



THE ROYAL NIGER COMPANY AND THE FOUNDING OF NIGERIA, 1879-1914.

Sunday M.A. Aloko

Zamani College Kaduna, Kaduna State University (KASU) and Ahmadu Bello University
(A.B.U), Zaria.

Email: smaaloko@gmail.com, smaaloko@gmail.com

Abstract

The paper examines the complex historical processes during the 18th and 19th centuries that culminated in the founding of modern Nigeria. It argues that the abolition of the slave trade and the subsequent introduction and promotion of legitimate trade and commerce in the 19th century by Christian missionaries and imperial companies due primarily to the industrial revolution which started in Britain and created the need for raw materials which were available in Africa to feed their home industries, holds the key to understanding the formation of Nigeria in 1914. It utilised both primary and secondary sources of research to show how the era of the new imperialism which was characterised by trade monopoly engendered company rule by European merchants which were later chartered to act on behalf of their governments in acquired territories. The study contends that the Royal Niger Company (RNC) led by George Goldie, which was chartered to acquire and rule territories on behalf of the crown not only secured British imperial interest in the area now called Nigeria but also made it possible for the British to shrug off intense rivalry from France and Germany, their arch rivals. To this end, it may be safe to argue that Fredrick Lord Lugard's amalgamation of the Northern and Southern protectorates in 1914 which gave birth to modern Nigeria, only built on the foundation which George Goldie and his company, the RNC had already laid.

Keyword: Royal Niger Company, Founding, Nigeria, Company Rule, Monopoly

Introduction

Modern Nigeria is beyond reasonable doubt the result of British imperialism in Africa. But although the country was formally created as a result of the amalgamation of the Southern and Northern Protectorates into a single politico-administrative unit in 1914, the complex socio-political and economic process that gave rise to the merger dates back to the 19th century. The industrial revolution which started in Great Britain and spread to Western Europe and the United States (US) decisively changed the course of world history and set industrialised nations on the path to progress that is unparalleled in human history and transformed African societies tremendously. It for instance accounted for the abolition of the trans-Atlantic slave trade which dominated Africa's relationship with Europe for over 400 years and ushered a new dawn in Africa's history; the introduction of 'legitimate trade' in agricultural produce to feed European industries at home and increased the penetration of Europeans into the interior of Africa and Nigeria in particular. The resultant effect was the intense rivalry for secured sources and supply of raw materials and market for excess finished goods among European trading companies.

The imperialist convoke of 1884/1885, popularly known as the Berlin Conference brought about relative peace and stability as territories in Africa were peacefully divided in piecemeal and areas of jurisdictions were well defined and agreed upon except for Rivers Niger and Congo which were to be international waters for free trade and navigation by all nations. In Nigeria, the British trading company whose activities were profound and unarguably laid the foundation of modern Nigeria was the Royal Niger Company (RNC).

The company which made remarkable impact in Nigeria and other colonised territories in West Africa chiefly due to the distinguished, influential and path breaking role of its founder and leader, George Taubman Goldie and the charter it received from the British government, left behind an indelible footprint which cannot be divorced from the founding of modern Nigeria in 1914. This paper examines the role of the RNC and its leader in the evolution of modern Nigeria.

The New Imperialism and the Era of Company Rule in Nigeria

The gradual decline in British technological advantage and hegemonic powers occasioned by the rapid rise of a politically stable and united Germany under Otto Von Bismark who was at the centre of European diplomacy and the unhealthy rivalry that ensued, marked the genesis of the new imperialism. This period, in world history, witnessed phenomenal expansion of industrialised nations throughout the world. Imperialism, the ideology of the industrialised nations, though as old as mankind, witnessed tremendous transformation such that it was christened, the new imperialism.

Prior to the era of the new imperialism, Nigeria had already become one of Britain's spheres of commercial interest and dominance. This was achieved soon after the abolition of the trans-Atlantic slave trade for the trade in agricultural produce, especially in palm oil, dubiously named

legitimate trade.¹ The Christian missionary activities which followed the abolition of slave trade and gained momentum after the founding of Liberia in 1822 and Sierra Leone in 1791 as ex –slave settlements gave impetus to the legitimate commerce, as new cash crops were introduced and cash crops production was promoted by the missionaries to take the minds of indigenous merchants in West Africa off the lucrative trade in humans which they had become too addicted to.²

Contrary to the views of Joseph Schumpeter and Hannah Arendt which ill-conceived imperialism as the desire for expansion for the sake of it or fun of it,³ imperialism is the systematic and organised domination of weaker nations by powerful nations essentially for economic reasons. The new imperialism which succeeded the old one was the direct consequence of the industrial revolution and began from the 1870's and reached its end in 1914. The key players of the period were France, Britain, Germany, Belgium, Italy and the US. These imperialist nations vigorously pursued economic objectives which fundamentally aimed at consolidating on their gains at home through oversee trade, which resulted in clashes on numerous fronts.

Fieldhouse has observed that European preference for oversee trade was predicated on the fact that wages paid to labourers abroad were far lower than what was obtainable in Europe, which enabled them maximise profit at lower cost in oversee territories.⁴ On his part, Lenin understood the new imperialism to mean an attempt by European imperialist to impose trade monopoly on non-industrialised nations as opposed to the doctrine of free market economy which negates it.⁵ The goal of the trade monopoly of the era was to enable all merchants and companies of imperial European countries to carve a niche for themselves and to guarantee constant investment and reinvestment so that surplus profit and value can be created in the overall interest of their respective motherland. It was for instance recorded that the period saw exponential increase in Britain's foreign investment and profits.⁶ It is instructive to note that the philosophy of the period was what made colonial conquest and subsequent colonisation inevitable in furtherance of capitalist expansion.

Against this backdrop, Rodney views the new imperialism as a phase in the development of capitalism that saw the imposition of all round hegemony – economic, political, cultural and military on nations which were too weak to resist European countries, Japanese and American domination and succeeded in partitioning the world into exploiters and the exploited, dominated and the overlords, policy makers and dependent partners.⁷ The new imperialism is thus the politico-economic ideology that was predicated on the exploitation of the resources of nations by those who could and saw industrialised nations go into Africa and other parts of the world in the late 19th century for the control of their economies and the globalisation of capitalism. The ideology was furthered by the findings of European explorers which were well documented and helped to raise enthusiasm among European trading companies as well as the timely discovery of quinine in 1820⁸ as cure for malaria which had before the time rendered the tropics “the white man's grave.”

It was against this background that company rule by European merchants and companies started in West Africa and Nigeria in particular to maximise profit beyond measure through the exploitation of the human and natural resources of the locals and the setting up of readily available markets for their excess manufactured goods in furtherance of their respective country's development. It has been argued that the period of chartered company rule in British Empire was informed by the need to work out a compromise between establishing effective administration in accordance with the Berlin Acts and the hesitancy of the British to commit its resources towards the expansion of its imperial empire into the interior of Africa.⁹ British administrators later agreed that to run their empires devoid of taxpayer's money would require the delegation of imperial power and authority to private companies and their agents. This, by implication, meant the outsourcing of imperial rule to chartered companies which were expected to boost economic development in the motherland through job creation and payment of taxes to British government. Thus, the British policy which required her overseas territories to be self-sustaining and financed themselves at no cost on her citizens explains the reason for company rule which preceded formal colonial takeover at the turn of the 20th century. The era which hijacked and reversed Africa's economic development and reduced the continent and its people to dependent partners in the international capitalist system is widely believed to have laid the foundation of Africa's underdevelopment and its continued dependence on developed nations which profited in the process.

The most important of the companies in West Africa was the RNC. The company which was established in 1879 as the United African Company (UAC) was renamed the National African Company in 1881¹⁰ and finally had its name changed to the Royal Niger Company in 1886 after it was chartered as a means to the realisation of a cheap method of exercising British imperial rule in West Africa. Its chartered status marked a critical stage in the history and development of the company, with great consequences for the political and economic future of the West African sub-region, especially, Nigeria.

The Company's Activities and the Founding of Nigeria

The charter granted to the RNC in 1886 after its intentions satisfied the queen in council forbade any form of monopoly and differential treatment under article 14 of the charter because it was considered inimical to trade. It was cautioned against disregarding the customs, laws, traditions and religions of the people. Interference could only be legitimate in the case of slavery which had been abolished and should be enforced by the RNC when the need arises. The company was however authorised to impose only duties and charges for administrative purposes, in addition to representing British presence, influence, the enforcement of treaty rights and to the 'administration of justice'.¹¹ The company was denied the right to impose trade monopoly in its delegated areas of jurisdiction,¹² which were initially not well defined probably due to the fact that it was tasked with the responsibility of enforcing the Berlin acts which included freedom of navigation on the Niger for all European powers. The restraint on the company was not without a caveat. For

instance, under Article 18 of the Charter granted to it, the Secretary of State could object the company's rule over territories surrounded by controversies¹³ but power to revoke the Charter was the exclusive right of the Queen in Council. It was also mandated to account for its revenue from duties and expenditure from same for transparency. The company was cautioned in the light of its conflicting jurisdiction which created tensions home and abroad and divided policy makers into protagonist and antagonist.

This proved to be very challenging to its leader, George Goldie, who strongly believed monopoly was in the best interest of his company and that of Britain due to his recognition of stiff competitions emanating from the French and Germans who also had their imperial eyes fixated on Nigeria. To this end, he amalgamated the three largest British firms operating on the Niger-Benue into a whole in order to counter French and German interests in the Nigerian area and to contain the hostilities of the Niger Delta middlemen who were considered a threat to individual companies. The companies were – Holland Jacques and Company, Brothers, and James Pinnock – to create the United African Company. He also went as far as incorporating three major French companies in 1884, making his company by far the largest on the Niger. This he did through a highhanded approach that relied so much on the imposition of fees, regulations and administrative measures that effectively dislodged the French and the Germans who repeatedly opposed the actions of the company¹⁴ because it violated the Berlin acts which gave all European nations the right to freedom of navigation and their attempt at internationalisation of trade on the Niger River.

The RNC for instance introduced horrendous tariffs on imports and exports at Arkassa on the Delta, which was the company's base and insisted merchants and their companies had to pay either before accessing the Niger or at exit point. A study by Falola and Heaton has shown that foreign traders were required to pay £100 for a license, in addition to £100 if they were to trade in alcohol. In furtherance of its strategy to frustrate firms able to compete with it, the company imposed import duties on ammunitions and alcohol, which amounted to about 100 percent increase, thus making importation of these goods only unprofitable to the RNC.¹⁵ The German government for instance protested in 1890 and Claude Macdonald who was then a major was asked to study the protest letters and report to the British parliament. While European traders were compensated, African traders were not.¹⁶ The unfair treatment irked local traders who felt their business interest was being undermined in what appears to be an apparent attempt by the company to change the hitherto trade status quo and impose monopoly that serves only the company's interest and that of the British.

Colonial records show that the chiefs and kings of the Niger Basin protested the company's purchase and incorporation of companies belonging to other European countries, which made it their sole trading partner. The Oil Rivers District consequently applied to the British government requesting to be chartered in order to challenge the privileged position enjoyed by the RNC. The imperial government rejected their application and suggestions by some officers of the colonial department that it should be made a colony connected to Lagos or separately on the ground that

the West African territories acquired by the British with great effort and finances were meant to be opened to all British traders, which would have been threatened if the district was chartered.¹⁷ It is clear the locals were very much aware of the dangers of monopoly and wanted an end to it. The reasons are not far-fetched; they wanted free trade given the comparative advantage it offers. They equally felt they would also suffer the same fate in their trade with the company which was determined to edge them out after it successfully extinguished other European companies with the exception of only the African association. Losing their sovereignty was another issue of grave concern, which could result in the liberation of their domestic slaves, reduce their social status and diminish their source of revenue.

The colonial government also dismissed their concerns against the backdrop of RNC's performance and in recognition of its acquisition of the protectorates of the Niger territories which cost it £ 250, 000.¹⁸ This action by the British makes its claim to a free trade doubtful or perhaps questionable. Thus, the greater evil which resulted from the company's trade obstructionist policies and its interference with European and Nigerian traders' right was tacitly supported by the British and spelt doom on the economies of the Nigerian societies and traders' gains, especially those on the Niger and Benue rivers, who preferred to trade with the highest bidder. The result was the attack on its headquarters at Akassa in the Delta in the year 1894 by the Brass people who had been effectively crippled economically, denied their preferred direct trade with the Germans after learning lessons from the account of Jaja of Opobo who was sent on exile for exporting Palm oil directly to Britain and is believed to have been killed on his way back home.¹⁹ The fact of the matter is, the people were at the point of starvation as a result of the company's exactions which systematically squeezed them out of trade and commerce in their own territories.

The role of the company in the founding of Nigeria could be seen in its signing of treaties of protection with the locals who thought they were mere treaties of trade, commerce and friendship because they did not understand the terms and conditions of what they had signed with the representative of the imperial government in London. The multiplicity of treaties (over 400) the company signed with local chiefs on the Niger, Benue and Delta earned Britain a firm grip of the greater parts of what later metamorphosed into modern day Nigeria because they were further incorporated into earlier ones signed by the British government by British consuls. For instance, it had treaties signed with Ilorin, Bida, Bussa, Sokoto and Gwandu such that in 1899, the entire caliphate had come under the control and influence of the company.²⁰ These treaties of trade and protection signed with the leaders of the aforementioned kingdoms and empires further solidified Britain's claims in its rivalry with the governments of France and Germany which felt obliged to honour them in order to avoid any form of military conflicts capable of negating the interests of their trading firms and those of their respective countries at large in Africa.

Furthermore, the charter which the company secured in 1886 empowered it to interfere in the internal politics of the territories it swindled into signing trade and diplomatic treaties aimed at deterring European competitors, especially those on the Niger-Delta which gave the RNC the exclusive rights to export palm oil and obfuscate the free trade agreements which the people

thought they had signed with Goldie's RNC. Its interference was made possible partly due to the fact that it was granted the right to put an end to slavery and to collect taxes to minimise its cost of governance while maximising profits at the same time. This was in addition to the fact that the charter it received also included the right to govern the territories under its jurisdiction. Although such interferences clearly violated the gentleman's agreement Goldie had made with the local chiefs of the Delta before 1886 which forbade his company from going beyond the coastal areas into the interior of Rivers Niger and Benue²¹, it was necessary for its effective control of trade and the peoples of the area.

The role the company played at the Berlin conference of 1884/1885 due to the scramble for the partitioning of Africa by interested European powers which heightened the search for a cheap method of imperial rule over distant territories cannot be overemphasized. This was because the mercantile European trading companies already operating in West Africa not only exerted pressure on their governments for more control in their spheres of influence but were also present at the conference to help their imperial governments consolidate on their commercial exploits. They were convinced that increased involvement of their governments would result in the provision of security and improved infrastructure capable of skyrocketing their profits in a more conducive and enabling business environment. It was against this backdrop that the West African section of the London Chamber of Commerce in 1885 recommended closer administration of British West African territories, which included the policing of the Niger and Benue Rivers and an effective communication system on regular basis for safe operations aimed at minimising risks of incidence.²²

Thus, its role in the partitioning of Africa included but may not be limited to the following; it worked very closely with the British to stall German and French further penetration into Northern and parts of Eastern Nigeria; the company penetrated the hinterlands and signed treaties with local chiefs and supported chiefdoms and kingdoms threatened by their rivals, which stamped British presence and influence in what is now Nigeria; it also effectively used gunboats to conquer and control territories under the coastal chiefs. Little wonder why the British quickly declared a protectorate over the Niger, dominated the oil Rivers, eastern trade as well as parts of Western Nigeria, especially, Lagos.²³ The exploits of Goldie and his company made it very easy for the British to advance its claim and interest on Nigeria at the Berlin conference with little or no resistance and helped to curb German and French further penetration into the interior of Nigeria.

It is perhaps instructive to note that the inhabitants of the area now called Nigeria was at that time estimated to be around 20 million, out of which the RNC controlled and administered a population estimated to be about 10 million people. In geographical terms, it controlled the entire Northern Nigeria; an area that was far more than a quarter of a million which included a strip of territory along the River Niger and the Delta states to the South.²⁴ Thus, the company controlled and managed more than half of what was later renamed Nigeria by Flora Shaw, a journalist who worked with Fredrick Lord Lugard, the first High Commissioner of Northern Nigeria and the first Governor General of Nigeria between 1914 and 1919 and later married him. The dominating and

seemingly mystical personality of George Goldie which owes much to his tremendous exploit in West Africa, comparable only to that of Cecil Rhodes and his British South African Company and the unexplained unusual secrecy that surrounds his life informed Lord Lugard's unmistakable conclusion that he was the founder of Nigeria and his ideas of a future Nigeria influenced the policy which he adopted after the charter granted to the RNC was revoked on the 31st of December 1899.

According to Lugard, George Goldie planned that Nigeria be governed on European principle indirectly through local chiefs in isolated settlements. His idea of government was predicated on climatic factor which convinced him that the administration of a future Nigeria must be conducted from an office in London.²⁵ Lugard's revelation suggests the indirect rule system which he introduced in which native authority was utilised in the administration of Northern and Southern protectorates of Nigerians under the supervision of British officials was partly influenced by Goldie's vision of a future Nigeria. What however distinguished the Lugardian indirect rule system from that of Goldie is the fact that the administration of Nigeria was not directly conducted from London. It was on the contrary conducted from Lagos, which was the crown colony after its bombardment in 1851 and annexation in 1861. While the Governor-General was at the helm of affairs from Lagos, he received directives from the Secretary of States who was based in London and was directly responsible and accountable to the Queen in Council (the British Parliament). It is important to note that Goldie's emphasis on London may have been informed by the fear of malaria, the deadly disease which accounted for the death of many British officials on the Niger River. Although the British through Lugard took cognisance of his concerns because it made use of only a few officials on the ground to maintain law and order, ensure adequate coordination and effectiveness in policy formulation and implementation, the discovery of quinine as a cure for malaria most probably explained the policy discrepancy.

As mentioned earlier, the charter granted to the company in 1886 was revoked in 1899, the eve of the 20th century. The creation of the Royal West African Force (RWAF) in 1900 under Lord Lugard, an experienced and accomplished colonial officer and an employee of the RNC was spiteful and a clear indication that Joseph Chamberlain, a former president of the Board of Trade and Secretary of States for colonies between 29 June 1895 and 16 September 1903 was against the renewal of Goldie's buccaneering company's charter beyond 1899. He was instead absolutely in favour of an outright transition to colonial rule which he felt would better secure and advance British interest in Nigeria and West Africa in general. He therefore settled for a negotiated revocation settlement with Goldie's RNC. The result was that the RNC sold its acquired territory, which was equivalent to Northern Nigeria to the British government for £865,000 and forfeited its rights and interests but was granted only commercial rights and royalty on mineral exploitation for 99 years. Soon after the deal which abrogated the charter and the RNC's rule on the Niger and Benue, Lugard and the newly formed imperial army, the RWAF swiftly advanced towards Borgu and the little left of the French in the area retreated, leaving the Niger firmly in the hands of the British. Consequently, Lugard declared on the 1st of January 1900 that all lands formerly in the hands of the RNC had become the property of her Royal Majesty, the Queen. He also had all the

lands registered and promulgated the infamous Crown Land Law No.16 ²⁶ which effectively transferred all land to the Crown. The Southern parts of the company's spheres of influence in the palm oil zone now known as the Niger-Delta were merged into the Niger Coast Protectorates and renamed Southern Nigeria in 1900.

Thus, there were three separate colonial administrative jurisdictions in Nigeria by 1900. They were the Northern Protectorates, Southern Protectorates and the Colony of Lagos which was acquired by the British in 1861. The administrative units were further reduced to two in 1906 when the Colony of Lagos and Southern Protectorates were amalgamated to form what became known as the Colony and Protectorates of Southern Nigeria. In 1914, finally, the Colony and protectorates of Southern Nigeria and the Northern Protectorates were amalgamated by Lord Lugard to form Modern Nigeria, which resulted in a central administration via the Nigerian council established in the same year. Goldie's company, the RNC changed its name to The Niger Company Ltd and was later absorbed by Unilever as a subsidiary in the 1930's and continues to operate in Nigeria.

Conclusion

The paper has shown that the need to find a cheap method of exercising political authority over distant territories necessitated the era of company rule in Nigeria and the subsequent charter given to the RNC legitimised its operations and activities in Africa. It contends that the role of the RNC in the founding of Nigeria is crystal clear, beyond measure and beyond any reasonable doubt. Its roles could be seen in its adoption of autocratic measures to put an end to internal slavery in the Niger-Delta and its provocative imposition of trade monopoly on the Niger and Benue Rivers which extended to the Delta states. In addition to this, it used its gunboats and other military structures to conquer, compel local rulers to sign treaties and expanded into the hinterland against the Akassa Treaty which forbade its penetration and systematically interfered in the local politics of the peoples of the Nigerian area. Apart from its collection and generation of revenue essentially through the imposition of custom duties on European and African traders which sealed its monopoly and systematically put an end to free trade which formed a central part of the Berlin acts of 1885, it also established de facto courts called court of equity to try cases, especially trade disputes to further its unscrupulous ambition at the expense of the locals who unapologetically demonstrated their penchant for free trade. The study contends that the sum-total of the company's policies, programmes and actions countered the strategies of the Germans and the French and deprived them the right to free trade with the inhabitants of the Nigeria area. Most importantly, it ward off their ambitions to occupy Nigeria and made it very easy for the British to gain full control of the territories that make up Nigeria, which it colonised between 1900 and 1960. Thus, Sir Fredrick Lord Lugard who amalgamated the South and the North of the country, Nigeria and widely considered the founder of Modern Nigeria, was right to declare Sir George Dashwood Taubman Goldie, the Governor of the Royal Niger Company the most deserved founder of modern Nigeria.

End Notes

¹ There seem to be a consensus among historians that there was nothing legitimate about the legitimate trade. The fact of the matter is what to produce, how to produce, when to produce and for whom to produce were all determined by European powers. Hence, the construct legitimate trade was probably intended to show a transition for the inhumane slave trade to the fairly acceptable trade in agricultural produce which also continued the regime of exploitation.

² Evangelicals in Britain and Europe played pivotal role in the abolition of slave trade because to them it was not practicable to preach Christianity, when slave trading, and inhuman and unchristian activity was ongoing. Only an end to the illicit trade could give them a clear conscience to do so. They therefore promoted cash crop production to dissuade the indigenous peoples of West Africa from trading in slaves with Portugal and Spain which continued the illicit business even after the abolition.

³ The two notable scholars attempted to divorce imperialism from exploitation, which is historically incorrect. Together with other scholars, they argue that imperialism is a natural instinct given the fact that humans by nature seek to dominate. This view is a façade and seeks to justify imperialism which has led to the domination and exploitation of millions of people across the globe.

⁴ Fieldhouse, DK. (1961). 'Imperialism': An Historiographical Revision, *The Economic History Review*, Volume 14, Issue 2, P. p 200-202. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0289.1961.tb00045.x>. Retrieved on 14 November, 2022.

⁵ Lenin, VI. (1917). *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of the Capitalism*. Petrograd, Zhizn i Znaniye (Life and Knowledge) Publishers, p. 245

⁶ Wengraf, Lee. (2018). *Extracting Profit: Imperialism, Neoliberalism and the New Scramble for Africa*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books, P.p. 28-29.

⁷ Rodney, Walter. (1972). *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications, p.206.

⁸ Dobson, S. (2001). The History of Anti-Malaria Drugs, in Pjr (eds) *Antimalarial Chemotherapy: Mechanisms of Action, Resistance and New Directions in Drug Discovery*. USA: New Jersey, Human Press. P.p. 15-25.

⁹ Gardner, L.A. (2012). *Taxing Colonial Africa: The Political Economy of British Imperialism*, Oxford University Press, U.K, p.21.

¹⁰ Baker, Geoffrey L. (1996). *Trade Winds on the Niger: Saga of the Royal Niger Company, 1830-1971*. Radcliffe, London, P.p. 40-60.

¹¹ See Affairs of the Oil Rivers Protectorate and Niger Territories: Royal Niger Company's charter. Memorial of the chamber on the above-named subjects to the Right Hon. The Earl of Rosebery ... together with appendices, containing memorial letter to the Most Honourable the Marquis of Salisbury and statement submitted to the council of the Royal Niger Company. Printed by Lee and Nightingale, Liverpool, 1893.

¹² The areas of jurisdiction according to the terms of the charter included the Niger, Delta, Nupe which was on the Benue and Yola at the extreme end of Nigeria. However, it is important to note that the company later went beyond these boundaries.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Flint, John E. *Sir George Goldie and the making of Nigeria*, Oxford, 1960 pp. 167.

¹⁵ Falola, T & Heaton, M. (2008). *A History of Nigeria*. Cambridge University Press, New York, U.S.A., P.p. 141-142.

¹⁶ See letter from the chamber to the Most Honourable, the Marquis Salisbury, K.G. on the extension of the jurisdiction of the RNC over the district between the Nun Niger, the Foroads River, and the Wari Creek, Liverpool, 25th May, 1892.

¹⁷ See Affairs of the Oil Rivers Protectorate and Niger Territories, op. cit., p.10.

¹⁸ See letter from the chamber to the Most Honourable, the Marquis Salisbury, K.G, op. cit.

¹⁹ Tayo, Ayomide O. (26 July 2019). "How Nigeria transformed from a business into a country". *Pulse NG*. Retrieved on 11 November, 2022.

-
- ²⁰ Lupton, Kenneth. The Partitioning of Borgu in 1898 and the French Enclaves in Nigeria, 1900-1960, *Journal of the Historical Society of Nigeria*, Vol. 12, No. 3/4 (DEC. 1984–JUNE 1985), P.p. 77-78.
- ²¹ Tayo, A.O. (26 July 2019). "How Nigeria transformed from a business into a country".
- ²² Pedler, S. F. (1975). 'British Planning and Private Enterprise in Colonial Africa', in *Colonialism in Africa 1870–1960: The Economics of Colonialism*, Cambridge, Press, P.p. 95–126.
- ²³ Falola, T et al (2014). *History of Nigeria Vol. 2: Nigeria in the 19th Century*. Learn Africa, Ikeja, Lagos. P.p. 174-177.
- ²⁴ Lugard, Lord (1937). British Policy in Nigeria in *Journal of the International African Institute*, Oct., 1937, Vol. 10, No. 4 (Oct., 1937), Cambridge University Press on behalf of the International African Institute, P.p. 378-379. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1155144>. Retrieved on 14 November, 2022.
- ²⁵ Lugard, Lord (1937). British Policy in Nigeria, p.379.
- ²⁶ Magvwat, M. (1984). *A History of Class Formation in the Plateau Province 1902-1960: The Genesis of a Ruling Class*. PhD Thesis, A.B.U., Zaria, p. 208.