

SOCIAL CONTRACT THEORY AND THE NIGERIAN STATE: AN ELUSIVE SYNTHESIS

**¹Felix Chinwe Asogwa & ²Nnamchi, Cyril Obinna
Department of Political Science,
Enugu State University of Science & Technology, Enugu.**

Abstract

The emergence of state in the society is premised on man's indispensable demand for survival, safety and co-existence and other fundamental principles aimed at addressing the basic necessities of life. This is in a bid to forestall the state of anarchism evident in the state of nature. This demand led to an agreement referred to as social contract by the people to freely submit their will and right to an authority with the onus to provide peace, security and order in return for obedience from them. This postulation therefore bestows on every society the ruler (sovereign) and the ruled that legitimizes the existence of the sovereign. Based on this, the Nigerian state has come under attack and criticisms by scholars and opinion moulders on whether it has a social contract status or not. Against this backdrop, this study examined the social contract theory and the Nigerian State. The historical development and the basic features of the social contract theory as espoused by the three major proponents of the theory was explored as a paradigm of analysis. Historical research design, documentary method of data gathering and content analysis formed the methodology used for the study. It was observed in the study that the Nigerian State does not imbibe the tenets of the social contract theory due to mainly foundational problem amongst others. It was also discovered in the study that the docility of the people in exercising their sovereignty creates room for the authority to jettison their obligation to the people hence the existence of insecurity and other social problems. However, a renegotiation of the contract establishing the Nigerian State to seek the consent of the people in tandem with the social contract theory was recommended.

Keywords: *Social Contract, Nigerian State, Theory, Hobbes, Synthesis*

Introduction

Early political thinkers were confronted with a lot of questions basically on political theories such as; what is the origin of state? Have men lived under some form of political organization? If they have not, what are the causes that brought about the original establishment of government (Appadorai 1974). These political theorists were unable to provide answers to these fundamental questions hence divergent views and postulations on the origin of state namely: the theory of evolution, matriarchal theory, the divine right theory, patriarchal theory, social contract theory, the force theory and a host of others. However, these theoretical conjectures pointed salient observations on the origin of state and

government but for the course of this study, discussion on the social contract theory takes preeminence.

The theoretical underpinning of social contract theory is that what we refer to as state today was not in existence before. Prior to the emergence of the state there were no laws, to be enforced by a coercive authority. Men just lived in what was referred to as state of nature in which they were only subject to such regulations as nature prescribed without any human or authority enforcing those natural laws and regulations (Appadorai 1974). Subsequently, these men in the state of nature decided to set up a government with the agreement to part with their natural liberty to obey the laws prescribed by such government. Though the proponents (Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau) of this theory differs on how men lived in the state of nature without the coercive influence of a government, why they decided to establish a government, who were the parties to the contract and other salient issues raised by the theory; they are in harmony with the central idea of the theory which emphasizes that the state is a human creation and the result of a contract (John 2000).

Going by this view, the emergence of the Nigerian state has a checkered history. Nigeria was a brainchild of British overlords who mainly for business, economic purposes and administrative convenience lumped people of diverse ethnic, cultural and historical background together as a country. Thus, the historical origin of Nigeria could be traced to the amalgamation of the northern and southern protectorates in 1914 by the British colonial masters. Nigeria remained under British rule from 1914 to 1960 when she was finally granted independence.

However, it is clear from the above that the unification of Nigeria in 1914 was not done in consultation of the people. The British government did not consider the huge ethnic and political diversity of the regions. The Southern Protectorate was largely dominated by Christians and the Northern protectorate was heavily populated by the Muslims. The result of the amalgamation was the marrying of over 250 ethnic groups together. The negative result of the British decision to amalgamate the country without due consideration of the country's diversities started manifesting soon after independence, as Nigeria's founding fathers that took over from the Colonial government rarely noticed that they were already an indivisible entity occasioned by the colonial design. They failed to realize that they no longer represent their various regions, but Nigeria. One major index that showed that the people did not see themselves as Nigerians was the formation of ethnic affiliated political parties. The Northern

People's Congress (NPC) was affiliated to the North, the Action Group (AG) was affiliated to the West, and the National Council of the Nigeria and Cameroon was affiliated to the East (Anthony and Eyo 2017:35).

The rhetoric of some of our founding fathers also affirmed the assertion above. The people that fought for the country's independence did not see any future in the country's unity as this was revealed by their utterances. For example, Awolowo while commenting on the unity of Nigeria emphatically stated that;

“Nigeria is not a nation. It is a mere geographical expression. The word Nigerian is merely a distinctive appellation used to distinguish those who live within the boundaries of Nigeria from those who do not. He went further to note that West and Eastern Nigeria are as different as Ireland from Germany. The North is as different from either as China” (Awolowo, 1947).

In the same vein, Balewa the man who later became the first Prime Minister of the country while addressing the legislative council in 1948 declared that: Since 1914 the British Government has been trying to make Nigeria into one country, but the Nigerian people themselves are historically different in their backgrounds, in their religious beliefs and customs and do not show themselves any sign of willingness to unite. Nigerian unity is only a British intention for the country. Similarly, Azikiwe the then leader of the NCNC and the first president of the Federal Republic of Nigeria was not left out in these unguided but truthful statements as he was quoted saying “It is better for us and many admirers abroad that we should disintegrate in peace and not in pieces. Should the politicians fail to heed the warning, then I will venture the prediction that the experience of the Democratic Republic of Congo will be a child's play if it ever comes to our turn to play such a tragic role” (Anthony and Eyo 2017:33).

The statements above as shocking as they are, were only a reflection of the fact that the people never saw themselves as one. Each region has attempted to secede at one time in history. Sadly, after several years together, the country still does not feel as one as in recent times; the Niger Delta Avengers, the Oduduwa Peoples Congress, the Arewa Consultative Forum and Indigenous People of Biafra have all called for secession or a restructuring of the federation. Unfortunately, after more than 50 years of civil war, the country is still confronted with the same set of problems that threw her into a ferocious confrontation.

Presently, there is a lot of clamour by different sections of the country especially the southern part of the country for a restructuring of the present federal structure. This agitation is due to alleged marginalization and subjugation meted on the other parts of the minority nationalities by the major northern oligarchs. This lopsided relationship that exists is further deepened and engrossed by the watery constitution of 1999 which has been purportedly regarded as a military fiat gazzeted to favour a particular section of the country, the North. These present challenges confronting the country is even made worst by the existence of violent sects such as: Boko Haram, Fulani Herdsmen, the Baddo group and other emerging sects.

Therefore, the Nigerian situation according to some scholars is clearly a reflection of a failure in governance (Ayeni, 1988; Ake, 1995). These scholars further aver that the leadership model in Nigeria lacks the necessary focus capable of instilling national development and promoting political stability. Against this backdrop, the focus of this paper is to examine the contractual nature of the Nigerian State with the features of the social contract as a yardstick of evaluation.

Meaning and Historical Development of Social Contract theory

The Social Contract Theory came from the works of three important Philosophers who were concerned with Order and Stability in modern society as against chaos, confusion and bad leadership. Social Contract Theory in its recognizably modern form was however revived by Thomas Hobbes and was equally developed and given a push in different ways by John Locke, J. J. Rousseau and Immanuel Kant. These theorists seek to demonstrate why a rational individual would voluntarily consent to give up their natural freedom to obtain the benefits of political order. The ideas they propagated in these works are referred to as the Social Contract Theory, which refers to a contract between persons in pre-socio-political conditions declaring the terms in which they can create and submit to political authority or government. The Contract explains a transition from a state of nature to a social and political existence. Hobbes tells that in a state of nature before any government came into being, everybody desired freedom but also tried to dominate others, because of self-preservation instinct. With this, a war of all against all existed which made life solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short. In this state of nature, there was no property, no justice or injustice.

Force and fraud were the two cardinal issues at stake. In order to escape from these evils, men formed communities and agreed (among themselves) to create and subject themselves to

a central authority. There is no right of rebellion because the Ruler is not bound by any contract but the subjects are bound by the contract. Essentially, the Ruler is an absolute Monarch or an absolute Assembly. The Covenant is not between the citizens and the Ruling Authority, but by the citizens with one another to obey such a Ruling Power the majority shall choose.

Locke's version of the Social Contract Theory was a reaction against the Divine Right of Kings: That God gave the Kings the power to rule. He stated that the State or the Government is a party to the contract and can be justly resisted if it fails to fulfill its part of the bargain.

Essentially, it is a democratic doctrine. Locke believed that in order to change the state of nature, which is not desirable, government or the State, must exist. Locke theorized that outside the state of nature, every man is a judge in his own case. But, where a Monarch is a party to the dispute, the Monarch becomes both judge and plaintiff. This, therefore, leads Locke to say that governments should not be absolute: The judiciary should be independent of the executive. The power of the government or the State is confined only within the common good. The chief end of people coming into political society is for the preservation of their property. The authority cannot take from any man any of his property without his consent.

In Rousseau's version of the Social Contract, self-preservation forced men to move from primitive independence in the state of nature to a direct democracy, where all citizens have the right to participate in making the laws for the good of all in the community. He recognized that even the smallest possible community capable of independence could not give political rights to everyone. His model of a community is a small-scale type, not a large-scale community, as other theorists conceived. Unlike Hobbes, Rousseau theorized that the state of nature does not contain war of all against all. Rather, it harbours friendship and harmony among people because natural man is moved by self-feelings of sympathy and compassion. John (2000) quoted Rousseau as saying that "Man is born free and everywhere he is in chains. One man thinks himself the master of others, but remains more of a slave than they are!" His emphasis in the theory is on the liberty and equality of man within the State.

However, the general feature of the Social Contract Theory is the unrestricted personal freedom which the individuals surrender to the State to ensure their safety, private property and other personal rights. The theory arose out of the struggle of the elite of the time against

feudalism and absolute monarchy. The Marxist Theory of the State which presented the other side of the coin declares that the Social Contract Theory was an ideological justification of the bourgeoisie's claim to political power.

Research Design and Method

The study adopted historical research design. Historical research design is unobstructive and well suited for trend analysis such as the subject of study. Documentary research method of data collection which entails the use of relevant journals, textbooks, periodicals and documents on the subject of study was utilized while content analysis was applied in analyzing the gathered data.

Features of Social Contract

- ***Free Consent***

According to the Social Contract Theory, consent is the basis of government; the government is entitled to rule because the people agreed to be ruled. Man, according to this theory, was originally in the state of nature which was also described by Hobbes as nasty, poor, brutish and short. The state of nature was that of anarchy; and man had to submit his right to a supreme authority that will protect and established a state or government.

From the theories of John Locke, Thomas Hobbes and Jean Jacques Rousseau, social contract can be further defined as an agreement, entered into by individuals. That agreement results in the formation of the state or an organized society, the prime motive being the desire for protection, which entails the surrender of some or all personal liberties.

By surrendering their rights, people relinquished authority to the government to enforce laws and agreements. Those living under a government are thus, parties to a social contract. Each person agrees to follow the laws of the state on the condition that everyone else does the same. That way, we are all relatively safe from each other and we all benefit from the other social advantages that will result there from.

The most fundamental concept of a democratic government is that the government exists only to secure the rights of the people. Men join a society, submitting to its government, by explicit consent in order to gain three things not given them by natural law:

1. Laws
2. Executive power to enforce the laws

3. Judges to arbitrate and settle conflicts in law

While under the laws of nature, it is theorized that man had an absolute right to protect himself, and to punish those who disobeyed those laws. Once a social contract has been entered into, by organizing under a government body, each person largely transfers his power to protect himself, and to personally punish those who do wrong, to that government.

- *Constitutionalism*

The theoretical foundations of modern constitutionalism were laid down in the great works on the social contract, especially those of the English philosophers Thomas Hobbes and John Locke in the 17th century and the French philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau in the 18th century.

Under the theory of the social contract, those rights which the individual brings with him upon entering the social contract are natural, and those which arise out of the social contract are contractual. Those contractual rights arising out of the constitution are constitutional rights. However, natural rights are also constitutional rights.

While a constitution prescribes the legal rights of individuals and the powers of government, the social contract also includes certain duties which members assume upon entry. Those duties include the duty to avoid infringing on the rights of other members, to obey just laws, to comply with and help enforce just contracts, to serve on juries, and to defend the community.

The state exists to enforce the rules necessary for social living while morality consists in the whole set of rules that facilitate social living as it governs behaviour that rational people would accept on the condition that others accept them as well. Thus, government is needed to enforce the basic rules of social living while morality may encompass some rules that are important for social living but are outside the scope of the state.

Those living under a government are parties to a social contract. Each person agrees to follow the laws of the state on the condition that other persons do the same. That way, we are all relatively safe from each other and we all benefit from the other social good that will result there from. Also, on the part of the people, social cooperation through submission to the

government is required while the government is expected to provide for the basic necessities for survival in any civil society. The basics expected to be provided by the government include but is not limited to:

Protection of life and property; this means that the government will now pay more attention to the issues of security in the country and not leave everyone living in a state of continuous fear either of armed bandits or kidnappers as we have in Nigeria today. Other rules needed to secure the benefits of social living. This means there will be prohibitions on breaking contracts and a general requirement of truth.

Flowing from the above, it is glaring that the government plays an important role in this contract as the foundation of every government is the social acceptance by its citizenry to be governed by the appropriate authority. Like any other contract, it is important to note that the obligation to conform to the terms of social contract is strictly legal, that is, anyone living in any particular locality is obligated to follow the law of the land. Some laws are penal, carrying with them penalties for failure to comply. Other duly approved and promulgated laws, like laws structuring marriage and setting standards with regards to basic needs, including among others safety, health and education, make social life possible. These laws assist human beings to function, flourish and perhaps even to prosper because they are members of the society.

Thus, social contract can only subsist when all parties keep their part of the agreement failing which the result of the breach will be some form of legal action.

- *Clear Objectives*

Political philosophers throughout history have had differing views on how governments rule over people. Sixteenth century philosopher, John Locke, believed that, when men transfer their rights to a government, a social contract is entered into. In subjecting themselves to a sovereign ruler, or other form of government, the people gain security.

Locke expressed a belief that people had certain basic rights that must be supplied by the government, as a result of its contract with the people. These include the right to life, liberty, and property. He also put forth the concepts of a separation of powers and majority rule. John Locke's political philosophies had great influence in the American Revolution, as the Founding Fathers penned these beliefs into the nation's Constitution.

Holding to his belief that all humans have the same feelings and experiences that none are inherently better or worth more than others Locke put his ideas of human equality into the organization of politics, saying that governments gain their power or authority from the people. In opposition to Hobbes' belief that people need a government to keep them from falling into chaos and violence, Locke believed that government exists to help and serve the people.

While both Hobbes and Locke believed that a social contract is entered into when people give over some of their rights to a government, they disagreed in how that would work. Hobbes supported the rule of kings, which held absolute power over the people, as they would be able to keep men from reverting to their natural states. Locke, on the other hand, favored government by representation.

In a nutshell, Social contracts are the origin of society. Without a firm social contract, society as we know it would not be possible. A social contract is only possible with the consent of the people. It is a social contract that establishes the legitimacy of authority and the state over the people. It establishes the political community and civil society. With a social contract the people trade personal freedom for social and political order. The people do surrender some freedoms to authority, but they do so voluntarily in exchange for protection of their remaining freedoms as well as the promise of services from government. Social contract expresses the general will of a people, their collective interests, and provides the basis for ensuring the general welfare of the people.

In further analysis of the clear objectives of social contract, it offers the promise of personal protection and the rule of law in exchange for giving up the natural right of personal retaliation and defines what is expected from government by the people. On the other hand, it defines what is expected from the people by the government. A social contract is needed to lift us out of the state of nature. It protects rights in exchange for the people accepting obligations to both their fellow man and to the institutions of society and government.

Reflections on Social Contract Theory and the Nigerian State

In Thomas Hobbes' reflection on the emergence of social contract, human life, he argued, was in a 'state of nature', referring to the nonexistence of social contract, human life; is clearly poor, nasty, and brutish. In the state, however, man's freedom to plunder, rape and

murder knew no restrictions. Therefore, in a bid to forestall this state of anarchism, men in their freedom and thoughtfulness liaised with one another to build a community that co-exists within the climate of social order, understanding and culture. The rise of civil society was then premised on man's indispensable demand for survival, safety and co-existence which depended on communal bond within the human society. As a result of that, social contract became the swivel between humanity and sanity, bestowing on human life a reasonable and glossy impression.

Social contract theory entails a collective resolve among a people to live together under a given authority with the ultimate aim of addressing basic necessities of life such as security and welfare.

It is a fundamental principle of legitimization of governmental organization, for it provides a starting point for a rational explanation of the origin of the state. The idea here is that the authority, which government has over supposed subjects or citizens derives originally from an agreement between ruler and ruled in which the former agrees to provide advantages such as peace, security and order in return for obedience from the latter.

Going by this view, the Nigerian state has come under several attacks by scholars, civil society and opinion moulders on whether the country operates under a social contract or not. This argument is largely due to the historical origin of the state. To some of the scholars, Nigeria is a country that was unified by the British colonial government without the peoples' consent. Her existence is the product of the forceful amalgamation of the Northern and Southern protectorate in 1914 by former colonial governor, Lord Fredrick Lugard for the selfish interest of Britain. Therefore, the origin or rather emergence of the country lacks the basic essentials of social contract as espoused by the theorists. Such as free consent, general will, sovereignty, self-preservation and legitimacy.

Nevertheless, at independence the founding fathers took after the steps of the colonialists and formed government along ethnic lines which eventually resulted in marginalization, oppression, injustice and a feeling of rejection by the few dominated ethnic groups. The faulty foundation upon which Nigeria was built by the western invaders manifested obviously after independence and even degenerated to a devastating three years civil war, incessant military interregnum and general political instability for over two decades. It is worthy of note that Nigerian state as at that time failed to live up to the prescriptions of the social

contract theorists, hence the malfeasance of political and socio-economic rumpus that have continued to slow the pace of development in the country overtime.

Constitutionalism which is one of the essential ingredients of social contract was imposed on the people by the military. So, there was no agreement between the sovereign and the ruled. Nigeria, despite the enormity of her resources, is still wallowing in the fantasy of political and socio-economic challenges. An indication that those entrusted with state power have not been able to live up to expectations as poverty has become very endemic alongside other teething problems in the country leading to lack of legitimacy from the citizens. (Nweke and Nkwede 2019:311) elaborately observed that:

“from the perspective of Hobbes, reason has collapsed in Nigeria. With its collapse comes the compromise of its goal and purpose which is collective “self-preservation” as defined by the presence of “peace”. To this end, our “rulers” have failed in their duties because “the safety of the people” has not been “the supreme law”. Since our rulers have acted in a manner “that the giver” (we, the people) now have the “just occasion” to retrieve our “free gift” from them, without doubt, the basis of legitimacy of our government is no longer there”

The current situation in Nigeria is one that is very disturbing as what is happening is not in line with what Hobbes offered for an ideal state such as Nigeria. This situation is further described as a reflection of a failure in governance (Rufus and Eyo 2017:34). There is indeed a crisis of governance in Nigeria with its threatening symptoms of failed schools, failed hospitals, failed roads, failed security, failed power supply, vanishing opportunities for youths, the widening gap between the rich and the poor and worse of all, the receding faith in Nigeria by Nigerians.

There is no doubt that the level of physical and social infrastructural decay, poverty and insecurity in Nigeria is an indication that the Hobbes’s social contract theory is at variance with what the state and its actors are up to despite the seeming commitments they made prior to assumption of office. The existence of adequate infrastructure is the underlying basis for sustained public welfare architecture and also the propeller of economic growth and development in any part of the world; hence Nigeria cannot be an exception. There is a great decline of public sector participation in this regard, an indication that the state is relenting in living up to its ideals as provided for in Hobbes’ social contract (Abegunde and Akinyemi 2014).

However, it is very disheartening to note that the hopes of Nigerians in the direction of their freedom search for the ‘good life’ as espoused by social contract theorists are being dashed in quick succession after periodic electioneering campaigns since the fourth republic. There is no gainsaying the fact that this failure has been a deliberate ploy to undermine the people and their constitutional rights as provided for by the Constitution states inter alia: “We the people of the Federal Republic of Nigeria”. With this phrase it becomes imperative to underscore the import of the above preamble upon which the Nigerian state came to being and typically captures succinctly the extant social contract upon which it operates and administers its people and territory. In other words, the preamble of the Nigerian Constitution as presented above typifies Hobbes’ social contract theory which eventually established a formal government thereby giving place for law and order in a war-torn Hobbesian state of nature. But even at that, one cannot conclude that the Nigerian Constitution is one document that typifies a social contract between the Nigerian state and its people in this regard because the 1999 constitution is a product of military fiat.

Moreover, the docility on part of the people who have continuously failed to appropriate from the powers of sovereignty bestowed on them has been largely responsible for the failure to deliver on security and welfare by the Nigerian state and actors in power. The Nigerian state has continued to cash in on the weakness and docility of the people to utilize their freely given sovereignty to question the level of injustice meted out to them as they have continued to suffer political and socio-economic commotion with little or no hope of survival in terms of security and welfare against the motives of Thomas Hobbes for an ideal state. Rather than address their security and welfare challenges as provided in the Constitution, the modern Nigerian state has become an impediment around the collective will of the people.

The Constitution emphasized the fact that the people resolved to live in unity and harmony as one indivisible and indissoluble sovereign nation. There is the expression of willingness to exist together as exemplified by men in the Hobbesian state of nature with a view to living a fulfilled life under a secure environment provided by the state. It again harped on the desirability of good government and welfare of the people which defines the essence of modern Nigerian state. In further reinforcing the foregoing, Chapter 11 (Fundamental Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy) of the Nigerian Constitution Section in 13 gives all organs of government and of all authorities and persons exercising legislative, executive or judicial powers the duty and responsibility to conform to, observe and apply the

provisions of therein. This is again an attempt to further reinforce the social contract between the Nigerian state and the people. Also, Section 14(1) clearly states that “the Federal Republic of Nigeria shall be a State based on the principles of democracy and social justice”. Social contract is usually built on democracy and social justice as typified by the provision of the Constitution above. This is in tandem with Rousseau’s social contract when he talked about the general will of the people.

The factual experience of Nigerian democratic practice for four good republics now, betrays the fact and makes the constitutional principle a fraud. The principles of democracy have been completely distorted and misrepresented. It was as if Franklin Roosevelt had Nigeria in mind when he talked about people being fed up with a democracy that breeds unemployment, insecurity, hunger and hopelessness. Nigerians have continued to wait for the dividends of democracy. The present dispensation leaves no light at the end of the tunnel. From the foregoing, it becomes evident that the Nigerian state that is built on the principles of democracy and justice as espoused in the extant provisions of the Constitution of Nigeria 1999 (As Amended) has not lived up to the ideals of the social contract.

Conclusion

The problems of the Nigerian state have metamorphosed beyond leadership into institutional problems. Nigeria is living in falsehood, as the constitution does not reflect the will of the people. Thus, the Nigerian state and its actors has not fared well in ensuring that sovereignty which was surrendered to them by the people has been adequately appropriated by those concerned to maximum benefits in terms of security and welfare of the populace. It was observed that despite the extant provisions of the law, there is a continuous abdication of this extant provision by the Nigerian state against all odds. If the country is to progress from this hopeless state in which she found herself, then she must be ready to revisit the basis of the contract terms of her union that will ensure that the government exists for the good of the people; and as such should depend on their consent.

Except the people reactivates their consciousness of the fact that sovereignty resides on them and take necessary action, the myriad of problems confronting Nigeria as a result of state failure will continue unabated. It is only by so doing that Nigeria will realize the dreams of Thomas Hobbes in his social contract theory to have an ideal state built on a secure and fulfilled people. Unless this is done, there is no end in sight of the high level of insecurity,

social decay, crumbling infrastructure and poverty that have become the order of the day in a great nation richly endowed with both human and material resources.

Recommendations

Given the nature and status of the Nigerian State appraised in this study, it is recommended that;

- ❖ The contract establishing the Nigerian State should be renegotiated by convocation of a sovereign National/constitutional conference or adoption of recommendations of previous National conferences to seek the consent of the people in tandem with the social contract theory.
- ❖ Since social contract involves an agreement between two parties, the ruler and the ruled, the people who are the most important party according to the theorist should jettison complacency in the Nigerian context and begin to exercise their right of the contract by holding the people in authority accountable.
- ❖ The people should also activate their instrumentality of the contract in exercising their franchise during electioneering periods to vote out corrupt leaders and vote in leaders with integrity. And by so doing confer their legitimacy on such leaders.
- ❖ According to these theorists, social contact theory is based on consent and other clear objectives and obligations, the people should always be eager to withdraw their consent whenever the government fails in her own obligation as the case in the Nigerian state presently by withdrawing their legitimacy and questioning the status quo.
- ❖ The sovereign powers of the people as provided for by the 1999 Nigerian Constitution (As Amended) have to be active to checkmate the encumbrances of the Nigerian state and its actors who have constituted themselves a clog in the collective will of the people to enjoy what actually gave rise to the Hobbesian social contract in the state of nature.

REFERENCES

1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (As Amended).

Abeguande, O. & Akinyemi, T. E. (2014). Public Policy, Welfarism, and Social Service Delivery in Nigeria: The Case of a Receding State. *Journal of Law, Policy and Globalization*, (22):134-144.

Ake, C. (1995) Socio-Political Approaches and Policies for Sustainable Development in Africa; a paper delivered at the annual meeting symposium of the African development Banks, Abuja, May, 25, 1995.

Appadorai (1974). *The Substance of Politics*. Oxford University Press.

Awolowo, O. (1947). *Path to Nigerian Freedom*. Faber and Faber.

Ayeni, V. (1988). Of Presidentialism and Third World Political Process: Introduction in Victor Ayeni and Kayode Soremekun, Nigeria's Second Republic. *Daily Times Publication*.

John, E.O (2000). *Man and the State: Issues in Socio- Political Philosophy*. Afahaide & Brothers Printing and Publishing Company.

Nweke and Nkwede (2019). The Nigerian State and Hobbes' Social Contract Theory: An Albatross around the Collective Will of the People. *European Journal of Scientific Research* (152)3 :304 - 321

Rufus, A. & Eyo, D.E. (2017). The Lockean State of War and the Nigerian State: a Comparative Analysis. *Global Journal of Human Social Science: F Political Science*, 17(3) 35-41.