

**THE THEMATIC CONTRADICTION IN THOMAS
AQUINAS' CONCEPTION OF THE STATE: AN AFRICAN
(NIGERIAN) PERSPECTIVE**

Olúkáyòdé R. Adésuyì

Department of Philosophy, Obáfẹmi Awólówò University

Ilé-Ifẹ̀, Nigeria.

olukayus@gmail.com

1. Introduction

A dominant feature in the medieval philosophy is the fact that the thoughts at that time were influenced by church men, especially the doctrines of Christianity. For any theory to survive it had to gain the support of the church men; otherwise, such would cease to flourish.

The political theories in the medieval periods were not exceptions. There was the presence of the relationship between the spiritual and the temporal powers.¹ Given this, the political theory of Thomas Aquinas and some medieval philosophers, who came before, during his period and/or after, had the same characterizing factor.

In the Medieval political theory, there were two types of society, the church and the state.² This was the idea in the medieval period. Aquinas' political thought, especially about the state, had this feature as well.

This paper attempts to examine Thomas Aquinas' conception of the state and its implication(s) in the post-colonial Africa, and Nigeria as the reference point. This shall be done by looking critically, but briefly, into the various conceptions of state of some of Aquinas' predecessors, to serve as background to Aquinas'

political theory. It shall also argue that Aquinas' theory is self-defeating, given what obtains in the Nigerian religious groups

The paper shall show that the themes in his conception of the state are contradictory, factually not acceptable and logically absurd given the situation Nigerian religious entities are found.

2. Conceptual Analysis of State

There have been various definitions of the state by scholars. Each of the definitions is to suit the purpose for which it is meant. According to Weber it is;

A compulsory political with continuous organisation, whose administrative staff successfully upholds a claim to the monopoly of the legitimate use of political force in the enforcement of its order.³

This is in line with the Hobbes' conception of the civil society, in which its formation was as a result of the problems inherent in their former place (state of nature). It also defines the state to be solely a tyrannical conception. In this regard, the citizens let events be, not that they are satisfied but that they have little or no power over the leaders. This can also be said to be defining the state in terms of unitary system of government, especially under the military.

Azelama conceives it as "an independent political unit recognised internationally as exercising sovereignty over a particular area of the earth surface."⁴ This definition considers an aspect of the state neglecting the other aspect. It is a definition based majorly on geographical location; not defining it in line with its end. This will not be tenable, when the interests of the citizens are to be considered. As far as the state is concerned, it is known as the state, if it is preoccupied with the common good of its citizenry, at least, in the context in which I want to look at it.

Hitler's conception of the state is a fictitious one. In his view, it is imagined as the living organism of a nationality but which, by further training of its spiritual and ideal activities, leads to its highest freedom.⁵ This conception of the state may not come to reality. There are equally some problems involved, the concepts living organism and nationality are not clearly explained, therefore creating some problem. He is trying to equate nation with state, which has always been the thought of some people. There is a clear difference between nation and state.⁶ Nation is referred to as those "whose peoples share a strong linguistic, religious, and symbolic identity,"⁷ while state as "relatively centralized, differentiated and autonomous organizations successfully claiming priority in the use of force within large, contiguous and clearly bounded territories."⁸ It is the coming together of nations that make a state and not otherwise.⁹ It is however discovered that these definitions are defective in one way or the other.

I will rather define a state to mean the togetherness of different people from different ethnic backgrounds having similar goals in common, some identical phenomena and identified to occupy a specific geographical location.

There have been different types of political theories, especially theory of state. These were attempts to establish the real picture of state with the theories. Of the theories propounded, some shall be discussed, in attempt to see which suits the Aquinas' theory of state.

One of such is the absolutist theory of the state. This theory recognises the monarch.¹⁰ It is as old as the genesis of any specified community. Its features are, among others, religious in nature; the personality identified with this represents what such a state is; absolute sovereignty; the power is rotational, but among the acclaimed members of the royal family, which 'royal blood flow in them.' Since it is religiously inclined, it is believed that whoever becomes the leader is divinely chosen. There is the belief that the monarch has divine rights.¹¹ This is an old practice in some parts of the world.

There is the constitutional theory of the state. The constitution is a guiding principle that sets limits on the scope of authority. In this regard, some people are selected to be representative, with some specified terms. The state is the guardian of the constitutional order.¹² The laws are binding on every member of the community irrespective of the position being occupied by anybody.¹³

Yet another theory is the class theory. This view is expressed to mean that the state is dichotomized. The relationship between the classes is always vertical and not horizontal, as it might be in some other theory. There is always the oppressor and the oppressed. The means of oppression is in the hand of the ruling class. This ruling class is in “control of economic means of production.”¹⁴ In this case, oppressors are the capitalists, who own the means of production.¹⁵ The class theory of the state is explained in terms of class composition. This theory is linked with Marx, who was believed to have propounded the theory.¹⁶

There is the pluralist theory. This lays emphasis on the individual’s loyalty to the group he belongs. Simply put, he owes allegiance to the group he belongs. What this implies is that, in a particular state, there are different groups. Each member is, therefore, loyal to that which he/she belongs. This could be ethnic, tribal, religious, social, or political group.

I shall try to relate, in due course, which of these conceptions suits Aquinas purpose, with reasons and why others seem not to suit his purpose with reason.

3. Theories of State

In the political theories of some scholars, there have been some theories of state. How did the state come about? Why did it come up? And what necessitated these states was equally enumerated. In all, there is the general consensus that the formation of state is a gradual process, a piece meal arrangement and not all at a go.

According to Locke's theory of formation of society, the society is that of conjugal.¹⁷ The first society is the union of man and wife. The cordial relationship of this, which is described by Locke as the voluntary compact between man and woman, serves as a cause of which the effect, that is, the end of it is procreation and continuation of species.¹⁸ These species are further classified into different categories, for instance masters and servants.

Becoming a member of a society, especially by birth, is without any choice. According to Sarah, "every person is born within a given human and cultural milieu without any choice."¹⁹ A person is therefore called to be inserted within a family, a religious group and the people at large. He/she is trained and fashioned by the cultural milieu into which he is born and he/she contributes (privately or publicly) alone or with others, to the enrichment of that same milieu. The family, which is the first place of man, has its own role to perform. Its role is to be "the cell in which man receives his first formulative ideas about truth and goodness, and learns what it means to love and to be loved, and thus what it actually means to be a person."²⁰

The relationship between the society and the individual can be likened to the relationship between a play and its parts or a team and its players.²¹ In this sense, it can be explained, even from the structuralist point of view, that for the whole to be known, it must be a thing of necessity to study the components/compositions of the whole. It is when the compositions are understood that the whole can be understood and meaningful contributions made.²² The essence of this study is to see how the society can be developed collectively by members of it, since "every real society is a process in time."²³ It is equally believed that phenomena are structured by "laws of compositions"²⁴ and structuring which is "essentially a system of transformation"²⁵ is what is to be used for the betterment of such phenomena. The phenomena referred to can be likened to the societies. The members of the society are counted upon to this meaningful contribution. As explained by Parsons;

The personalities of members of the society are also parts of its environment in the sense that society must be able to count on its members to societal functioning.²⁶

The interest of the society is, therefore, the totality of the interest of the several members that constitute that society.²⁷ The implication of this is that one cannot talk of the interest of the community without first understanding the interest of the individual. Therefore, the basis of the existence of the state is primarily the existence of the individual person.

From the above, at least, two further implications can be drawn. First, the society must be able to maintain some control over the personalities of its members in order to ensure that these personalities assume roles in society without undue strain. When this is guaranteed, it will bring about the second implication, which is that the majority of the personalities that make up the society must not be alienated.²⁸

The formation of the state can be summarised thus: It is the combination of conjugal family members, from the genesis which is man and his wife up till the society; societies form a nation and nations finally form the state.

The state is an umbrella, bigger and more self sufficient than its institutional components. Some of the componential institutions that are under the umbrella of the state are religious bodies, political institutions, business organizations, educational institutions. As earlier pointed out, these institutions, which serve as parts of the whole (state) put together, define the state's self identity.²⁹ In this case, there is a relationship between the state and its componential parts, and this is reciprocal. This portrays the thesis of the communitarian. The belief that "the individual exists in function of the group to which he/she belongs and to which

everything is permitted”³⁰ can further be expatiated to mean that each society exists in function of the state to which it belongs and which its contributions are permitted.³¹ This is why the ontological dictum “I am because we are” is said to be a logically valid dictum. It is equally understood and reasonably expressed to mean that of dependence without any suppression.³²

Conceptions of State

Thomas Aquinas’ conception of the state serves as a response to some preceding theories either to further support them, with some additional ideas, or to make some amendment in such theories, if found with some inadequacies.

According to Bentham, mankind is governed by two basic things; pain and pleasure, which are regarded as sovereign masters on their own.³³ It is, therefore, rational to jettison the former and embrace the latter with any rationally ethical means. One of the aims of the state is to promote good life, and a means to achieving this good life is to avert pain for the citizens.³⁴ For this to be achievable one must not be alone and not being alone necessitated the formation of a state. It follows, therefore, that the state is a necessity. This is the claim of the scholars, who have propounded some theories about the state, though with different arguments.

Plato conceives of the state, as that which grows out of the nature of the individual.³⁵ The existence of the state is rooted in the individual; its origin is as a result of the individual needs. Naturally, no one has everything or capable of possessing every need of his. He asserts that “a state, I said, arises, as I conceive, out of the needs of mankind, no one is self sufficing, but all of us have many wants.”³⁶

Man needs some other person to contribute into his life. For each need, there must be a skill. Take, for instance, as it is generally believed that the basic needs of human beings that are of necessity are food, clothing and shelter. It is obvious that a single sector of human endeavour may not be able to provide the services for these. This necessitates a division of labour,³⁷ meaning that men

need themselves for survival and fulfilment.³⁸ If there are no individuals to be concerned with each of these sectors, it may turn out that, when there are lapses, even the existence of the individuals is problematic. For this to be avoided, Plato feels that the coming together of individuals to become societies and the togetherness of the latter to become state is necessary.

Apart from the basic necessities, which are basic for lower animals as well,³⁹ some other luxuries are needed.⁴⁰ The yearnings of people who need these must be satisfied. Every individual is expected to be preoccupied with one thing or the other. People desire for more. Two factors are responsible for this, the increase in population and the unsatisfactory nature of people with what they have at hand, necessitating preference for replacement of better services. The desire for more will exhaust the resources of the community, as noted by Plato.

When this continues, people tend to pass their boundaries, invading into the property of fellow people. This leads to war⁴¹ even among the states. This implies that, according to Plato, desire for more serves as the basis of war. Provisions must be made to avert the invaders from attacking the people or state, and this necessitates the emergence of the army.⁴² From the generality of people, another class will emerge, which is the class of the guardians, and from the guardians, then, the ruler. The most trained guardian becomes the ruler.⁴³ So for Plato, citizens are to be divided into three classes; the common people, the soldiers and the guardians. The guardians alone are to have political.⁴⁴

The state is a universal set with subsets in which the category of the guardians is one. The guardians are seemed to be chosen by the legislator, after which they will succeed by hereditary. However, there is always an exemption to this. There are some cases in which promising child may be promoted from one of the inferior classes to attain the position of the powerful people, while among the children of the guardians, a child or young man, who is unsatisfactory, may be degraded. There may be the fear that there will be some problems if those to assume leadership roles are not

properly trained, that they may not be able to govern. As a result, the rulers must have undergone some training at different age range and stages in/of life. Having done all of those, they can then become the ruler at fifty years of age.⁴⁵

Aristotle sees the state as a creature of nature. Human beings are, by nature, social and political animals. Based on their nature as social beings, no man can exist alone. He must be, as a matter of necessity, influenced by his environment.⁴⁶ Man must necessarily live amidst others and be influenced by them. He, who sees no reason to live in a state, is regarded as either a beast or god.⁴⁷

Aristotle's view is that the establishment of the state is for a duty, which is preservation of life for families and communities, who are members. The family, a subset of the community, preserves life for members of the family; while the state as an all encompassing phenomenon, preserves life for the families and the communities. It makes sure that the economic ends of the people are guaranteed, and also supreme good, which includes moral and intellectual life.⁴⁸

There must be a system of rule/government adopted by a state. This further characterizes the state as to which type it is. For Aristotle, there are two forms of government and in each; three types of state can be deduced. The forms, according to him, are true and perverted forms. In the former, the rulers seek to achieve the good end for all. While in the latter, the rulers seek their own private gain. Under the true form, there are monarchy, aristocracy and polity.⁴⁹ The major difference among them primarily, is the number of rulers each has. A government can have its rulers one, which is a characteristic of monarchy; few, a characteristic of aristocracy and many, a characteristic of polity.

These can, however, turn to be bad rulers, if perverted. Monarchy can turn to tyranny, aristocracy to oligarchy and polity to democracy. But Aristotle's preference is aristocracy, for he believes that these few are rational.

Saint Augustine is another philosopher, whose contribution to political thought, especially in the medieval period, cannot be overlooked. Unlike Plato and Aristotle, Augustine's political thought was influenced by his Christian doctrine. It is not surprising seeing him prioritizing religion over and above political institutions.

For Augustine, there are two kinds of society, which human race divide themselves into, the state and the church.⁵⁰ This necessitates the division of those who love God and those who love themselves and the world. Based on this, there are two different cities; City of God, for the former and City of the world for the latter.⁵¹ To further clarify this, these two cities are not identical, strictly in my opinion, with the church and state. The more reason why they are not identical is in respect to the fact that members of these cities cut across the state and church.⁵² He, however, gives superiority to the church over the state. According to Augustine,

a society cannot be ideally founded unless upon the basis and by the hand of faith and strong concord, where the object of love is the universal good, which in its highest and truest character is God himself and where people love one another with complete sincerity in Him, and the ground of their love for one another is the love of Him from whose eyes they cannot conceal the spirit of love.⁵³

Society is “an assemblage of rational beings associated in a common agreement as to the things it loves.”⁵⁴ It is no longer a problem tracing the relationship between the state and the societies. It is to be noted that societies make a nation and nations make a state.⁵⁵ According to Augustine, therefore, a state is a

group of people of various societies and nations united in their natural love of mutable, temporal goods necessary for human life, of which peace is taken to be the loftiest and inclusive.⁵⁶ But its origin is as a result of the Original sin⁵⁷ and later sins.

A church is perfect and sovereign in the spiritual order of peace and salvation while the state is in the corporeal order of peace and harmony.⁵⁸ This is not to say that there is no cordial relationship between the two. The state is, according to Augustine, considered to be an offshoot of Original Sin. The church is necessary for the citizens, and the state at large, for 'redemption'. In a nutshell, Augustine sees sin as nature of man. The sins necessitate the establishment of the church, since it is believed that God is the creator of everything. Everything depends on God, who is the ultimate source of legitimate authority and the author of nature, for he gives kindly power on earth to the pious and impious.⁵⁹ It is equally God that can cure any of His creatures of any ailment. So the church serves as orthodox for the ailment of the state.

4. Thomas Aquinas' Conception of State

Saint Thomas Aquinas' political theory is influenced by the theories of some of his predecessors discussed above, but two of these have prominent influences on his theory. One is Aristotle's and the other is Augustine's. Aquinas combined Aristotle's works and the doctrines of Christianity to suit his purpose. There are similarities between Aristotle's and Aquinas' political theories. There are, however, some differences. There are also some similarity and difference in Augustine's and Aquinas' political theories. While both have Christian flavour, which serves as the major similarity, they disagree on the origin of state. It has been explained above that Augustine's conception of state is in respect to the Original sin. Aquinas' conception of state is however not the same.

Aquinas conception of state is in line with Aristotle's that the state is founded on man's nature as social animal. In reaction to Augustine's position that the state is an effect of the original sin, Aquinas says that it may be the offshoot of Original Sin, but the state would still have necessarily existed if there was no sin. The meaning is that there is no cause and effect relationship between the state and Original Sin or any other sin. So even if people were innocent, there would still have been a state, because people would have been members of a society.⁶⁰

Aquinas political theory is modelled on his ethics and the latter modelled on Aristotle's Nicomachean ethics. Aristotle identifies the ultimate goal of human life with happiness, and that happiness cannot be equated with pleasure, riches, honour or any bodily good. Happiness must consist in activity in accordance with, especially intellectual virtue.⁶¹

The intellectual activity that is in line with Aristotelian requirements for happiness is found perfectly in contemplation of the essence of God. So according to Aquinas, happiness is to be found only on the soul of the blessed in heaven.⁶² This, therefore, means that those who believe in God and follow his parts will receive more happiness, even when they get to heaven.

There are two types of life; the contemplative life and active life. Even in the Nicomachean ethics, "the contemplative life orders seek to spend time on God alone, the active life orders seek to serve the needs of their fellows."⁶³ The contemplative life involves some activities such as preaching and teaching, which shows that it is a religious life. This is considered to be the best life, because it is a religious life that includes teaching and preaching.⁶⁴

Aquinas' conception of the state is patterned towards these types of life. The church serves as the contemplative life, which is the most important and the state represented the active life. This is

why it is claimed that Christianity is assumed to be a teaching. Aquinas political philosophy, especially the importance, relevance and superiority of the church over and above the state, are in line with Christian teaching.⁶⁵

In his view, and for some other medieval philosophers, especially the Christian Medieval philosophers, there is a connection between the church and the state. This connection is to prove that faith and reason are not contradictory, as had thought. In this regard, there exist two truths; truths of faith and reason.⁶⁶

Though, the existence of the state is necessary for human society, whether or not there was Original Sin or that sins are still being committed. It does not mean that the state is autonomous. What this means is that the state does not have absolute power. The state can only make provisions for the natural ends of man. It, however, cannot take care of spiritual end, which is the ultimate end.

For a state to be governed there should be a specific form of government to be adopted. As noted by Hobbes, there are many types of political systems among nations of the world.⁶⁷ As earlier explained, Aristotle adopts aristocracy as the best form of government. Similar to Aristotle's form of state and the end result of good rulers, Aquinas classifies form of government into three; monarchy, aristocracy and law abiding democracy and the corresponding deviations, which are tyranny, oligarchy and irresponsible democracy. His own preference is monarchy blended with other forms. This means that one man will be at the realm of affairs and assisted by few elites and democracy helps in choosing the ruler.

Aquinas' choice of monarchy, as his best form, is not unconnected with his religious training, as a Christian and his beliefs in the doctrines of scripture of the religion. It is obvious

that the religious people always appeal to the scripture in some matters. So Aquinas' case is not an exemption, he appeals to Ezekiel chapter 37 verse 24. The belief and his adoption of monarchy are further supported by the fact that the only power that is sovereign is that of God, and through His intervention, leaders are chosen. It is in this respect that considering the conceptions of the theories of state earlier enumerated, Aquinas conception will fall under the category of absolutist conception of state.

From all that have been discussed, one can say that the discussions and conception of political philosophy and theories have to do with best regime; its location, formation or a formulation, which includes the type of government and the kind of people to be in charge and what to be used to govern and the kind of people governed.⁶⁸ For this best regime to come to fruition, at least, in Aquinas' view, his adopted form of government must be accommodated. But this can only be done again by introducing something else, which is law. There are two categories of human beings based on their characters and behaviours, 'hard and proud' and 'good and just'. For the first category, the law is like an instruction to help them fulfil what they intend to do. It is only the good and just people that can presumably see the goodness of the law if presented for their consideration. They see the law as solution to solving a real problem or puzzlement.⁶⁹

But because of the fact that that the function of the state is to see to the good life of the citizens, and there is the possibility of the people going against this. This could be either by frustrating the efforts of those at the helm of affairs or that when they commit any offence, it may be difficult for them to be apprehended. The feature could be found amidst the hard heartened and proud people. Once this is the case, power is then necessary, as noted by Hobbes, that "the power of any man is his actual means to obtain

some future apparent good.”⁷⁰ There are various kinds of power, their contributions and features.⁷¹

Having explained that Aquinas adopted the monarchy as the best form of government, it therefore means that the kind of power he would adopt is that which is compounded of powers of most men united by consent in one person. This kind of power is, according to Hobbes, the greatest of human powers.⁷² This power could be natural, as it is in religious circle or civil. This power combines some other ones, just the way it is explained by Aquinas that monarchy is to be blended with other forms.

When the power has been got, it is expected of the state to work for good life of the human group. The citizens must therefore benefit from the economic and social development, which must have been realized by the totality of the hard of the members of the state.⁷³ In other words, the citizens are expected to be beneficiaries of political, economic and social life, which are all elements of good life.

Aquinas adopts monarchy as his own best form of state, which is categorized under the absolutist theory of state. This amounts to the fact that a man is at the helm of affairs. The implication is that in one way or the other, it becomes the function of that individual in control to work out modalities that would assist him carry out the duties expected of him. The individual works out these modalities from a historically and socially constructed framework, world view or conceptual frame work. These are set of beliefs, values, attitudes and assumptions which explain, shape and reflect the view of the individual and that of the state.⁷⁴

Some human beings by nature are not static in some respects, character wise and some other things, and can construct a conceptual frame work. He can construct a frame work, which can change. The reason is that individual understands and

constructs what he perceives, knows and values through some other conceptual framework. Some conceptual frameworks may be good or bad, depending on their effects on citizens. Given their relativity, some are oppressive and the affected ones are the lower classes, the subjects. Some of the conceptual frameworks are value-hierarchical thinking, either or thinking, logic of domination.

The value-hierarchical thinking gives room for dichotomy. The relationship is always vertical, which is not a good relationship. Some are up while some are down. The ‘downs’ are given smaller value, while greater ones are given to the ‘ups’.

Either or thinking accommodates the exclusion of some people and inclusion of some. In this sense, there are two classes, which ordinarily are expected to be complementary, but instead are oppositional. The inclusive class enjoys at the expense of the exclusive class.

Logic of Domination is in a form of reasoning usually used by the ‘up’ class to prove and justify the superiority of some people of some others. They always give argument to support their claims.⁷⁵

Each of the conceptual frameworks shows that it is favourable to one class and not to the other. When this is the case, the citizens may lose interest in the state/government. As observed by Obadan, it is only “when citizens have the belief that their government operates on their behalf in an open accountable manner will government be able to obtain their willing cooperation.”⁷⁶ Obadan has, in his view, brought to the discussion the issue of public morality⁷⁷ as they relate to governance.⁷⁸ Once it is perceived that the morals expected of the state are lacking, and the belief and trust reposed in them are no longer there, the next thing is for the citizens to turn against the government representing the state. In this kind of state, some things will happen.

One of the problems that the state will face is that of anarchy. This may happen when “institutions collapse, when existing institutions are not fulfilling people’s basic needs and when satisfactory alternative structures are not readily available.”⁷⁹ Some other problem that may arise, as argued by Irele, is that it will lead to the difficulty of eliciting the loyalty of the people. The reason for this is the alienating nature of the social system, where people do not seem to be gaining anything in terms of dividends of governance in the state.⁸⁰ It is therefore evident that a state will not be problem free and there exists in such a state lack of effective statehood.

If the problems persist, the state is left with some alternatives. One of such alternatives is either to allow the problems persist and continue to “revel in anarchy and a prolonged period of chaos and crises, or to splinter into a number of mini-states.”⁸¹

These alternatives are not without problems. It is obvious that no rational being will want to choose the first one. Given Aquinas’ religious background, as a Christian and the doctrine of church against war and the preaching of loving one’s neighbour as oneself, the first option will have to be discarded. The second option is also not a better option, because of the belief in the togetherness of the state as a body. If it is divided into a number of mini-states, there is the possibility that the mini-states will divide and may continue until it gets back to the basis, that is, family clan alone. The problem inherent in this is that each family will not be as strong as the state. This may result to invasion, oppression or even to the Hobbes’ state of nature, where there would not be morality, law etc. From this, there is the possibility that members there die untimely.

To solve the perceived problem, something external must be the solution. The solution therefore, according to Aquinas, is the church. This is where the church is a necessity. The church is to

be the last resort, if the citizens are suffering in the hands of those in charge. Even if the state is doing well by performing its functions, providing the good life for the people, the church is still needed to give what the state cannot do. What is this that the state cannot provide, according to Aquinas, is the ultimate end, which is salvation.

Salvation, an age long phenomenon, is found in religions (Christian and some others). Salvation has been interpreted to mean so many things. One of such is that it is an act of saving preservations from destruction and death. It could be said to be the saving of man from the powers and of sin. This includes the deliverance of man from the condition of spiritual isolation and estrangement to a reconciled relationship of community with God, fellow men, redemption from spiritual lost to religious fulfilment and restoration to the fullness of God's favour. It could also mean deliverance of the soul from sin or the spiritual consequences of sin. In other words, it is the saving of person's soul from eternal punishment.⁸²

Saving the souls or having a good relationship with God could only be manifested by the help of the religious institution, a componential part of the state, whose duty is to ensure man's eternal happiness, which can only be found in the church. As pointed out by Plato, there are different people with different occupation and duties to perform. There is the reflection of that even in Aquinas' thesis, the members of the church performing what others cannot do, based on the fact that their service is necessary. This service is a means to man's end, which is eternal happiness, ultimate end, salvation.

However, it does not mean that anybody can get this eternal happiness by accident. For someone to get this, at least, two conditions have to be met, they are repentance and faith.⁸³ These conditions cannot equally be met without the help of the church.

This is the sense, in my view, in which Aquinas portrays the church as a necessity.

Does it then mean that it is only in the church that salvation, an eternal happiness, can be got? This question has been answered by Kung that salvation can be got outside the church.⁸⁴ In his argument, Kung claims that all religions are ways of salvation and as far as some religions are concerned, there are some religions, whose salvation is based on work. Salvation in this sense is interpreted to mean 'salvation at work'. He says that "all religions seek to interpret the world, to find, in practice, a way of salvation out of the mystery and torment of existence."⁸⁵ Work in this sense includes obedience to the law, profession of faith, prayer etc.

In Kung's conception of salvation, it is not applicable only to the church, but to all other religions. To buttress this point, Omoregbe explains that God has no favourite language, culture, race etc, so does he not have any favourite religion. In any case, whoever does God's will and lives a good life is acceptable to Him.⁸⁶ This, if looked at, is not similar to Aquinas' conception of the church as a basic means to achieving salvation. In a nutshell, salvation is needed by the citizens and the state cannot provide this salvation, it is the duty of the duty of the church.

5. Implications of Thomas Aquinas' Conception of the State for the Nigerian St

It is assumed that any theory, idea or any other related matter conceived by a figure should be universally applicable/acceptable in any given context. In other words, it should not be spacio-temporally conditioned. Such idea should be suitable at all times. Thomas Aquinas view on the state is an exception. While conceiving the idea, perhaps, he would have assumed that it would be a welcome idea, theory or conception. But as I shall show, this is not the case for Nigeria.

Nigeria is a multi-religious and ethnic state. “The state system in Nigeria was a deliberate creation and a [by-product] of British imperialism.”⁸⁷ That Nigeria is made up of diverse ethnic nationalities with different historical, geographical, political, religious and socio-economic specificities and peculiarities, as further noted by Alao,⁸⁸ proves or shows that Aquinas’ conception of the state is not a universally relevant idea. His idea, therefore, will not be meant for a state with these features. Aquinas’ attempt to situate this idea and make it fit into any organized society is like following the school of thought of Parmenides. However, as evident in Nigeria, and as rightly expatiated out by Alao, Nigeria is a Heraclitean state, where people experience changes all the time; hence, there have been dynamics of the evolution of the Nigerian State since amalgamation and political transformation till date.⁸⁹

Aquinas resorts to monarchy as a preferred form of government in his conceived idea of a state as earlier explained. Nigeria, as noted above with diverse cultural heritage, does not have an all embracing traditional political system; different ethnic groups with their systems of traditional government. There are some ethnic groups/communities that have their monarchs being hereditary; this is the commonest. However, there are few exceptions with their monarchs being elevated; an instance is Ibadan in Oyo State, Nigeria.

The leader in this category is that born into the hereditary position recognized by custom and tradition. According to Ekong, “his leadership status is therefore ascribed rather than achieved.”⁹⁰ This kind of leader has authority by virtue of the tradition of the community. The tradition also affords him/her an unlimited loyalty and unquestioned obedience from members of the community.⁹¹ He is a divine ruler who has control over people and group. However, his powers could be checked by his chiefs and the people he governs.⁹² A candidate for a monarchy position emerges from a particular royal family, or ruling house. Royal families in a

town are limited, although, there may be many branches as to the number of male children, that is, princes. “As the families expand in numbers, the problem of choosing a successor becomes compounded and acrimonious.”⁹³

Today, the traditional rulers are not as powerful as before. Their powers were reduced first with the introduction of colonialism, and later with subsequent contemporary governments. Afolayan and Afolayan have noted that the greatest blow of the traditional government was their disempowerment through colonialism.⁹⁴ The post colonial times have not been the best era for traditional rulers. They face “more direct confrontations, intimidations and occasional humiliations from, not only the modern day “main stream” secular political establishments, but worse still, from members of their own immediate communities.”⁹⁵

Kingship institution, especially in the South-Western part of Nigeria, has been experiencing unpleasant challenges. There is the unusual power tussle, or what I can call ‘power for relevance’ among the subject. One of the factors responsible for this, as pointed out by Afe and Adubuola, was the introduction of indirect rule brought by colonialism.⁹⁶ With this, the traditional rulers have lost their political authority; the much revered *Kábíèsí* (the unquestioned) is now being questioned on many issues by higher authority.⁹⁷ What they now have is pseudo-authority; at the same time, they can best be described as ceremonial rulers over their subjects. However, people still struggle to get the so called “nominal authority and recognition.”⁹⁸ Among the monarchs, there are perceived atrocities, except for some few towns with checks and balances⁹⁹, these traditional rulers have absolute monarchy. The implication is that if the monarch is the type that does not care about the subjects, then the subjects suffer. This cannot be the monarchy conceived by Aquinas for it is purely a contradiction of his idea.

Another perceived problem is that of hereditary. Nobody sees any problem with this primary criterion of becoming a traditional ruler, and I do not think it is posing any serious challenge. Where the problem lies is the capability or otherwise of the chosen candidate, and whether or not the candidate is loved/liked or otherwise by his subjects. There have been cases of monarchs not liked by the subjects but since they not have any choice, they grudgingly accept the 'offer'.

Now that Nigeria is governed by leaders different from the monarchs, and that the monarchs are themselves subjects under the new organized government, it means, the state is to be looked onto for the needs of the people. One of the basic needs of the citizens is social justice. By social justice here, it is implied to mean social morality. The social morality here is expected from both the state and the citizens; but more from the state. In this case, there is a kind of relationship between the state and citizens. As described by Akpekpe,

The relationship between a state and its citizens is bi-dimensional in nature. The consequence of this is that for the people to achieve good life, it requires the state to provide the enabling milieu necessary and sufficient for that purpose.¹⁰⁰

Citizens, therefore, believe that their needs can be gotten from the state, and not from religious groups. They prefer to face the government of the state to going to meet the clerics for these needs. But where the state fails to meet the needs of the citizens, the citizens resort to going to religious bodies for divine intervention. Those in government equally patronize the religious bodies for religious intervention. But one cannot say whether they go there in the genuine sense of it or camouflage. Although, there is the constitutional provision that prohibits the state from adopting a particular religion as that of the state,¹⁰¹ yet government officials

still go to them under the pretence of going to God. Although, they have not declared a particular religion a state religion, but they have not been able to adequately balance the equation between the religions found in the country.

Going by Aquinas' religious background, no need of any further interpretation to know that he chooses Christian religion as the foundation for his theory and that is why he chooses the church as the saving ground. This cannot be implemented in Nigeria given its multi-religious background, otherwise, the 'relative' peace in some parts of the country may not be found. The consequence of this may be the age long conflict between some of the religious groups, especially practitioners of Islam and Christianity.¹⁰²

It must be noted, however, that these religious bodies have not been up to the task. They have been romanced by government of the day. They perform more of civic duties than religious duties assigned to them. They equally commit more sacrilege than before. Therefore, to use Aquinas' term the "Church" cannot be of help to the citizenry.

6. Conclusion

The conception of the state by Aquinas and others that have been discussed can be referred to as political naturalism. The major theme in Aquinas conception of the state is the necessity of the church, as a means to salvation. Aquinas discussion of the state is supposed to be an ideal one, in which case, the church or simply put, the doctrines of the Christian, which can be found majorly in the Bible, serve as flavours in his conception of state. So for Aquinas, the Christian doctrines are to be the guiding principles for the state.

As noted, the church is a religious institution and of course a componential institution in the state. But according to Aquinas, the church is superior to the state, which makes it impossible for the state to be absolutely autonomous. In other words, the autonomy

of the state is context bound. How can it be said that a part is superior to the whole, when in the real sense, it should be otherwise? It may be argued, using the analogy of the human composition and for the sake of argument, that the heart, for instance, is an essential part of the body. When the heart stops working, the entire body (both internal and external) ceases to exist. Can this be said of the church that when it is destroyed, the entire state ceases to exist?

There can be a further question, that is it then the case that other componential institutions of the state are not necessary, such that even when they do not exist the church does and the state's existence is guaranteed? This can be viewed from Jemiriye's perspective on salvation, that salvation could also mean the socio-economic well being of man on earth.¹⁰³ This has further introduced two levels of salvation; spiritual and physical levels. The point is that, according to Aquinas, importance is given to the spiritual level over and above the physical level of salvation.

It is possible for a person to attain the two levels, if one goes by the account of Augustine that there are two societies for the citizens, especially the Christian. In this case, his citizenship is to both church and state. It is equally possible for a person to be a citizen of either. If this holds, looking at this from the exclusive point of disjunctive analysis, it will mean that if he belongs to one of them he gets salvation, but different level. If he belongs to the church, he gets spiritual salvation but if the state, then, socio-economic salvation. Does it then mean that one will want to forget one for the other? It may be argued that one may forfeit one for the other in this sense. But the question is which of the salvation, the spiritual, which will amount to eternal torment, though not with absolute certainty? Or the socio-economic, which amounts to poverty, that makes him an unequal fellow in the society? What becomes the fate of this kind of person spiritually or/and socio-economically?

Aquinas conception is religiously inclined. But it is assumed, for the sake of argument, that the theory is expected to be true irrespective of space and time. The conception can be said to be a Christian doctrine, but influenced by Aristotelian philosophy. The perceived problem is that since it is a Christian oriented theory, it may not be a universally acceptable theory. In this case, I want to use Kung's analysis of salvation, where one is a universal salvation and the other is strictly Christian salvation. The universal recognises salvation in the other religions and Aquinas' salvation is to be found strictly in the Church. If this holds, it means that for those whose salvation is not guaranteed because of their non-belief in Aquinas (Christian) conception of salvation, would not have a place. Given this, Aquinas' conception is not tenable.

Is it not possible for some people not to be preoccupied with spiritual salvation, that whether there is salvation or not they do not know and are not concerned? I want to assume that there is a possible state with members. Is it not possible for members of the society not to be interested in salvation? If there are some people that are interested in it, then, the Church may still be necessary. On the other hand, if all members of the state are not interested in salvation, it, therefore, means that the establishment of the Church will not be necessary. This refutes the thesis of Aquinas, making the Church as a basic necessity, as not a tenable thesis.

In the conception of the state, the theory that suits Aquinas is absolutism, which is in line with monarchy. The monarchy/absolutism can develop into what will later become problem for the state. The monarchy is not the perfect form; it may turn to tyranny, where the head uses his power to acquire wealth at the expense of the citizens. Solomon, in the bible, was a monarch, but used his position, as the King to marry wives and had concubines, proving the fallibility of humans. He can even go ahead and come up with his own conceptual framework that will favour him alone.

There is also the tendency of this theory changing to theocracy. This will cause problem among those that do not believe in religious doctrine. This may eventually lead to conflict of interest, where people fight over ideologies to be used to govern the state. This may result to crises, wars. At the end, lives of citizens, which are supposed to be preserved, are taken prematurely. So, what is expected to be solution turns to be a problem. In another way, there may be more than one religious group. The problem of relevance of the other perceived religious groups are raised.

Given all these, one can say that Aquinas conception of the state with the importation of the Church will not be a tenable one. Though, one should not be surprised that that was the practice in the medieval period, but it does not, however, mean that it is acceptable and adequate. Therefore, his theme of necessitating the Church and even making it more powerful indirectly is not a convincing one.

It is thought that the church is supposed to serve as control measure for immorality. However, it is to be noted that immoral acts are perpetrated even in the same church by ‘members’ of the church. My use of church here represents religion as a whole. Those to guarantee salvation for the citizens, if salvation is considered universally, and not restricted to a particular sect or religion, are not working towards getting for themselves first. There are abundant examples from Nigerian religious societies, especially the two dominant religions in Nigeria – Christianity and Islam.

In Christianity, people are found now establishing churches at different locations all in the name of salvation. Their claim is usually that they have been called by God. The question is, if truly they have been called by God, which is a subjective claim, is it a crime to deliver the messages to their initial companions in their initial churches? Is it necessary to go out of the initial churches to

deliver such 'divine' messages? The churches that are expected to serve as salvation domain for church members are now places of doom for them. Prosperity is now preached as against salvation as enshrined in the philosophy of Aquinas. In this Christianity as well, other numerous evils are perpetrated which the church cannot curb.

In Islam, although, Mosques are not individually owned, even if personally built by one's effort, the builders do not expect money coming from the mosques into his purse. However, *Imams* and other prominent figures are chosen for to govern the affairs of the mosques. By this, it means that these leaders are not to lead in prayers alone; they are also to preach, and teach morals. The irony of the whole situation is that these people that are to teach morals lack morals. Is it then possible for a person without a thing be able to give out what he/she does not have? In a nutshell, they equally lack morals and, as a result could not give salvation to their people.

Therefore, given the Nigerian context, Aquinas claim that the church, which I prefer to refer to as religion as whole, cannot solve the problem of their people. In a sense, his theory is self defeating.

Notes and References

¹ See Copleston, F. C., *Medieval Philosophy: An Introduction*, Mineola, New York: Dover Publications Inc., 2001: 166. This is an abridged republication of a standard edition of the work originally published in London: Methuen and Co. Ltd, 1952.

² Copleston: 166

³ Weber, M., *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1947: 154.

⁴ Azelama, J., *An Introduction to Political Science*, Benin City: MACADAMS Publishers, 2002: 32

⁵ See Oommen, T. K., *Citizenship, Nationality and Ethnicity*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997: 136.

⁶ See Barker, E., *National Character and the Factors in its Function*, London: Methuen and Company Ltd, 1948: 126

⁷ Tilly, C., “Collective Violence in European Perspective” in Graham, H. O. and Gurr, T. R. (eds), *Violence in America*, New York: Bantam, 1969: 3

⁸ Tilly: 43.

⁹ An example is Nigeria. On this analysis, Nigeria can only be referred to as a state and not a nation as some would rather call it.

¹⁰ See Idowu, W. O. O., “Citizenship Status, Statehood Problems and the Political Conflicts: The Case of Nigeria” in *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 8, 2, 1999: 75

¹¹ These divine rights and some other things inherent in this kind of rule are supported by the laws of the religion practised in that kind of a state. In Saudi Arabia, for instance, this is what is practised. So for them, the reference point is the Qur’an. For instance, Qur’an 2 verse 41-42 which says “And believe in what I have sent down. . . And mix not truth with falsehood, nor conceal the truth.” In which case one of such messages sent is found in Qur’an 3 verse 26 which says “.Say, O Allah! Possessor of the kingdom, You give the kingdom to whom you will, and You take the kingdom from whom You will. . .” in the Christian fold, an example was Solomon. Some backup can be found in Romans 13 verse 1-7. In the old Yoruba political system, the same was apparent. They used Ifa divination as a reference point. Though, the Ifa divination is still used, but not to select a monarch for a state, rather for a community in a state. See Salami, Y. K., “The Democratic Structure of Yoruba Political-Cultural Heritage” in *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, 1, 6, December 2006: 69-70

¹² Idowu, W. O. O., *Citizenship Status, Statehood Problems and the Political Conflicts: The Case of Nigeria*: 76

¹³ There are various forms of this, but the commonest example is Democratic state, which could be either presidential or parliamentary system.

¹⁴ Idowu: 76

¹⁵ It is to be noted, however, that this kind can be found in some other theories of the state. An example is constitutional. In a sense, therefore, one can say that it is inherent in some of the theories. Those who have this will be said to have had both political and economic power.

¹⁶ But according to Idowu, Marx did not, in concrete terms, develop and articulate a distinct theory of the state. The class theory came to be associated with him due to the influence his idea of class conflict and antagonism had on latter Marxism. Idowu: 76

¹⁷ Locke, J., *Two Treatises of Government: A Critical Edition with an Introduction and Apparatus Criticism by Laslett, P.*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960: 337.

¹⁸ Locke: 337

¹⁹ Sarah, R., *Culture, Democracy and Development in the Light of Centesimus Annus*, Nairobi: Paulines Publications Africa, 2004: 14.

²⁰ Sarah: 45

²¹ Oyeshile, O. A., "The Individual-Community Relationship as an Issue in Social and Political Philosophy" in Oladipo, O. (Ed), *Core Issues in African Philosophy*, Ibadan: Hope Publications Ltd., 2006: 103.

²² See Rosman, A., "Structuralism as a Conceptual Framework" in *African Studies Review*, 13, 1, April 1970: 71.

²³ Leach, E. R., *Political Systems in Highland Burma*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954: 5

²⁴ Maranda, P., "Structuralism in Cultural Anthropology" in *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 1, 1972: 335

²⁵ Maranda: 335

²⁶ Parsons, Talcott, *The Evolution of Societies*, Englewood, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1977: 7.

²⁷ Bentham, J., "Happiness is Seeking the Greatest Pleasure for the Greatest Number of People" in Gould, J. A. and Mulvaney, R. J. (Eds) *Classic Philosophical Questions*, Eleventh Edition, New Jersey: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2004: 349.

²⁸ Oyeshile, O. A., *The Individual-Community Relationship as an Issue in Social and Political Philosophy*: 103

²⁹ Oyeshile: 104.

³⁰ Sarah, R., *Culture, Democracy and Development in the Light of Centesimus Annus*: 6.

³¹ This is the view of those who hold onto communitarianism, that there is a close relationship between the community/state and the individual. There are two types of communitarianism, the radical and the modest. While the former holds the claim that individual cannot do without the community, the latter

claims that though individual belongs to a society, but still can do some things without solely being influenced by societal norms. For a detailed analysis of communitarianism, see Gawkowska, A., “Neutrality, Autonomy and Order: Amitai Etzioni’s Communitarian Critique of Liberalism Under Scrutiny” in *A Decade of Transformation, IWM Junior Visiting Fellows Conferences*, 8, 4, Vienna 1999: 1-34, Gbadegesin, S., “Individuality, Community and the Moral Order” in Coetzee, P. H. and Roux, A. P. J. (Eds), *The African Philosophy Reader*, London and New York: Routledge, 1998: 292-305.

³² See Gbadegesin: 295.

³³ Bentham, J., Happiness is Seeking the Greatest Pleasure for the Greatest Number of People: 349.

³⁴ See Boule, John, *Hobbes and His Critics: A Study in the 17th Century Constitutionalism*, 3rd Edition, London: Frankcass and Company Ltd, 1969: 40.

³⁵ Stumpf, S. E. and Fieser, J., *Socrates to Sartre and Beyond: A History of Philosophy*, 7th Edition, New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education, 2003: 65.

³⁶ Plato, *The Republic*, Jowett, M. A. (trans), New York: Vintage Books: 60.

³⁷ Plato: 62.

³⁸ Odunsi, D. M, “The Ideal End of the State and Its Basic Duties: A Challenge to Nigerian Society” in *Enwisdomization Journal: An International Journal for Learning and Teaching Wisdom*, 3, 1, 2006:73

³⁹ Lower animals cannot survive without food, their hairs, feathers, scales or any other thing perform the function of clothing, while their abodes are equivalent of shelter. That is why any animal that leaves its abode to another animals abode will not survive. For instance, goat cannot leave land for river, likewise fish cannot leave river for land or desert. This is a perfect explanation of Darwinian Evolution Theory, which explains the adaptation and survival.

⁴⁰ Plato, *The Republic*: 65.

⁴¹ Stumpf, S. E. and Fieser, J., *Socrates to Sartre and Beyond*: 65. This is a perfect illustration of the Nigerian predicament. The resources are not enough, while the available ones are not evenly distributed. The fact is that everybody wants to be satisfied by whatever means. There are two options to be provided with these needs; even distribution of available common wealth or they search for themselves. Since the first option has failed, at least for now, they are left with the second option. But by this, they may be said to be committing a false dilemma fallacy.

⁴² Hobbes idea of the state of nature is similar to this, only that in that state, it’s law of nature that made the people act the way they did. But unlike Plato, the solution to anarchy in Hobbes’ state of nature was to form a civil society. The civil society would be represented by a sovereign power.

⁴³ This sounds like a perfect description of military government where the most senior Army officer, who is assumed to be the most highly trained guardian,

becomes the Head of State. This will only happen when there is the need for that and in ideal Army setting.

⁴⁴ See Russell, B., *History of Western Philosophy*, London: Routledge, 1946: 125.

⁴⁵ Stumpf, S. E. and Fieser, J., *Socrates to Sartre and Beyond*: 66-67.

⁴⁶ See Shields, C., *Aristotle*, London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2007: 353-354.

⁴⁷ Stumpf, S. E. and Fieser, J., *Socrates to Sartre and Beyond*: 94. Only these can naturally live alone without being influenced by other creature.

⁴⁸ Stumpf and Fieser: 94.

⁴⁹ Shields, C., *Aristotle*: 365.

⁵⁰ This does not mean that the individual belongs to either; instead it is believed that people share dual identity. This is why, especially for those that belong to one denominational church or the other, they are members of the church and state.

⁵¹ Augustine, Saint, *City of God*, <http://personal.stthomas.edu/gwschlabach/docs/city.htm> [accessed 05/03/2010]

⁵² This is to say that members of either of the cities can be found in either of the societies, that is, state and church.

⁵³ Quoted from Stumpf, S. E. and Fieser, J., *Socrates to Sartre and Beyond*: 140

⁵⁴ Augustine, *City of God*, <http://personal.stthomas.edu/gwschlabach/docs/city.htm> [accessed 11/04/2010]

⁵⁵ A clear example is the Nigerian state that comprises many nations, given the feature of a state.

⁵⁶ Augustine, *City of God*

⁵⁷ A sin considered to be the first sin committed by Adam and Eve.

⁵⁸ See Aspell, P. J., *Medieval Western Philosophy: The European Emergence*, Washington: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 1999: 37.

⁵⁹ Augustine, Saint, *City of God*

⁶⁰ Stumpf, S. E. and Fieser, J., *Socrates to Sartre and Beyond*: 180. The implication of this is that, Adam and Eve, the acclaimed first parents, were in a society before they sinned; so if they had not sinned, the society would still have grown and the population of such society would, perhaps, have increased.

⁶¹ See Kenny, A., *An Illustration Brief History of Western Philosophy*, 2nd Edition, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006: 159.

⁶² Kenny: 159

⁶³ Kenny: 162.

⁶⁴ Kenny: 162

⁶⁵ See Strauss, L., *Persecution and the Art of Writing*, Westport: Greenwood, 1952: 7-21.

⁶⁶ If it said that they contradict, then, it will mean that there is the introduction of split into the human nature and human search for the whole/reality. See Strauss, L., “How to Begin to Study Medieval Philosophy” in Pangle, T. L. (ed.), *The Rebirth of Classical Political Rationalism*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989: 207-226.

⁶⁷ Hobbes, T., “Monarchy is Best” in Gould, J. A. and Mulvaney, R. J. (Eds) *Classic Philosophical Questions*, Eleventh Edition, New Jersey: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2004: 504.

⁶⁸ Schall, J. V., “The Right Order of Polity and Economy: Reflections on Saint Thomas and Old Law” in *Cultural Dynamics*, 7, Nov. 1995: 427-440.

⁶⁹ The law here can be likened to the constitution of any state. In this case, the constitution is consulted, when there are problems arising. This same constitution is used, together with some Acts to battle with offenders, hard hearted, if there are.

⁷⁰ Hobbes, T., Monarchy is Best: 505.

⁷¹ For detailed descriptions and explanations of power, See Hobbes, T. Monarchy is Best: 505.

⁷² Hobbes: 505.

⁷³ Sarah, R., *Culture, Democracy and Development in the Light of Centesimus Annus*: 15.

⁷⁴ Idowu, W., “Feminist Epistemology of Law: A Critique of a Developing Jurisprudence” in *Ife Juris Review: A Journal of Contemporary Legal and Allied Issues*, 1, 2004: 4.

⁷⁵ See Idowu: 4-5

⁷⁶ Obadan, M., “The State, Leadership, Leadership, Governance Economic Development” Presidential Address Delivered at the Annual Conference of the Nigerian Economic Society in Kano, July 22-24, 1998: 25.

⁷⁷ This morality is all inclusive, as accountability, transparency, equity in judgement and some other things will be part of the morality.

⁷⁸ See Omotoso, F., “Morality and Accountability in the Nigerian State” in *African Journal of Stability and Development*, 1, 2, August 2007: 83.

⁷⁹ Snyder, J., “Nationalism and the Crisis of the Post-Soviet State” in *Survival*, 35, 1, 1993: 12.

⁸⁰ Irele, D., *Alienation and the Problem of Loyalty in African*, Ibadan: Options Book and Information Services, 1993: 7.

⁸¹ Idowu, W. O. O., “Citizenship Status, Statehood Problems and Political Conflicts: The Case of Nigeria” in *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 8, 2, 1999: 79.

⁸² Jemiriye, T. F., “Salvation: A Critique of Kung’s Position” in *JOPRED: Journal of Philosophy and Related Disciplines*, 2, 2, July 2004: 20.

⁸³ Jemiriye: 19.

⁸⁴ Kung, H., *On Being a Christian*, Quinn, E. (trans), London: Sheed and Ward, 1963: 91.

⁸⁵ Kung: 92.

⁸⁶ This is equally to settle the problem of religious evil, an effect of religious intolerance, which arises out of the claim that a religion is better and more acceptable to God than some others. See Omoregbe, J. I., "God Has No Favourite Religion: Christianity, Islam and ATR in Dialogue" in Momoh, C. S. et al (Eds), *Nigerian Studies in Religious Tolerance, Vol. IV: Philosophy of Religious Tolerance*, Lagos: CBAAC/NARETO, 1988: 348-365.

⁸⁷ Alao, A., "The Evolutionary Travail of the Nigerian State and Political System, 1914-1999", *1st Professor S. O. Arifalo Public Lecture Presented at the Department of History and international Studies, Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria, September 17, 2008*: 1

⁸⁸ Alao: 2

⁸⁹ Alao: 9-28. Note that even before amalgamation, the Yoruba nation, for instance, had diverse cultural, political and religious peculiarities. This could be found among other nations and ethnic groups that make up the present Nigerian State.

⁹⁰ Ekong E. Ekong, *Rural Sociology*, Third Edition, Uyo: Dove Educational Publishers, 2010: 110

⁹¹ Ekong: 110

⁹² A. O. Y. Raji and H. O. Danmole, "Taditional Government" in N. Lawal et al (eds.), *Understanding Yorùbá Life and Culture*, Asmara: Africa World Press, Inc., 2004: 259

⁹³ Raji and Danmole: 69

⁹⁴ Afolayan, M. O and Afolayan, P. O., "Obas in Contemporary Politics" in N. Lawal et al (eds.), *Understanding Yorùbá Life and Culture*, Asmara: Africa World Press, Inc., 2004: 288

⁹⁵ Afolayan and Afolayan: 290

⁹⁶ Afe, A. E. and Adubuola, I. O., "The Travails of Kingship Institution in Yorubaland: A Case Study of Isikan in Akure land" in *Nebula*, 6, 4, 2009: 114

⁹⁷ The cases of erstwhile *Obas* that have been dethroned are instances to buttress this point. There are others that are being tried in law courts of alleged offences. For *Obas* that had been deposed, countless examples could be cited. In Ondo State, there was the case of the then *Ọlọwọ* of *Ọwọ*, Sir Olateru Olagbegi in 1965, the then *Ọlọba* of *Oba-Ile*, Ilesanmi Bayode, Orioge II in 1980, the then *Deji* of *Oluwadare Adesina Adepoju* in 2010 etc. The case of *Alowa* of *Ilowa* in *Obokun Local Government* of *Osun State*, *Oba Adebukola Alli* being tried in a law court of alleged rape of a corper. For the report on the case of *Alowa*, see *Alaroye Tuntun, Idi Ketalelogbon* (Vol. 33), *Eyo Karun un* (No. 5), May 31, 2011: *Oju iwe keji* (2)

⁹⁸ Afe, A. E. and Adubuola, I. O., “The Travails of Kingship Institution in Yorubaland: A Case Study of Isikan in Akure land: 114

⁹⁹ An instance is the traditional Oyo political set up in South Western Nigeria.

¹⁰⁰ Akpekpe, S. O., “Moral and Political Rights of Citizens” in Nemeke, A. D. and Erhagbe, E. O. (eds.), *Nigerian Peoples and Culture*, Second Edition, Benin: Department of History, University of Benin/Mindex Publishing Company Ltd, 2002: 181-2

¹⁰¹ See Section 10 of the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

¹⁰² See Adamolekun, T., “Muslim-Christian Encounter in Modern Nigeria since 1914: A Historical Perspective” in Babalola, E. O. (ed.) *Christian-Muslim Encounter in Modern Nigeria*, Lagos: Eternal Communications Ltd., 2002: 2002: 58-69.

¹⁰³ Jemiriye, T. F., *Salvation*: 21.