

*Appendix 41:*

Christian Views on Politics and Government

Jan H. Boer 2009

The reason for this and a number of other appendices is that Appendix 35 to which they are attached was to be a chapter in the actual book, not an appendix on this CCD. When the book threatened to become too large, I had to revise the plan and turn three chapters into major appendices. These are Appendix 1, 6 and 35. So, now we have three major appendices, each of which has generated its own appendices! When you look at the List of Appendices in the book itself, you will see how it has all been organized. Most of the appendices constitute materials written by others; some are written by myself. You can find the list of the latter under my name in the Bibliography. A few may be tucked away in other folders and can be found by searching for “Boer” by using your computer’s “search” function.

These appendices were all created on the assumption that Appendix 1, 6 and 35 would constitute chapters in the book itself. Since rewriting them to fit this re-organization would have been very time consuming, I largely left them in tact and made only a few minor changes. The bad news is that the result may be a bit complicated, but the good news is that all the materials, facts, ideas, etc. are there for you to read, use and enjoy.

This appendix contains both BZ and AZ materials. Some AZ issues are included because the stories were too lengthy for the chapter [now Appendix 35] that was to be part of the hardcopy book, where some are summarized and others simply skipped.

It was close to 20 years ago that the Christian community became aware of a serious problem, namely the avoidance of politics by Christians as a no-go area. That has been adequately discussed in earlier volumes. In 1987, CAN Northern Zone—later to become “CAN Northern States and Abuja”—explored the subject and published a short essay called “Biblical Grounds for Political Involvement,” in which it developed some principles for Christian participation in politics. Not only was the political imperative becoming recognized, but also the style or content of participation was now becoming

---

important. It was no longer just a matter of a warm Christian body on the floor of the House. CAN called on both the church and individual members to play their part. "The local church should organize itself actively to play a responsible part in local decision-making. At the individual level, a career in politics is one of the most significant callings for a Christian to follow." There is need for the "re-orientation of all dimensions of life."<sup>1</sup> Well, principle is a good place to start.

CAN and TEKAN have been fellow travelers from the beginning. They began to get their toes wet in politics simultaneously. TEKAN agreed with the assassinated Military Head of State, General Murtala Muhammed, "that a federal system of government is best for Nigeria, because of its heterogeneous nature. It is a system that allows for unity in diversity." It could hardly foresee that a good decade later that would become a major argument for sharia, the very thing TEKAN opposed bitterly. It is impossible for me to go through all the political ideas of TEKAN, except to quote a few passages to indicate how it wanted the future to be shaped. Sharia is hardly mentioned; even Islam is not prominent in the report, but it is there in the background.

---

*Our vision is one of development from below rather than from above. That is one of the key TEKAN proposals to the Politbureau in this submission.*

*It is TEKAN's considered opinion that pressure from below is the only way to galvanise decision-makers into responding to the demands of the poor for justice.*

*The Government's monopolistic [educational] system can hardly serve a people who hold various philosophies of life and, consequently, of what development means to them. We therefore call upon the Federal and state governments to return voluntary agency institutions to their original owners.*

*Nigeria must adopt a political structure that is pluralistic and multi-religious, terms that we take to be synonymous. By [such a] state we understand one that allows all forms of religion to co-exist, without any of them being the religion of the entire country. We do not subscribe to the notion of the state trying to, or being seen to, promote one religion at the expense of the others. All religions are entitled to equality of treatment. The governments of [such a] state must ensure:*

---

<sup>1</sup> CAN, 1989, pp. 2-4,

1. *Impartial justice and equity.*
  2. *Honesty and integrity.*
  3. *Respect for person, property and authority.*
  4. *Encouragement of the exercise of responsible freedom.*
  5. *Regard for the equality of persons before the law.*<sup>2</sup>
- 

CAN and TEKAN were joined in their call for Christian political participation by leaders of the Pentecostal movement. A. O. Oyeniran delivered a speech that TEKAN included in its 1987 publication. In contrast to the past, when Christians avoided politics as worldly, he now demanded that Christians “should rise up to support any Christian who wants to assist the nation.”<sup>3</sup>

Jolly Tanko Yusuf was a voice closely associated with that of CAN. Having engaged in regional, national and international politics, probably no one did more to move CAN and, through CAN, the entire Christian community, into the political sphere. Apart from his insistence on Christian unity, he pushed hard for Christians to join politics. He admits he at one time entertained a strongly anti-political stance for Christians, but experience forced him to change: “God desires full participation by Christians in the politics and administration of Nigeria.” “To strengthen the nation we ultimately have to strengthen the individuals of all faiths in Nigeria. There is no other way.” “The collective character of individuals and religious groups plays a major role in the evolution of any society.” His own political focus has been on fairness to all as a basic building block for peace and stability. “A just society is possible when Christians are actively taking their share of responsibilities in political administration of Nigeria.”<sup>4</sup>

The years of 1987 and 1988 were rich in literature on the subject. It seemed to be a period of political awakening for Christians with Christian organizations, including the official church bodies, and individuals all urging widespread political participation in politics upon Christians. Politics and government must be freed from the exclusive domain of Muslims. It needs to be cleaned up. The Fifth National Congress on Evangelisation of 1988, in its Communique, apart from the word “sharia,” did not overtly

---

<sup>2</sup>TEKAN, 1987, pp. 11-17, 41. I have always found the churches’ calls for democracy and decentralization somewhat humourous and even a bit annoying, given the fact that in most Nigerian churches the clergy tries hard to centralise and control.

<sup>3</sup>A. Oyeniran, 1987, p. 66.

<sup>4</sup>T. Yusuf, 1988, pp. ii-iii.

mention Islam or Muslims, but its pronouncements clearly referred to them. Christians were called upon to realize and oppose the fact that “more and more political, legal and cultural obstacles are being erected against Christian freedom.” “Christians cannot afford to be lax” until the land is cleared of political and economic injustice.” Christians must pray for “wise and just government” and “promote social justice.” The Congress called on the FG “to strengthen her commitment to human rights and justice. All restrictions of freedom of religion should be removed. It offends natural justice that peace-loving and law-abiding citizens are made to lose their freedom due to the unruliness of others. Only fairness and justice will fully heal the land.”<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, the Congress called on members of the CA of the day “to rise up above sentiment and parochialism, to give our fatherland a full and befitting constitution.” “God and the people are counting on them to lay a solid foundation for a new and greater Nigeria.”<sup>6</sup>

Adebanjo Edema, an indigene from Ondo State and active as a leader of various national Christian organisations, including the Full Gospel Business Men’s Fellowship International, chimed in with one of the most expansive treatments of Christian political issues, though not exhaustive . He asserted that Christians cannot be oblivious of the changes around them. “We must be involved in setting new guidelines and participate in making decisions which influence the society.”

---

*The Bible teaches that God cares about the social order. Christian principles are the right principles and as far as we adhere to them, the society will be better and so far as we depart from them, the society will be worse off or doomed. We must therefore not underrate the need for Christians to wield political power to ensure that such divine principles are not thrown overboard. Committed Christians with political power will legislate or execute laws or administer the nation’s resources for the good of all, regardless of religion.*

However, he wanted to be understood correctly. He wrote:

---

*It must be emphasised that this [book] is not a political pamphlet for building religion into Nigerian politics, but a book written to help Christians apply the*

---

---

<sup>5</sup>Though I understand and sympathize with the Congress’ concern here, it should be realized that many, if not most, laws restrict citizens’ freedom and that they are passed because of the undesirable behaviour of some people.

<sup>6</sup>Fifth National Congress on Evangelisation, TC, 6/88, p. 29.

*principles of their faith to the building of the society in which they live through participation in politics. Society can be made more or less righteous and the Christian must be concerned that, as far as he is able to accomplish it, righteousness shall prevail in those spheres in which he is involved. It will be suicidal for any individual to completely abandon his or her responsibility as a Christian citizen*

---

Edema was a strong believer in the separation of church and state. Both receive their mandate from God, but their areas of authority and of expertise differ, so that neither may encroach upon the sphere of the other. “Where the matter is unmistakably spiritual, the Church has the right to speak with authority; where the matter is political, she has no right to speak as church.” It is “wrong for a church to be identified with any particular dogma in the changing world of political ideas. It is also wrong for the church to abandon her responsibility to the state. Though I also advocate the separation of church and state, Edema’s version of it is skewed, for it is based on the dualism I have often rejected in my writings—as in this series, especially in Volume 5, Part 2, and as I will do again in the next chapter. The church does not own the Spirit; He is accessible to all.

It is the individual Christian whose voice should mainly be heard in politics in a fashion complementary with that of the church. Christians are to participate in politics “as citizens of the state and independent of the church.” They are to be “guided by Christian ethics” as people who “have something to offer in the running of the state.” The church is to encourage and counsel them constantly “so that they can abide in Christ in the discharge of their political responsibilities in such a way that every individual, no matter his religion, can benefit from the exercise of the political power given to them.”<sup>7</sup>

Edema warned against political parties based on religion or region. It is only the “secular state which guarantees religious freedom to all. Any other will make it “impossible to avoid religious polarisation.” To establish “a completely Christian party or a Muslim party” will be suicidal for the nation. He wanted a system where “each party consists of a spectrum of people from various backgrounds [and] religions. Christians should find themselves in these parties and demonstrate good and exemplary leadership. The choice of party, however, must be led by God,” with the only yardstick being that it

---

<sup>7</sup>A. Edema, 1988, pp. 2-6.

have “respect for democracy, rule and due process of law, human dignity and sanctity of human life. Its avowed objectives must not be antithetical to God’s principles as revealed in the Holy Scriptures.”<sup>8</sup>

Professor Jerry Gana has played a very prominent role in the FG under several administrations. During his earlier academic days at ABU he was the leader of the Christian community there under the ABU leadership of Professor Ishaya Audu.<sup>9</sup> In about 1988—the exact year is not sure-- he delivered a lecture on the political system of Nigeria that he envisioned for Nigeria. Since it was a BZ lecture, I will not go into the full details of his lecture. It constitutes Appendix 10 in Volume 5 of this series and can thus be read there on the *Companion CD*. In view of Gana’s subsequent influential role at federal level over the life of several administrations, I do encourage you, especially “Gana watchers,” to read the entire lecture to enable you to judge to what extent he actually worked out the perspective he outlined.

Like Muslims, depending especially on the British Christian social thinker Catherwood, he emphasised that

---

---

*there is no particular method of government which is sacrosanct. Different moral orders in society may require different types of government. Thus within the context of Christian principles, we have to think through the fundamental issues related to good government.*

*In the search for a new political system, we should realise that no political system can by itself ensure good government. Political systems are operated by people, and evil men can ruin the best system. The Christian should always be aware that there are destructive forces of wickedness in the world (Ephesians 6:10-20).*

*Therefore, in setting out ideals for a good society, the Christian should not only be idealistic, but should also be realistic.*

---

---

Nevertheless, he outlined a governmental programme that would have to do justice to “the values of freedom, equality, social justice, community, co-operation,

---

<sup>8</sup>A. Edema, 1988, pp. 27-28.

<sup>9</sup>On a personal note, it was with Audu and Gana that I had to negotiate during my bid for the position of Associate Chaplain at the university back in the 70s. The deal was cut short with the overthrow of General Gowon and the subsequent replacement of Audu with a Muslim Vice Chancellor.

progress, peace and prosperity,” while there should be no room for “oppression, exploitation, inequality, injustice, poverty, misery and dehumanisation.” On that basis he summarized seven characteristics of good government. After rehearsing various forms of government that he rejected, he concluded that :the only viable form of government is democracy. But democracy has been derailed. In Nigeria it “has been too much about power instead of about principle.” The more power leaders amass, the less likely they are to adhere to democratic principles. One of our political tragedies has been that leaders have been willing to do anything within their power “to extend their term of office.” He strongly advocated a two-party system instead of the multi-party system that is generally based on ethnic and religious considerations. The former should present voters “with a clear ideological orientation and well articulated alternative programmes.” He preferred to have the presidential model put in place but with some modifications to the model already tried. Gana also dealt with the democratisation of LGs and with economic power. I can only urge you to get hold of the *Companion CD* and study it yourself. Even the length of appendices must be kept modest.

Oyelade opposed “religious fundamentalism” as a threat to peace and political stability in Africa. He observed that “the usual tendency is to degenerate into fanaticism that seeks to destroy those that object to certain understanding of faith and practice.” He therefore made the following call on governments and friends of Africa:

---

*To help fight against religious fanaticism.*

*To help sustain freedom of religion and human rights in Africa.*

*To help uphold African pluralism so that all citizens, notwithstanding their religious differences, may live peacefully, work together and determine their destiny together.*

*To help ensure that the Traditional religious communities in Africa are legitimate citizens and part of Africa.<sup>10</sup>*

In the wake of the 2002 Zangon-Kataf riots the old but legitimate complaint about Muslim rule over indigenous people once again reared its head. Dr. Harrison Bungwan challenged the Government that if it “is really interested in peace, it should no longer disregard the call of the people for a separate chiefdom. The time has passed when his

---

<sup>10</sup>E. Oyelade, 1992, pp. 188-189.

people should continue to be enslaved or discriminated against in government patronage and appointments. As long as these unjust practices continue, there will be no lasting peace.” Addressing the same situation, former Military Governor Yohanna Madaki and indigene of the area, stated, “It’s time for the wind of change.”<sup>11</sup> It was to be a decade before a Governor would heed these warnings

Before closing this BZ political discussion, I leave you with a long quote from Dennis Gereng, the CAN successor to Wilson Sabiya of Volume 7 fame. Under Minchakpu’s blunt title “There Is a Subtle Plan to Islamize Nigeria,” Gereng said,

*A Christian leader should be smart enough to be able to get close to the people who are in government. Important positions in high places should be struggled for. These are the same machineries, apparatus or tools that the Muslims use or are using in trying to entrench their will and desire in this country. We know that the mallam or Imam or whatever he is called, doesn’t go to the government house to do all these things by himself. He uses people who are working there as government agents. So they are always close enough, they know how to influence them and to manipulate them and tell them, this is the thing that they want them to do. So, the Christian leaders need to be close to their own followers as well, to the point that they will be able to let them know that these are the things that are happening if they are in an office. They must make sure that he tells them what is wrong or against your religion. He should not just keep quiet because of fear. We know that most of the Christians in these places, fear that if they say this or if they raise alarm, they are going to terminate their appointments or they will not promote them or they will leave them to become redundant. These are the kind of things that make some of them to be afraid to say anything. But I feel that if one is a Christian, if you are in any position, you are not only there for yourself, you are there also to serve God. So the Christian should not see anything evil or unjust happening and then keep quiet because he may want material gain or otherwise. What I am saying is that, those who are Christian and in high positions, should be able to relate to their Christian leaders and their Christian leaders should also do all they can to go close to their members who are in*

---

<sup>11</sup>Anonymous, TC, 4/92, pp. 8-9.

*government, so that they can influence them in the same manner. We are not saying that they should take government money and bring it to the church, but we are saying that they must be recognised to the point that if they see any injustice, they'll cry out against it so that the world will know that these things are happening. They should not keep quiet, they have to immediately stand up and act, because that's the only way we can save the situation. If the people in government cannot challenge any government, we who are religious leaders, can stand uyp to speak out on behalf of our churches and our people. Unless the problem with religion in Nigeria is identified and dealt with, we are going to remain with it in this country. We must face reality and what is happening in this country. We must not chase the shadows and leave the real substance somewhere.<sup>12</sup>*

++++

At this point I move on to AZ days. The issues below are either summarized in the book or simply skipped.

For many decades the Middle Belt (MB) region has felt uncomfortable being part of the North, with its political power concentrated in what many consider till this day its Muslim feudal power. Already during colonialism several political parties arose to represent the interests of the MB, though they did not always see eye to eye, led as they were by politicians with their own agendas. But it remained an issue over the decades with Muslim Northerners and Christian MB-ers writing back and forth. The press would publish articles back and forth on the controversy.

One Kpang P. David of Lagos responded to one Safina Ahmed Tukur who wrote disparagingly about the MB and its people. According to David, Tukur “referred to the MB Movement as a ‘relatively raw concept in the country’s political lexicon.’” He also asked, “Who are the MB-ers? Of what geographical parameter is the MB? What are the natural elements binding the MB-ers? Is the MB not conceived just to create a political advantage for its proponents?”

---

<sup>12</sup>O. Minchakpu, *TC*, 1/94, pp. 7,8.

David charged that Tukur's "explanations are skewed towards satisfying the Northern oligarchy." He described Tukur's as a

---

*jaundiced position on the MB Movement. The struggle of ethnic minorities of the MB for political autonomy through the MB Movement has been consistent throughout all the constitutional conferences in this country, including Macpherson's 1954, Willink's 1958 and the military regimes' constitutional conferences. Thus, rather than being raw, the MB Movement is a systematic and well-co-ordinated programme for freeing the ethnic nationalities of this region from the political and economic strangulation by the Northern oligarchy.*<sup>13</sup>

---

David had understood the MB well. Only two years later, the MB, through the person of Solomon Lar and totally in keeping with David's sentiments, puffed up its chest and put the entire country, but especially the North, on notice that the MB had had enough of Northern feudalism. The only way for me to convey the spirit of this declaration is to reproduce the report entirely:

---

*The MBt is poised to direct the country's political direction in 2007, Acting Chairman of the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) Board of Trustees and leader of the Middle Belt Forum, Chief Solomon Daushep Lar has declared. He said that "those who think that the MBt is a misnomer or a myth will soon be made to realise that we are a reality that cannot be wished away." "They will soon see that our pains are real, our fears are real, our frustrations are real, our aspirations are real, our links are real, our solidarity is real, our determination is real and our capabilities are real," he added.*

*Lar, who noted that people who have all along been taking the MB for granted "will do so at great loss;" he tied the civic reception organised by the Middle Belt Forum in Honour of Lt.-General Theophilus Danjuma, former Defence Minister to "the beginning of renewed dynamism in theMB" and "the beginning MB initiative for a great new Nigeria."*

*By way of clarification as to the difference between the geographic MB and the political MB, Lar stated that "the political MB encompasses the marginalised minority groups in Northern Nigeria. These are the nationalities that have historically resisted feudalism, political oppression, injustice, religious discrimination and the political emasculation of*

---

<sup>13</sup>K. David, 29 June/2001.

*the unfavoured masses.” Lar added that “this extends from Ilorin to Kabba, to Adamawa, Taraba, Southern Borno, Gombe, Tafawa Balewa to Zuru and every part of Northern Nigeria where the tyranny of a predatory oligarchy had frustrated and is still trying to frustrate the legitimate aspirations of many people groups in the region.”*

*“The unity of the minority groups in Northern Nigeria has thus created a new majority, making the Middle Belt Forum the largest progressive nationalist group in Nigeria,” he added.<sup>14</sup>*

It was a brave, if not brash, declaration with which I fully sympathized at the time. But we have passed the 2007 election and the Presidency has moved from the South-West to the North, bypassing the MB. I am not sure the MB has reached its goal. But it sounded great and in conformity with claims in other parts of this chapter that Muslims will act positively only under pressure of tough language and action.

About the same time and in similar spirit, the Middle Belt Progressive Movement (MBPM) demanded that MB governors “stop attending meetings of the 19 Northern governors.” Again, here’s the entire article:

---

*The MBPM has asked governors from the MB to stop attending meetings of the 19 northern governors. The movement also asked speakers of Houses of Assembly in the MB to form their own speakers’ forum.*

*The position of the MBPM is contained in a resolution at the end of a meeting of its national working committee in Kaduna. The group said it was disappointed that the governors and speakers of the MB states were yet to dissociate themselves from the “so called 19 northern states.”*

*According to the resolution, it is against the collective desire of the MB to be associated or identified with the North. The movement believes that Benue, Plateau, Nasarawa, Kogi, Niger, Adamawa, Taraba and parts of Kaduna, Kwara and Bauchi States belong to the MB region.*

---

<sup>14</sup>TD, 29 Oct/2003. For more detailed background to this move see Appendix xxxx Igiebor and Akinkuotu. However, not all MB governors agreed with the trend. Abdullahi Adamu of Nasarawa State insisted that the MB is “part of the North and must maintain the unity of the North.” “We will not allow the North to break” (AM, 19 Apr/2000). That is a surprising insistence from a governor of a state that recently broke away from the Christian Plateau State for religious reasons! It is clear that his agenda was primarily Muslim hegemony over the MB, the very thing the Christian MB rejected

*The resolutions signed on behalf of the movement by former Deputy Inspector General of Police, Mr. Potter Dapub and Mr. Sam Onimisi, particularly decried the forum of speakers from the North which include legislative leaders from the MB. According to the statement, “It is a tragedy that the MB speakers remain so docile and dumb as to be cajoled to attend a regional meeting where they don’t belong.”*

*“If northern speakers chose to meet, we wonder what the MB speakers have in such a meeting.” “Northern speakers’ meeting is not beneficial to MBers, because northerners often look for their slaves to carry out their sinister agenda against other parts of Nigeria, and those who agree to run such errands suffer at the end of the day,” they stated. The statement said governors and speakers from the MB should constitute their own meetings to address peculiar problems of their people.<sup>15</sup>*

Clearly, the spirit of political separation from the traditional Northern establishment was in the air in the MB. Unlike Mary Joe, no political re-alignment of Northern states borders was in view, but political re-alignment definitely was. It was a direction away from the traditional easy mixing of religions within the various parties that has always characterized Nigerian politics. It also went counter to the desires of one of the MB’s most illustrious sons, Yakubu Gowon, who at one time held the chair of the Board of Patrons of the Arewa Consultative Forum (ACF) and encouraged the North “to take unity serious, to regain the glory it enjoyed before the Nigerian civil war.” He warned, “If we are not working as one family, anything to the contrary would not augur well for us, we the *Arewa* [Northern] people. That is the only way we can succeed. Every Northerner, irrespective of religion or tribe, should unite and work for the socio-economic progress of the entire North.”<sup>16</sup> And it went contrary to the emphasis of dialogue advocates who promoted working together.

Femi Awoniyi offered a unique perspective and solution. He is covered only in this Appendix, not in the book. He charged that the Fulani, in distinction from the Hausa, raised the sharia issue as an “instrument of political mobilization.” The loudest protagonists, he said, were Fulani. He saw the expanded sharia as “a logical continuation of the Fulani historical politicization of Islam for power” and as “an instrument of mobilization of political violence.” The new “sharia creates a climate of Islamic extremism, and there are no better soldiers than fanatics of any ideological or religious persuasion.” Thus, “the Fulani political sharia has the

---

<sup>15</sup>A. Madugba, 30 Oct/2003.

<sup>16</sup>J. Lohor, 22 Aug/2002. R. Ibrahim, 28 May/2001.

potential to create a pool of hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of zealots who would be willing to die for Fulani power, erroneously believing they are giving their lives for the true Islam.”

He then traced the clever way in which the Fulani allegedly use the Hausa people by pretending unity with them, but it is not unity so much as subjugation through denying the Hausa people their own cultural identity.<sup>17</sup> It is a continuation of the Danfodio campaign, but now in cultural form. The Hausa in Northern Nigeria are a beaten people with no education. They are far behind the Hausa in Ghana, where they are only a small minority but amongst the most educated.

Another part of the Fulani campaign for hegemony is to hide their true identity by constantly using inclusive terms like “Hausa-Fulani,” “The North” and “Northern.” These terms are supposed to cover both the core North and the MB, whom we have already seen to refuse the connection. And while the Fulani use this wide terminology for themselves, they divide the South into Igbo and Yoruba in their bid to divide and rule. But “North” is a geographical term, while “Igbo” is an ethnic term, farther removed from each other than “mango” and “guava.” Somehow this language, along with their sharia campaign, covers up the Fulani power play and helps them retain their power.

This Fulani power must be broken, declared Awoniyi:

---

*Hausa mind reclamation is a critical prerequisite for peace in Nigeria. This must begin with the de-monopolization of Fulani control over the media information consumed by the general masses of illiterate Hausa and other related peoples, both in the North and South. There is a massive undercurrent of Hausa resentment of Fulani privilege in Nigeria, but this grievance lacks avenues of media expression. The Fulanis know it, but for the time being they have been able to deflect it in the direction of others: non-Muslims, Yorubas, etc.*

---

---

<sup>17</sup>In vol. 7, p. 176, of this series, there is reference to the Federal Radio of Kaduna refusing to air Hausa music in a Christian programme. The explanation given there for this refusal is thrown into doubt by Femi Awoniyi, who wrote, “The recent banning of the public performance of Hausa music and other forms of cultural expression in Hausaland because they are ‘un-Islamic’ is an act of hostility against Hausa culture.” This is the only time I have heard of banning of Hausa music in general and cannot vouch for its correctness. However, if it is historically accurate, then the refusal Mary Anfani Joe reported is part of a larger anti-Hausa campaign on the part of the Fulani and not aimed only at Christians.

Awoniyi also suggested steps to achieve the liberation of the Hausa. Electronic broadcasting services in the South and the Christian North should introduce Hausa programmes and thus give the Hausas a voice. The press should quit using their inclusive language and clearly identify Fulanis just as Igbos, Yorubas, Tivs, Jukuns, etc. are identified by their ethnic identities. “This will gradually reveal the full extent of Fulani privilege over our people in the North. And the realization will dawn on them that that privilege is at their expense.” “The control of the Hausa mind is the source of Fulani power in Nigeria. We must wrest this power from them, if we are to rescue our collective fate from Fulani whims”<sup>18</sup>—and, I add, from their tool of sharia.

In another paper, he put the challenge this way: “The battle against Fulani trouble-making must be taken to Hausaland, where the Hausa man is so thoroughly and hopelessly marginalized. We must free him from the evil shackles of Fulani political Islam because only then will we have sustained peace in Nigeria.”<sup>19</sup>

---

---

<sup>18</sup>F. Awoniyi, ““Sharia, Hausas and Fulani...” This paper was part of an ongoing bitter Gamji dispute between the Fulani and their Yoruba attacker. I recommend you read all 3 of his papers for their poignant quality. See Bibliography.

<sup>19</sup>F. Awoniyi, “Political Sharia...” Awoniyi’s anti-Fulani writings evoked bitter and harsh responses from Fulani writers. Magaji Galadima called Awoniyi a “buffoon” and a “colossal quack” with “venomous outpour.” “Fulani bashing and Islamaphobia” have been typical of the Yoruba for a long time, according to Galadima. The murdered Federal AG, Bola Ige, in life an anti-Fulani warrior, “died like a dog, consumed by the Frankenstein monster he created and nurtured.” Since these papers did not contribute to the search for solutions, I have not discussed them. However, the articles are found on the *Companion CD*. (Magaji Galadima, “Do They Sell *Ogogoro* in Germany? A Response to Femi Awoniyi.” Gamji, n.d. *Companion CD* <Misc Arts/Sharia/Galadima M>). (M. A. Ibrahim, “In Response to Femi Awoniyi’s ‘Sharia in the House of Oduduwa: The Challenge of Fulani Political Islam to Peace in Nigeria.’” Gamji, N.d. *Companion CD* <Misc Arts/Sharia/Ibrahim MA>).