guardians is a resident of Nigeria qualifies as an indigene (Citizen's Forum for Constitutional Reform, 2002). The constitution, however, clearly makes arrangement for naturalization and for non-natives to apply for Nigerian citizenship, though, there are conditions attached to this provision (Citizen's Forum for Constitutional Reform, 2002).

Apparently, the determined resolution of crisis of citizenship could have gone far to address and resolve in a more solid way the indigene-settler crisis, however, this has not been the case. Strategically, Nigerian Constitutions since political autonomy had accentuated the crisis of citizenship and essential human rights. Section 3 of the 1999 Constitution recognizes who an indigene is and how one can become one. Particularly from Sub-Sections 25 and 27, it can be recognized how citizenship can be achieved in the Nigerian society (Jibrin, 2001). These means are by birth, registration and naturalization. Also, Section 4 of the Constitution harps widely on the Fundamental Human Rights of Nigerians regardless of their ethnic or linguistic groups, area or place of birth (Jibrin, 2012).

Clearly, these arrangements were intended to go about as a shield against the infringement of one's citizenship rights. However, these arrangements did not foresee an aggregate numbness of circumstances, whereby the delight in citizenship rights will be handicapped or forestalled by superfluous contemplations, for example, indigeneity. Indeed, even where there are clear arrangements on the basic rights that Nigerians can appreciate, the circumstance is not in any capacity unique (Mamdani, 1998). For example, Sub-Section 42, Section 4 of the Constitution accommodates the privilege to flexibility from separations. Particularly it expresses that, a national of Nigeria of a specific group, ethnic group, place of origin, sex, religion, or socio-political conclusion might not (a) be subjected to disabilities or confinement to which native of Nigeria of different groups, ethnic groups, spots of origin, sex, religions, political assessments are not supposed to undergo or (b) to be agreed any benefit or preferred origin that is not concurred to resident of Nigeria of different groups, ethnic groups, spots of origin, sex, religious, and socio-political suppositions, among others (Golwa, 2012).

Grandiose as these arrangements might seem, the matter is far from being perfected. Consequently, Nzongola-Ntalaja (2012) states that the Constitutional arrangements are refuted by political thought in which case there is an emphasis on what he alludes to as indigeneship rights which are either of ethnic or sub-ethnic groups. This he contends has uncovered the government framework to a specific level of partitioned or double citizenship between group rights and individual rights. Thus, it places group rights over individual rights and by extension, the rights of ethnic groups especially of indigenes over those of settlers.

It has been contended that the crisis over citizenship in Nigeria today to a great extent came from the segregations allotted to individuals based on ethnic, regional, religious and sexual identities. This is on account of the individuals who see themselves as 'indigenes' as against those considered as 'settlers' from the angle of basic rights that they should enjoy as Nigerians upon the satisfaction of certain urban obligations (Adejo, 2012).

The 1979 Constitution, from which the 1999 Constitution was derived has been viewed to have laid the premise for the indigeneship crisis.⁷ This is on the grounds that it explicitly gives, that keeping in mind the end goal to appreciate access to social and political positions based on 'elected identity,' one should be an 'indigene' of the state or neighborhood government concerned. Being an indigene includes indicating confirmation of having a place of origin, through one's folks or grandparents to a group indigenous to a state, which basically demands identifying with an internal ethnic group. In this way, the failure to demonstrate such participation of a group of individuals will bring about being characterized as a 'more unusual settler' who cannot appreciate every one of the rights of indigenes (Mangvwat, 2012). In addition, Section 147 of the 1999 Constitution also states that the President should select no less than one Minister from each state, who might be an indigene of such state.⁸ In this manner, it ought to be immediately pointed out that the thought process behind the fusing of these arrangements into the Constitution apparently is to reinforce the standard of the Federal Character.

Particularly, Section 2, Sub-Section 14(3) of the 1999 Constitution clarifies

⁷ Chapter 3, section 1 of Nigeria's 1999 government Constitution sets out different tests for Nigerian citizenship, for a close look at citizenship laws in sub-Saharan Africa.

⁸ Section 147(3) of the constitution arranges the president to designate no less than one indigene from every one of the nation's thirty-six states to the federal cabinet. Courts have here and there characterized an indigene by referencing to other constitutional arrangements. Section 223(2)(b), for example, requires that the executive level of any national political party contains individuals who have a place with no less than 66% of the states in the organization. Section 318(1) characterizes the expression, "have a place within that setting," as applicable to 'a man both of whose guardians or any grandparent was an individual from a group indigenous to that state'.

the thinking behind the arrangement (Egwu, 2004). Hence, the organization of the administration of the league or any of its offices and the direction of its undertakings should be done in such a way that mirrors the selected identity of Nigeria and the need to advance national solidarity. It should also be to order national devotion, in all, guaranteeing there be no transcendence of individual from a couple of states or from a couple of ethnic or other sectional groups in that legislature or in any of its offices (Best, 2005). As such, the Federal Character guideline was intended to advance solidarity in diverse variety while empowering convenience at the government level, especially in terms of arrangements. It is self-evident that the Constitution, in this way, was not intended to accomplish anything vile.

However, when the view is that the Federal Character rule and its ancillaries, for example, the amount, framework and zoning among others, have advanced remarkably at the cost of legitimacy, especially with the perspective that portrayed its application in common administration arrangements, to that point it could be viewed as an answer that has turned out to be a threat. All the more vitally, the avoidance of Nigerians based on ethnicity or sub-ethnicity and the subsequent foreswearing of access to arrive, instruction, work and even political workplaces could not have been conceived or maybe purposely disregarded/bypassed by the Constitution.

Strikingly, one noteworthy theory going through the previous discussion is that the established arrangements on citizenship and human rights ought to have given the required antitoxin to the indigene-settler division, but they did not. First, this was because a portion of the arrangements was truly imperfect and even opposing now and again wherein citizenship versus Federal Character, particularly in the development of group rights over individual rights through indigeneity. Second reason is on the grounds that the arrangements did not visualize or consider threatening circumstances. Basically, citizenship had not, and would not have the capacity to determine the indigene-settler crisis in its present arrangement.

5. Discourse on the Analysis of Citizenship and Indigeneship

In characterizing who an 'indigene' is with regards to the Federal Character guideline and Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 Constitution, it is pertinent for one to have an origin with a group indigenous to a state or neighboring government through one's parents or grandparents (CLEEN Foundation, 2009). The experience of the diverse ethnic groups alluded to as occupied by settlers in various parts of the nation show that they settled in places now known to

them quite a while back. As it were, a few ages of these groups, may not be restricted to that of parents and grandparents or even just grandparents or an experienced childhood in their present areas.

Thus, being prominently qualified as individuals from groups indigenous to a state or neighboring government, they are additionally in the position to partake definitively in the sociopolitical existence of the group, satisfying their commitments and getting a charge out of fundamental rights. The arrangement, which was intended to avoid a few people, especially from the political existence of their group, the entire nation could really serve their advantage if appropriately translated. What is more, the arrangements uncover the shortcoming innate in deciding Nigerian citizenship, especially in the light of the impediments forced by the Federal Character. Again, there is certainly the requirement for a reevaluating or a redefinition of citizenship opposite other restricting variables; aside from including or presenting changes that are fit for testing the norm, reexamining or fortifying citizenship to address the issue of indigene-settler crisis.

Basically, there are assertions among Nigerian scholars on the need to reinforce basic rights and over group rights, because the latter has been established as a propeller of indigene and settler crises, including the various ethnic group insurgencies, as observed in various states of the nation. Moreover, it has been proposed that citizenship rights ought to be attached to either place of birth or living arrangement, with the goal that any Nigerian who has lived in any space of the nation for certain number of years can appreciate full settler rights, which must incorporate all rights typically accessible to the customary indigenes of the states.

While in 1987, the Nigerian government set up and prescribed ten years residency for the fulfillment of this right, Ehusani (2005) states the case of some of the state governments in Nigeria since 1976 had suggested that any Nigerian conceived in any state of the federation and has lived there for a long time ought to enjoy every one of the basic rights either as an indigene or a settler. Perceptibly, dynamic as the so many state governments standard might have been, it was not received as a national strategy, nor was there any confirmation of its workability, in all states of the federation. In any case, while the protected arrangement for indigeneity stays challenged, legislators at various levels] are progressively looking with vast discretionary coalitions into the matter of non-indigenes who have the vote, yet feel disappointed by their 'settler' status. State governors have in this manner been finding diverse approaches to charm and appease non-indigene voters. Sokoto State, for example, has annulled unfair expenses in instructive organizations.

Be that as it may, though it might be considered an insignificant proposition, it has been recommended that a national citizenship is to be assembled through having center-people Constitution in Nigeria which includes joining the 'Indigene Rights' and 'Settler Rights' well established in the Constitution. This Sub-Section of the constitution as proposed ought to give that a Nigerian settler who has lived constantly for a time of five years in any condition of the league and plays out his/her municipal obligations, including the installment of asses, should be qualified for every one of the basic rights of the state. Henceforth, this would be as per the training in many leagues and would reinforce the provisions of the Constitution notwithstanding operational limitation of who can challenge races in various states of the federation (Bagudu, 2003). Regardless of the timing, what is being pushed for and what is viewed as applicable is that settler rights ought to be joined along with the indigene rights in the constitution.

In addition, the need to amend the Section 147 of the 1999 Constitution was proposed to demand that those to be selected into positions of leadership must fulfill all the condition of the federation and must be the indigenes of their states. Then again, in this sense, it was recommended that indigenes must be characterized as the individuals who meet the settler prerequisite in a specific state (Egwu, 2005).

In this manner, in concurrence with the surrounding crisis of settlers as a central point in characterizing citizenship, Ifidon (1996) maintains that each Nigerian native has a right to everything in the state including the land. Based on Momoh's (2001) submission, if a non-native could turn into a Nigerian following fifteen years of residency through naturalization, at that point it ought not to be difficult for Nigerians to appreciate citizenship rights, regardless of where he or she lives. He emphasised that anything shy of this speaks of a reduction of citizenship.

Consequently, battling further that there cannot be contracted citizenship inside a unified nation, Mwadkwon (2001) watched that most limitations that can be put upon the meaning of 'home' inside Nigeria might be the necessity of some time span before an indigene can assert a place as his home. All the more imperatively, indigenes characterized by a decided number of years and qualified by the execution of such commitment as paying assessment should make a Nigerian qualified for citizenship anywhere in all states of the federation, independent of his ethnicity or origin of birth (Kraxberger, 2007).

Moreover, fusing settlers directly into the Constitutional provisions would no doubt be the initial phase in ensuring citizenship to all Nigerians, and to

taking care of the indigene and settler crisis. There is a need for the actual practice of these rights, such that it does not remain just an item for academic engagements. Applicable here is a recommendation for its entrenchment in the Constitution through a commission that would screen the execution of a portion of the exceptionally basic arrangements of the archive (Adebanwi, 2009). In addition, on account of citizenship, the National Human Rights Commission would be more significant on the grounds that the state of the federation has set up the commission. Yet how dynamic is the commission? In this way, what is required is an exceptionally dynamic, effective and responsive Human Rights Commission, else it would be better as non-existent.

More so, authorizing indigene or settler rights with regards to the Nigerian circumstance could in some cases depend on the local population, thus, there is the need to prepare Nigerians to implement their basic rights. Implementation in this sense will include being prepared to take the challenge as the trends of event requests. This could include amending and reviewing of the constitution over the crisis of citizenship cum indigene and settler rights as well as being willing to investigate every legitimate means to any level required. Strengthening the capacity of Nigerians to look for authorization is key, especially with a consciousness to utilize every known medium to make mindfulness, utilizing distinctive dialects to achieve the mass of the populace. Subsequently, the substance of the awareness programme ought to incorporate the extent of rights, what they are, the constitutional arrangements backing them up for authorizing the rights and looking for a review on account of encroachment. Also, non-legislative associations with a predisposition for citizenship rights could be included to make and support needed awareness and encourage the provision of the requirement.

Moreover, in the past, efforts were made to encourage authorization or even the usage of constitutional arrangements, which is expected to monitor the majority against political control by the privileged class, a vital component which has frequently played up or down the crisis of indigenes and settlers relying on whichever side would serve their advantage better.

Thus, an intricate program to promote the right consciousness is expected to alarm the majority to readily accept the end of indigenes-settlers crisis in order to enable themselves end up pawns on the chessboard of the political class, whose real objective generally is the acknowledgment of their narrow and selfish-minded interests. Moreover, the consciousness or awareness is expected to teach the majority how to make selections not based on the

indigene-settler premise, but instead on the high-risk factor of a possible crisis. Obadare and Adebani (2009) conclude that normally the idea of citizenship ought to recommend that an individual has a right to challenge a race wherever he dwells, and this can happen when Nigerians start to center around the capacity of government officials, instead of their ethnic sources.

6. Conclusion

Nigeria should nullify the hogwash polarities and pointless accentuation typically put on Nigerian settlers. There should be a superior assurance of citizenship constrained to certain criteria which would decide a full citizenship. Thus, as long as a national is resolved to be naturally and legitimately a Nigerian, the country citizenship ought to manage and measure up to insurance, full confidence and credit all through the country. The indigenes and settlers' crisis in the country had turned out to be extended because of the restricted meaning of citizenship in principle and in practice. Also, the interest to appreciate the advantages of both indigeneship and citizenship has not improved the situation.

Consequently, as opposed to playing down disruptive propensities and advancing joint factors, the turnaround has happened, and creating crisis of differing extents with chaperon loss of human and material assets becomes a thing of the past. There is, however, no sign that a most exceedingly bad crisis would not be produced later on in light of the fact that the basic reason for the crisis is being ignored, as though it were to unravel itself. Consequently, there is a need to take the bull by the horn and address exhaustively the underlying driver(s) of the crisis.

In this period of worldwide citizenship, turning into an indigene in Nigeria both in words and in reality ought not to be dodged by constitutional arrangements through which some class of people should need to plume their home. Or maybe citizenship ought to be reinforced, starting with Constitutional arrangements, which ought to be upheld by the legislature, as well as by the local population who ought to normally seek help. Generally no one will know whether any torment is felt, and if alleviation is required, and along these lines their separation and their diverse variety of their objectives in any case, stay applicable for the local population with a large scale programme of attention to educate, sharpen or prepare the cognizance of the local population, and subsequently, set them up to bring their predetermination into their own hands.

Biographical Notes

Seun Bamidele is a PhD Research Fellow and Social Sciences Research Council Research Fellow at the Institute of Peace, Security, and Governance, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria. He holds a master's degree in Peace and Security Studies from the Institute of Peace, Security and Governance, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria and also another master's degree in Adult Education with specialty in Community Development and a bachelor's degree in Education (with Adult Education) and Political Science from the University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria. His research has been supported by awards including a doctoral fellowship in Peace and Security Studies at Ekiti State University and a Social Sciences and Research Council of New York Doctoral Fellowship. His articles have been published in *India Quarterly: A Journal of International Affairs* (SAGE), *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights* (Brill), *African Conflict and Peacebuilding Review* (Indiana University Press), *Journal of African Union Studies*, and forthcoming *Jadavpur Journal of International Relations* (SAGE).

References

- Adebanwi, W. (2009) Terror, territoriality and the struggle for indigeneity and citizenship in northern Nigeria. *Citizenship Studies*, 13(4), 349-363.
- Adejo, A. (2012). Indigeneity and Belonging in Nigeria from the Pre-Colonial times to 1960. In I. Jibrin and I. Hassan (eds), *Citizenship and Indigeneity Conflicts in Nigeria*, Centre for Democracy and Development, CDD: Abuja.
- Adesoji, A. O. and A. Alao, (2009). Indigeneship and Citizenship in Nigeria: Myth and Reality. *Journal of Pan African Studies*, 2(9):151-165
- Adetutu, A. (2012) Nigerians Constitution must Resolve Indigene-Settler Issue from, [www. thenationalineng.net/new/nigerian-constitution-must-resolve-indigene-settler-issue](http://www.thenationalineng.net/new/nigerian-constitution-must-resolve-indigene-settler-issue).
- Agaba, H. and O. E. Akintola, (2012). Citizen-indigeneship Issues and Political and Socio-Economic Development in Nigeria: A Case Study of Ife- Modakeke and Tiv-Jukun Crisis. *Journal of Legislative Studies and Governance*, 1(3):9-22.
- Alubo, O. (2004) 'Citizenship and Nation Making in Nigeria: New Challenges and Contestations'. *Identity, Culture and Politics* 5, 1&2.
- Amaza, M. (2012). Bridging the Indigene-Settler Divide from nigerianstalk.org.2012/12/20/bridging-the-indigenesettler-divide.

- Anifowose, R. (1999). Constitution and Constitutionalism. In Anifowose, R. and Enemu, F. (eds); Elements of Politics. Lagos: Sam Iroanusi Publications.
- Bagudu, N. (ed.). (2003). Linguistic Minorities and Inequality in Nigeria. Tafawa-Balewa, Jos, Nigeria: Published by League for Human Rights: Working for Economic, Political and Minority Rights, with the support of the Heinrich Böll Foundation.
- Best, S. G. (2005), "Bridging the Indigene and Settler Divide: Challenges of Peace Building in Nigeria" a paper presented at a Seminar for Opinion Leaders to Provide Inputs into Conflict Management Discourse in Jos, held at the Leadership Institute, Dandaura Road, GRA Jos, on Wednesday February 6.
- Citizen's Forum for Constitutional Reform, (2001). The Position of the Citizen's Forum for Constitutional Reform on the Review of the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, Lagos.
- Citizen's Forum for Constitutional Reform, (2002) Memorandum Submitted to the Presidential Committee on National Security in Nigeria.
- CLEEN Foundation, (2009) Citizenship and identity politics in Nigeria: Conference proceedings.
- Dibia K. I. (2010) Indigene/Settler Dichotomy in Nigeria. The son of the soil syndrome. *The Sage* vol 24. Seminary of SS peter & Paul Bodija. Ibadan.
- Egwu, S (2004) "Beyond 'Native and 'Settler' Identities, Globalisation and the Challenges of Multicultural Citizenship in Nigeria. In J. Moru (ed) Another Nigeria is Possible Abuja: Nigeria Social Forum.
- Egwu, S. G. (2005). Bridging the Indigene and Settler Divide: Challenges of PeaceBuilding in Nigeria. A Paper Presented at a Seminar for Opinion Leaders to Provide Inputs into Conflict Management Discourse in Jos, on Wednesday 9th February 2005, at the Leadership Institute, Dandaura Road, GRA Jos.
- Ehusani, G. (2005) Citizenship and the Indigene/Settler Syndrome, Nigerian *Guardian* Newspaper, July 4, from www.dawodu.com/ehusani2.htm.
- Falola, T. and M. Heaton, M. (2008). A History of Nigeria. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria, (1999) Constitution (as amended) of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. Lagos: Federal Government Printer.
- Golwa, J. (2012). Reflections on Citizenship -Related Crises in Jos: Finding the Road Map for Peace. In I. Jibrin and I. Hassan (eds), Citizenship and Indigeneity Conflicts in Nigeria, Centre for Democracy and Development, CDD: Abuja.

- Ibeanu, O (2012) "From Native to Citizen to Indigene: Reflections on National Unity and Constitutional Review in Nigeria" being a paper delivered at the Nnamdi Azikwe University, Akwa, June 30.
- Ibrahim, J. (1999). Ethno-Religious Mobilization and Sapping of Democracy in Nigeria. In J. Hyslop (ed.) *African Democracy in the Age of Globalization*. Witwaterand University Press.
- Ibrahim, J. (2001) Civil Society, Religion and Democracy in Contemporary Africa. In B. Beckman et al *Civil Society and Authoritarianism in the Third World*, PODSU, Department of Political Science, University of Stockholm, Stockholm.
- Ibrahim, J. (2006) Expanding the Human Rights Regime in Africa: Citizens, Indigenes and Exclusion in Nigeria. In L. Wohlgemouth and E. Sall (Eds) *Human Rights, Regionalism and the Dilemmas of Democracy in Africa*, CODESRIA and Nordic Africa Institute, Dakar and Uppsala.
- Ibrahim, J. (2012). Indigeneity and the Bifurcation of Citizenship Rights in Nigeria: The Search for a Political Solution. In Jibrin Ibrahim and Idayat Hassan (eds), *Citizenship and Indigeneity Conflicts in Nigeria*, Centre for Democracy and Development, CDD: Abuja.
- Ifidon, E.A. (1996). "Citizenship, Statehood and the Problem of Democratisation in Nigeria. *Africa Development*, XXI, (4).
- Isichei, E. (1983). *History of Nigeria*, New York: Prentice Hall.
- Kraxberger, B. (2007) Strangers, indigenes and settlers: Contested geographies of citizenship in Nigeria. *Space and Polity*, 9(1), 9-27.
- Kyernum, N. and Agba, A.S. (2013). The Indigene-Ship Question and Its Implication on the Socio-Economic Development of Nigeria. *Journal of Social Sciences and Public Policy*, vol.5, no. 2.
- Mamdani, M. (1996) *Citizenship and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*, Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey.
- Mamdani, M. (2005) 'Political Identity, Citizenship and Ethnicity in Post-Colonial Africa,' being a paper delivered at Arusha Conference on "New Frontiers of Social Policy" organized by World Bank on December 12-15.
- Mamdani, M. (1998). When Does a Settler Become a Native: Reflections of the Colonial Roots of Citizenship in Equatorial and South Africa, Inaugural Lecture, University of Cape Town.
- Mangvwat, M. (2012). Historical Insights on Plateau Indigenes and the Struggle for Emancipation. In I. Jibrin and I. Hassan (eds), *Citizenship and Indigeneity Conflicts in Nigeria*, Centre for Democracy and Development, CDD: Abuja.

- Momoh, A. (2001). Even Birds Have A Home: Explaining the Pathologies of the Citizenship Question in Nigeria, EMPARC's Annual Lectures series, 7.
- Momoh, A. (2001). Even Birds Have a Home: The Social Pathologies of Citizenship in Nigeria. Lagos: EMP ARC.
- Mwadkwon, S. D. (2001). Religion, the Settler Question and the Emergence of Ethnic Conflicts in Nigeria: A Survey of Jos, *Swedish Methodological Themes*, 89(1)55-73.
- Nzongola-Ntalaja, G. (2012). Citizenship and Exclusion in Africa: Indigeneity in Question – Key note address. In Jibrin Ibrahim and Idayat Hassan (eds), *Citizenship and Indigeneity Conflicts in Nigeria*, Centre for Democracy and Development, CDD: Abuja.
- Obadare, E. and Adebani, W. (2009) Transnational Resource Flow and the Paradoxes of Belonging: Redirecting the Debate on Transnationalism, Remittances, State and Citizenship in Africa. *Review of African Political Economy*, 36(122), 499-517.
- Omonigbun T, Adegboya, E and S. Awonusi, (eds) (2003) *Nigeria and Globalization: Discourses on Identity Politics and social conflict* Lagos. Stirling-Horden publishers.
- Osaghae E. E. and R. Suberu, (2005) *A History of Identities, Violence, and Stability in Nigeria*, CRISE working paper, Oxford University.
- Rinyom, J. (2007) *Indigeneship, Citizenship and the Lost Nigerianship:: An Unpopular Essay*, from www.amanaonline.com/Articles/art728.htm, 1.
- Rinyom, J. D. (2011). *Indigeneship, Citizenship and the Lost Nigerianship: An Unpopular Essay (Part 1)* from www.gamji.com/article3000/NEWS3804.htm.
- Sha, D. (1994). The Settler Question and the Emergence of Ethnic Tension and Violence in Jos Nigeria.” In: *Urban Management and Urban Violence in Africa*. Eds. I. O. Albert et al. Ibadan: IFRA.
- Sha, D. (2005). *The Politicization of Settler-Native Identities and Ethno-Religious Conflicts in Jos Central Nigeria*. Ibadan: Stirling Horden Publishers.
- Shut, T. T. (2007). The Settler/Indigene Phenomenon and Conflict Generation in the Middle Belt Region of Nigeria. In O. O. Okpeh Jr, Ada okau and S. U. Fwatshak (eds) *The Middle Belt in the Shadow of Nigeria* (Makurdi: Oracle Business Ltd, 91-107.
- Ukiwo, U. (2003). Politics, Ethno-Religious Conflict and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria. *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 41(1), 115–38.