**NIGERIA CAMEROON RELATIONS DURING GEN. SANI ABACHA'S REGIME**

**CHAPTER ONE**

**INTRODUCTION**

**BACKGROUND TO STUDY**

The existing theoretical structure of the CameroonNigerian relations fall within the confines of distributive ethnic compositions, colonial influence on indigenous boundaries, permeability of the Cameroon–Nigeria border and the dispute between both states over the Bakassi Peninsula. In fact, however separated these nation-states seem to be they remain a common people, especially the inhabitants of the frontier-line (Omede, 2006:17; Ate and Akinterinwa, 1992).

They are duly associated not by colonial effort but through ethnic affiliations. Rather, colonial state creation dishearteningly fragmented brethrens. No wonder, Njoku (2012: 198-199) claims that the permanent presence of a population with a common historical experience, and of the same ethno-cultural stock on both sides of the ostensible international divide is one of the natural features which have stubbornly frustrated Cameroon and Nigeria attempts to physically demarcate their borders. He maintains that ethnic groups and sub-groups of Nigerian origin cut across the Nigerian international boundaries with Cameroon. The four major ethnic groups that originally occupied the boundary area between both nations are the Ibibio, Efik, Ekoi, some Bantu and semi-Bantu peoples, and that the semi-bantu (Ibibio/Efik, Ekoi and Boki).

This is confirmed by Hansen (1981) when he indicates that these groups constitute part of the Bakassi border region which “ . . . falls under sub-national areas where the socio-economic lives and well being of the people are directly and significantly affected by proximity to international boundaries.” These boundaries (artificial in nature) once created as Niger Thomas (2001:55) suggests, cut across native areas, split communities and distorted the functioning of some of these communities, like the Ejagham and Boki groups of Manyu Division divided between Nigeria and Cameroon into Ejagham-Nigeria and EjaghamCameroon. Kah and Nkwi (2011: 44-51) attribute this ethnic division and disintegration to the German and British boundary demarcation exercises of 1912-1913. Fanso (1989:53) adds that the Ejagham, who straddle the Cameroon-Nigeria border, are also located in the area extending from west of Nchang near Mamfe town to Ikom in Nigeria. They also extend from Agbokem on the Cross River to the Oban Hills and Calabar at the month of the Cross River.

Pemunta (2011:171) supports Fanso when he says that Ejaghams and the Bayangs maintain similar socio-economic and political institutions and have historic connections to the outside world by virtue of their transborder location on the Cameroon-Nigeria frontiers. Besides the Banyang, their northern neighbours living on the “over side” of the Cross River generally referred to as Anyang and the Keyaka-Ekoi people (Obang, Ekwe and Keaka) also constitute an ethnic connection with those distributed in neighbouring Nigeria. This is also the case with the Mbembe people of Abong (Nigeria) and Abongshe (Cameroon). Shewa (2006:27) and Ntoi (2003:13) confirm this when they say that the Abongshe and Abong peoples, living on both sides of River Donga are all Mbembe.

They are only divided by the River, which represents the international borderline between Cameroon and Nigeria, and they all depended on one another’s political, economic and social contacts. This interdependence introduces a high degree of permeability on this boundary. Similarly, Kane (1976:23- 24) points out that within the Kanem Bornu Empire, the presence and connectivity of these Cameroon-Nigeria peoples, like the Kanuri (often referred to as the Kanuri of Nigeria and Kanuri of Cameroon) made them to consistently see themselves as brothers despite colonial influences.

They depended on one another’s political, economic and social activities and thus enhancing the permeability of the Nigeria-Cameroon borders. Njoka (2012:199) sees the interconnectivity of these crossborder communities as a serious issue for the respect of the international boundaries since some of these groupings share deities and totems, ancestral shrines and major rites (birth, manhood, maidenhood, womanhood, marriage, child-bearing and death), annual festivals and rituals that all members of each group across the frontier are traditionally obliged to take part in. For their convenience and interest, the colonial masters portioned out various ethnic groups among themselves. Asiwaju (1984) points out that a study of European archives points to the idea of an accidental rather than an intentional making of African boundaries. This means that the European interests were of primary concern.

Therefore in determining boundaries , the Europeans did not take African interests into consideration. An AngloFrench Commission of diplomatic and colonial experts was formed for the purpose of demarcating the boundaries, but the limits of its expertise soon became evident. Lord Salisbury commented: We have been engaged in drawing lines upon maps where no white man’s feet have ever trod; we have been giving away mountains and rivers and lakes to each other, only hindered by the small impediment that we never knew exactly where the mountains and rivers and lakes were’ ” cited in Molem and Johnson-Ross (2006:103–122).

**Statement of problem**

Despite so many measures adopted to manage and contain, if not extinguish totally the Nigeria-Cameroon boundary dispute, both by the leaders of the two countries and the third parties to the problem, the issue of boundary and territorial claims between Nigeria and the Cameroon remains unresolved. In other words, from bilateral negotiations, through diplomatic means involving international mediators (good offices of United Nations and Africa Union), to the arbitration proceedings of the International Court of Justice (ICJ), the border problem between the two countries is still faced with multi-dimensional problems. Put differently, a cursory look at the efforts and strategies employed to tackle the Bakassi problem, indicated that some of the measures taken so far, did not reflect a thorough understanding of the issues involved in the case. To this, it shows that the dispute over the Bakassi includes a number of other contradictions aside the political and economic issues that were determined in the past to manage the conflict. One that requires a closer examination, attention and perhaps the most crucial, is the “Ethnic” context of the dispute. The “right to self determination” agitated by the Bakassians, borne out of their ancestral and cultural affiliation and attachments to the disputed area, has not been fully appreciated. Therefore, pressure from the real victims of conflict, that is, those whose livelihood chances are directly threatened by the conflict, is often critical in bringing about a resolution of the conflict.

# OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Granted that every academic endeavour has stated objectives it seeks to achieve, the objectives of this study are in two folds; the general objective and the specific objectives. In general, this study aims at examining critically the dynamics of the ethnic factor in NigeriaCameroon boundary dispute. This objective is realized by showing the result of a group called “the Bakassi self determination movement” (BSDM), declaring its independence from both Nigeria and Cameroon in November 2006, following the decision as well as the reactions of the general indigenes of the Bakassi area against the verdict of the international court of justice over the border dispute between Nigeria and Cameroon, as what constitutes the major issue in the case. Hence, central to this study is an attempt to place the border problem in its historically ethnic perspective. Then, the specific objectives also aim at the following.

1. To ascertain if the ethnic interests of the people living in the Bakassi, have had any impacts on the entire dynamics of Nigeria-Cameroon border problems.
2. To ascertain whether the International Court of Justice (ICJ) ruling inspired the secessionist bid of Nigerians residing in the peninsula.

In other words, the study would be stemming to find out the situation of the problem even with the International Court of Justice (ICJ) judgement and the subsequent handover of the peninsular to the Cameroon.

# 1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

 For the fact that no research work is an end to itself, this study at completion shall be of great significant in the following ways:

 First and foremost, this study has both social and academic importance. Yes, because there is considerable disquiet about conflicts, especially in Africa where they have greatly negated development and have equally remained topical. Recent interventions in such conflicts have had limited results, be them inter or intra state. The frequent failure in intervention has led to a mood of “Afro-pessimism” and “conflict fatigue”, on the part of outsiders. Emphasis has thus shifted to containing the conflict rather than eradicating it. Taking into consideration Bozeman’s observation that “African political processes cannot be adequately accounted for by simply applying findings from elsewhere (because of her empirical complexities)”. (Bozeman, 1976: 36), This work offers a good case study of the raging influence of a conflict situation which carries the potentials of plunging the central and west African sub-regions into a catastrophe and ruin. The study offers insight into the, apart from the central organizing influence or factor in the Bakassi problem, between Nigeria and Cameroon, the international diplomats interested in resolving, containing or preventing conflicts, for the Nigerian-Cameroon border situation is unique and offers a good case study in that, it reveals a distinct experience dictated by the chequered colonial history of both countries.

# 1.5 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

A good research needs to be delimited to a manageable scope. Delimitation of research refers to the definition of the scope (extent or boundary) covered by the research. The scope of a research can be operationally defined in terms of:

1. the issues covered;
2. the period (time frame);
3. subjects studied such as people,
4. geographical area covered; and
5. sector of an economy such as public and private sectors, or health, educational….etc (Obasi, 1999: 99).

In this light, our study is at large, limited to the conflicting claims between the Nigeria-Cameroon people along the lacustrine boundary in the Chad area; and the maritime border around the Bakassi and adjacent islands (known as the fish towns in colonial days that are the undisputable epicenter of the border dispute). And in particular, the ethnic factor in the dispute. In other words, it examines the ethnic question as a factor precipitating the conflict between Nigeria and Cameroon over their maritime border differences for decades now.

# 1.6 LITERATURE REVIEW

No researcher or author per say, is an Island unto himself. His ideas are generated and formulated from reflections of what he reads, observes, examines and discusses with others. Therefore, in this literature review section, we review many works of different writers. And from these, we have found, scholars and experts actually dwelt primarily on the general dynamics of Nigeria-Cameroon border dispute – the economic, political legal, socio-cultural as well as the imperialistic aspect of the problem), but have failed to touch on the ethnic factor in the problem. So, we have exposed them with a view to locating this gap (ethnic factor) in literature, taking our research questions as basis around which our review revolves.

Notable scholars who have written profusely on this include: (Asobie, 2003; Baye,

2010; Aene, 1970; Nwokedi, 1985; Esiemokhal, 1982; Nwaeke, 1982; Shagari, 2001;

Sholanke, 1993; Ngang, 2010; Fombo, 2006; Rose and Sama, 2006; Eke, 2009; Ebeghuleum,

2008; Aghemelo and Ibhasebhor, 2006; Ronke, 1997; Akanmode, 2003; Kolapo, 2002; Sanusi, 2002; Rudin, 1938; Uffot, 2008; Ogen, 2011;…….. etc.). According to Asobie, 2003, who did study of the international conflict between two neighbouring, under-developed African States, Nigeria and Cameroon, anchored on the analysis of the principles and norms thrown up by a conflict situation, and of the domestic political and economic contexts of international conflicts, placed in a historical perspective. He noted that the general points of theoretical and practical policy interest emerge from the study.

First, it is clear that there is a link between authoritative repressive regimes in conflict and high proclivity to resolve international disputes by the use of violence. It was under the highly repressive regimes of Babangida and Abacha in Nigeria and Paul Biya in Cameroon that the conflict between the two countries arising from the dispute over boundaries and territories almost degenerated to violence confrontations. Second, economic interests, especially stakes in some valuable natural resources, rather than concern for human lives and consideration for human welfare, underlie most international conflicts. He opined that in the case under reference therefore, it was the discovery of crude oil in the disputed territory in 1967 that heightened the interests of the governments of Nigeria and Cameroon in the disputed territories, especially the Bakasi peninsula. Third, strong contending parties with weak cases avoid arbitration, judicial settlements, and collective security and go far bileral negotiations, conciliation and self-enforcement. Fourth, pressure from the real victims of conflicts, that is, those whose livelihood chances are directly threatened by the conflict is often critical in bringing about a resolution of the conflict. Conversely, those who indirectly benefit materially from such conflicts, for example, oil – prospecting companies operating on both sides of divide and potential suppliers, of arms and ammunitions, local and international, constitute obstacles to peaceful conflict resolution.

 Baye (2010) in his study, examines, the geopolitics of the Bakassi dispute between Nigeria and Cameroon, and outlines socio-economic implications of its peaceful settlement. Nothing that neglect and subsequent discovery of oil deposits subjected the Bakassi peninsula to claims and counter-claims for sovereignty, military occupation and recourse to the international court of justice (ICJ), he maintained that the ICJ ruling in 2002 in favour of Cameroon, although based on sound historical evidence, faced implementation difficulties. However he said that following mediation by the United Nations (UN) secretary – General good faith by protagonists, the Green-tree Agreement and subsequent instruments, Nigeria completed the withdrawal of its military, policy and administration from the Bakassi peninsula by 14 August 2008. Putting aside disruptive activities by social movements, the entire process could be viewed as a model in peaceful resolution of border conflicts.

 He goes further to state that, “implications of the settlement anchor on expenditurereducing and expenditure-switching effects, wealth-generating effects, and enhanced Crossborder activities”. Infrastructural developments and effective presence are considered essential elements in border management policies.

 Anene (1970), close to our point, takes a more thorough and holistic approach to the establishment of Nigeria’s boundaries. With much vigour given by his perfect mastery of not just the historical facts, but also the ethnographic realities of Nigeria’s border regions. Anene debunks the theory of Africa’s and especially Nigeria’s boundary arrangements being “mortally injurious” to the pre-colonial political order. Treating with remarkable details the ethnic composition of contiguous areas on Nigeria’s borders, and the diplomatic negotiations that took place to establish them, Anene describes as being “unhistorical” and “dangerous” emotive phrases denouncing the existing international boundaries in Africa. His elaborate treatment of the various tradeoffs among European states and the ethnic considerations they took, gives us an inkling of the enormous difficulties inherent in embarking on revisionism of the present borders of Nigeria to satisfy ethnic sentiments or claims, and by extension, the rest of Africa, an endeavour which he describes as “utterly unrealistic”. For sure his argument is not that the unity of some groups was not outraged by the borders but that there is no way this could have been completed avoided, especially in relation to the eastern boundary of Nigeria with Cameroon.

 While Anene treats with sympathy the cumbrous process of establishing Nigeria’s borders, Nwokedi (1985) deplores the ill-defined nature of these borders and emphasis that like most others in Africa are the products of arbitrariness. He attributes intermittent border dispute between Nigeria and her neighbours to imprecision of boundaries, the presence of vital mineral resources within the frontier zones and what he calls “trans-border activities of nationals and government agents”. Of import to this study is his discussion of efforts to resolve problems between Nigeria and her neighbours. Probably because of the focus on all the borders of Nigeria, his analysis is rather weak and tries conclusions simplistic. For instance, tries recommendations for stable boundary policies call for “intensified co-operation in economic, industrial, socio-cultural and political points of contact between these states” offers nothing new, given that he does not indicate how these issues over which they disagree can then be turned into issue of co-operation. Nor is it evident that he is borrowing a leaf from functionalists and neo-functionalists that do indicate explicitly how this can be achieved.

 Esiemokhal (1982), picks up this cue from a higher level. Armed with the analytical techniques of international law, the author rather lopsidedly recounts the origins of the conflicts between Nigeria and Cameroon. After reviewing the strategic importance of the disputed Bakassi and surrounding islands, he posits that the Anglo-German control of this area should be jettisoned for it was based on misinformed opinions on the part of the negotiators. He challenged the wisdom of the 1964 OAU resolution on boundaries and calls for a revision so, as to “correct mistakes of the colonial past”. This work is relevant to our study in two major directions. First, by invoking international law and customs, he exposed international litigation and arbitration as a possible visit to be explored for a solution to the Nigeria-Cameroon crisis. Second if shares the concern of other analysts that erratic leadership could plung Nigeria and Cameroon into fall-scale war if these problems are not resolved.

 Furthermore, in a more critical analysis of the conflict between Nigeria and Cameroon, Aforka Nweke (1982) focuses on the May 1981 crisis. He analyses the response of the federal government of Nigeria to the incident that led to the deaths of five Nigerian soliders around the Bakassi peninsula, from the decision-making perspective. He finds the decision of the federal government not to go to war with Cameroon to have been at variance with public opinion and the general consensus of politicians and the military in the country as well as inimical to Nigeria’s national interest. However, his well structured analysis of the conflict still ends up reiterating analysis strategic and economic importance of the Bakassi and the adjoining islands-the holy grail of the Nigeria-Cameroon conflict – as being the “Actcilles heel of Nigeria’s potential to have her way militarily and not the legal issues or documents establishing the boundary.

 Similarly, Shagari (2001) pays some attention to the Nigeria Cameroon dispute focusing on especially the 1981 crisis between Nigeria and Cameroon. Beginning with a refreshing but familiar summary of the evolution of Cameroon under German, then French and British colonial tutelages which affected Nigeria boundary, he argues that the diverse parts to independence taken by the British, Northern and southern Cameroons left Nigeria and Cameroon dissatisfied with the out come of the decolonization process. However authoritative this source night be, (the author was the president of Nigeria (1979 – 1983) during the May 1981 crisis) it does little to quell the controversies surrounding this border, particularly, in regard to postcolonial boundary instruments. He unwittingly joins those who argue that without ratification, the Marona Accord was null and void, and also states emptiatically that “it was clearly understood that the agreement signed by the two leaders would become law only after it was ratified by the legislatures of each of the two countries”, meanwhile, this seems not to have been stated in the course of the negotiations. Also, the shortcoming of the Accord as being overgenerous to Cameroon for gratification of support given to the federal side in the Nigerian civil war which he points, is also off the mark.

 Moreso, Sholanke (1993) approached the issue by exposing the unofficial stance of both countries in their dispute (Bakassi dispute). He begin with refreshing renditions of the historical background in which the border between Nigeria and Cameroon was created. Sholankes study tries to expose the weaknesses in previous treaties and protocols on which Cameroon case against Nigeria is based. Noting the frequent pledges by leaders of both states to resolve the conflict peacefully, he concludes though erroneously, that in recognition of the weaknesses in previous agreements “both states have recently shown their readiness to redefined their boundary alignments”. This study manifest the error in most works on the Nigeria-Cameroon dispute, especially in relation to the Bakassi peninsula. Few have articulated the fact that the crux of the matter is a challenge of title rather than doubts as to where the boundary is located. It is only when a diachronic review is made of the widening claims by the parties that we can see that marked change of policy by Nigeria from 1992 when a new map of the federation is drawn and a corresponding intensification of the hostiles, in the disagreements. This study hopes to fill this lacuna.

 Ebeghulem (2008) in his own study, focusing on the diplomatic impact of the

Nigeria’s foreign policy over Bakassi, and also seeking to analyse Nigeria’s handling of the Bakassi imbroglio before, during and after the world courts judgment, pointed out that, it was a diplomatic blunder in Nigeria’s foreign policy. He wrote thus: the population of Bakassi is overwhelmingly Nigerian. Its local government, functions as part of Cross River State since the inception of the State. The Efik Nigerians have always voted to choose their representatives whenever the civilian governments hold sway since Nigerian independence in 1960. The residents of Bakassi believe themselves as Nigerians because they have always participated in all decision-making processes since the nation was born. They should have therefore, been given the privilege to determine their future instead of being partitioned into Cameroon as implied by the ICJ’s ruling. Looking at this blunder from a constitutional angle, Okuwa (2006) points out that Nigeria is a federal system, and the loss or the excise of a state or part of a state to another sovereign state is “a situation not imagined or envisaged when the 1999 Nigerian constitution was hurriedly written”. Okuwa also put up a strong argument why the 1913. Anglo-German Agreement should have thrown out by the international court of Justice. According to him, “the 1913 Anglo-German document signed on Bakassi should have been thrown out by the International Court of Justice in The Hauge. Why? It was a treaty between two alien powers about the future of a traditionally sovereign community who had no role in drafting the imposed treaty”. We agree with Okuwa’s submission that Nigeria has all the diplomatic options and material resources to vigorously pursue a face-saving alternative to the embarrassing consequence the country finds itself now.

# 1.7 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Studies of political phenomena have been carried out under various approaches or rather schools of thought. But for the purpose of our study, we adopt theory of “Nationalism” to the study of political consciousness and organization. And to render nationalism more relevant to our research problem, we invariably also adopt the ethnic interpretation of Nationalism (Ethnic Nationalism). Nationalism as Obasigwe would note in his politics and globe dictionary, is the practices of ethnic ideology or simply tribalism, each of which at some point necessitates the exploitation of differences in nationality for any purposes. One consequences of ethnocentrism, itself an inward-looking and chauvinistic attitude towards ones nationality or cultural group, with a correspondingly suspicious and hostile attitude towards others, especially those held to be in competitive relations with ones own. (Obasigwe, 2007: 283)

To this, it is a strategy to survive and prevent domination. Nationalism, the outcome of political and economic need becomes a force and a source of conflict when it is “refracted” into a society. The intelligentsias are agents of this refractions and are the main purveyors of nationalism. In other words, it connotes the active consciousness of being a different nation, especially in relations with other nations or groups - the struggle by colonized nations or nationalities for collective or separate independent statehood or any other form of selfdetermination. Imperatively, nationalism generally was introduced in this part of the world “Africa” by the westernized educated Africans in the 19th centuries, during the era of European colonialism. Several factors were responsible for the rise of nationalist movements in Africa chief among them include; socio-political and economic, as well as cultural exploitation and subjugation by the European powers. In this light, nationalism, writers Chukwu, (2000: 106), “is a patriotic feeling which brings oppressed but related people together to demand for their independence”. It is often found rooted and promoted by the presence of another superior power. This was quite obvious in colonial Nigeria where Britain remained the superior power, militarily and technologically while Nigeria remained weak. On the other hand, ethnic nationalism is a form of nationalism wherein, the nation is defined in terms of ethnicity. Whatever specific ethnic group is involved, ethnic nationalism always includes some element of decent from previous generations and the implied claim of ethnic essentialism ie. the understanding of ethnicity as an essence that remains unchanged over time. The central theme of ethnic nationalism is that “nations are defined by a shared heritage which usually includes a common language, a common faith, and a common ethnic ancestry. It also includes ideas of a culture shared between members of the group and with their ancestors, and usually a shared language, however it is different from purely cultural definitions of the nation” (which allow people to become members of a nation by cultural assimilation and a purely linguistic definitions (which see the nation as a one speakers of a specific language).

# 1.8 HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses anchor our empirical verifications.

1. The ethnic interest of the people living in the Bakassi, have had impacts on the entire dynamics of the Nigeria-Cameroon border problems.
2. The International Court of Justice (ICJ) ruling inspired the secessionist bid of Nigerians residing in the peninsula.

# 1.9 METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

 This section is concerned with attempts to unveil the building blocks of the research edifice. It shows the processes and procedures employed in sifting through mountings of data and choosing a particular set of data; and presenting the data so chosen and the analytical tools utilize to reach conclusions (Agaptus, 2009: cited in Ugonna, 2010: 30).

 There are two broad methods of generating data for social science research. These are observation method and self-report. While the former entails either observing actions or events as they occur (direct observation) or observing the traces or records of actions or events as well as the reports put down or recorded through direct observation (indirect observation), the former largely borders on the use of interview and/or questionnaire to elicit information internal in the respondents. For the purpose of generating data to test our hypothesis in this study, we shall use the observation method of documentary sources - secondary method. By document, we mean any written material (whether hand-written, typed, or printed) that was already in existence, which was produced for some other purpose than the benefit of the investigation (Nwana 1981 cited in Obasi, 1999: 192). Hence, observational/documentary method is used in this study to mean a method of gleaning, extracting, examining, analyzing and interpreting information as well as reading meaning into these pieces of information so as to draw inference from the available evidence in other to reach a conclusion (Obasi, 199: 171).

 What the foregoing implies is that documentary method makes the recourse to the secondary sources of data inevitable. By secondary sources of data, we mean data gathered from documents authored by another person, virtually data from the available data archives, either in form of document or survey result and books. To this end, this study will be based on documentary analysis of secondary sources of data. These sources of data include institutional and official documents from embassies and policy document by strategic institutions, etc.

# 1.2.1 Methods of Data Analysis

 Like our design exposed, and also in corroboration with our methods of data collection, we adopt descriptive qualitative data analysis or method for our study. This otherwise known as content analysis is essentially normative and descriptive in orientation. This is essential because, according to Obassi, 1999: 61) it is always necessary to subject historical data to internal and external test of validity in order to ascertain their objectivity. This is because people can reconstruct historical events or data for selfish reasons and such biasness usually affects the method of gathering such data as well as the content of data. So in using content analysis, we hope to apply deductive and inductive logic on our analysis. In doing this, we hope to as Obasi, (1999: 60) insinuates, determine, evaluate and explain past events essentially for the purpose of gaining a better and clearer understanding of the present and making a more reliable prediction of the future.

 To this, in our study, we examine a class of social artifacts typically written documents as we noted in our design and methods of data collection. Therefore, we shall examine rather historically, document evidence regarding the impact of ethnicity on the Nigeria-Cameroon border problem.

# 1.2.2 Research Design

 In conducting research, research designs are indispensable. Eboh, (2009: 45) observes that, “research design is the deliberate strategic approach used in conducting a scientific enquiry”. It gives shape, form and identity to the research activity. Research design serves as the anchor of the scientific study. It provides the smooth sailing and enables the evolution of the scientific exercise. It is the research plan or blueprint of action. Invariably, Obasi, (1999: 54) defines it as simply a plan that specifies how data should be collected and analysed. Therefore, a research design is a plan which guides a researcher and prevents him/her from veering off course in the process of collecting, presenting, analyzing and interpreting data. In this light, this study is basically qualitative and non-experimental, thus we are using the observation method of documentary sources; that is, going through documented evidence to discover the various information that have made this work scientific. Nonexperiments are based on the same logic as experiments and can be designed to determine associations. While the study couches the hypothesis in relational terms, (dependent and independent variables), it does not use experiment or controlled groups.

 The relationship amongst variables in our hypothesis is asymmetrical. As Rosenberg (1968, cited in Ugoma 2010: 33) opines, “in this type of relationship, we postulate that one variable (the independent variable) is ‘essentially for’ another (the dependent variable)”. Our variables exhibit the type of asymmetrical relationship which Rosenberg (1968) has described “essentially a necessary precondition for a given effect”. In our first hypothesis for instance, there is a relationship between the ethnic interest of the Nigerians living in the Bakassi area and their rejection of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) ruling. The same pattern is observed in our second hypothesis. There is a relationship between the International Court of Justice (ICJ) ruling (which took not cognizance of the ethnic interest of the Bakassians) and the secessionist bid of Nigerians residing in the peninsular.
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