
A GENERAL OVERVIEW OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE AS RESISTANCE AND REVOLUTION AND ITS IMPLICATIONS ON THE NIGERIAN SOCIETY

BY

**TORKWEMBE, CATHERINE MWANGER (PhD)
Department of Religion and Philosophy,
Faculty of Arts,
University of Jos.**

INTRODUCTION

Nigeria is one of the countries that got her independence in 1960 from the British government. She had been an 'independent' nation for 60 years now with indigenous leadership. She had experienced military and democratic forms of government within the period under review. When the present 'Mantra of Change' came on 29th May 2015, it promised change and entrenchment of true democracy founded on the basis of the rule of law. It promised independence of certain hitherto, executively-controlled sectors like the judiciary, electoral body, security agencies; just as it will revamp the already dwindling and near death stage of the education, power, petroleum and health sectors. Equally, it promised to handle the Nigerian 'cankerworm'; corruption and insecurity as well as boosting the economy and naira value against foreign currency. It encouraged the Nigerian populace by promising the proper handling of Boko Haram and the safe return of the abducted Chibok girls. These and many more they said, brought smiles on the faces of many Nigerians and even the international world.

The paper before us suggests that the Nigerian situation is yet to experienced the promises made especially in the area of the entrenchment of the rule of law. There have been protests against certain policies and governments from all sectors and levels. Civil disobedience was supposed to be a far cry from this government; at least, she is five years old. The paper discusses civil disobedience as a theme and medium of communication. It looks at the issue from both a theoretical and practical perspective. It draws its support from the history of civil disobedience from around the world. It discusses the views of certain people on the subject matter and the justifiability of protests. It, however, finds some linkage with the Nigerian situation especially in the aftermath of what civil disobedience has brought about in some African countries. The worst-case scenario is how to avert violent civil disobedience like that happening in Syria, although it argues for both the possibility and impossibility of an uprising that is violent.

CLARIFICATION OF CONCEPTS

1. Civil Disobedience

This is a compound word involving 'civil' and 'disobedience'. The term 'civil' can be used variously to mean the 'legitimacy of an existing legal order'; the opposite of military (that

is, not using physical force); opposite of primitive or uncivil etc (Webster Dictionary Page No). We are more comfortable with the meaning of civil as that which concerns the public or “connected with the people who live in a country”, while 'disobedience' simply means “failure or refusal to obey”.

In putting the two terms together therefore, the Webster's dictionary says civil disobedience means “refusal to obey the demands of commands of the government especially as a non-violent collective means of forcing concessions from the government. The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary says it is the “refusal by a large group of people to obey particular laws or pay taxes, usually as a form of peaceful protest” (Page No.). By the above definitions, it is obvious that the term 'civil disobedience' connotes the idea of non-violence. John Rawls' definition is “a politically-motivated, public, non-violent and conscientious breach of law undertaken with the aim of bringing about a change in laws and government policies” (Web n.p.) Many however, view the definition of civil disobedience as not zeroing out the possibility of violence. Summarily, civil disobedience as viewed by the writer of this piece, is from two words: involving public and orderliness, thus, the functional definition is that, civil disobedience is that orderly conduct of people, protesters and authorities, in addressing grievances or legislations that are not clearly understood.

The term became popular from the writing of Henry David Thoreau in 1849, 'Resistance to Civil Government' or 'Civil Disobedience'. He built his article, ideology and action of non-cooperation with the civil system on the motto, 'That government is best which governs least'. He chose non-cooperation with the American government, believing that it was inefficient, abusive and pervasive – using Americans' taxes in the purchase of weapons and financing the American-Mexican war (1846-1848) and enforcing Fugitive Slave Law, although, he said he was not fighting those in authority but also those that believed it was wrong and yet did nothing. In his famous speech, he said there are “hundred thousand merchants and farmers here, who are more interested in commerce and agriculture than they are in humanity and not prepared to do justice to the slave and to Mexico” (Civil Disobedience 4). As a result, his paying taxes would equally be doing the same evil both the government and other taxpayers were accused of doing.

Just like Socrates, Thoreau believed in obeying certain laws as his obligation. He had agreed to pay the highway taxes that would not go directly to the government. When Socrates was advised to escape from prison, he refused, saying that he had a moral obligation to obey the law of Athens and maintain a moral consistency by not retaliating evil with evil, rather, he would chose to die than “commit this breach of faith and stain (his) conscience” (Tredennick 94).

Interacting with the work of Thoreau, both Mohandas Gandhi (1930s) and Martin Luther King Jr. (1960s) were influenced and began their non-violence campaigns against government policies. They both affirmed the impact of Thoreau's philosophy upon their lives. Gandhi said after 1907, 'Thoreau was a great writer, philosopher, poet, and with a most practical man, that is, he taught nothing he was not prepared to practice in himself. He was one of the greatest and most moral men America has produced... His essay has, therefore, been sanctified by suffering. Moreover, it is written of all time’ (Civil Disobedience 4). Three decades later, Luther said:

During my student days I read Henry David Thoreau's essay *On Civil Disobedience* for the first time. Here, in this courageous New Englander's refusal to pay taxes and his choice of jail

rather than support a war... I made my first contact with the theory of non-violent resistance... deeply moved... became convinced that non-cooperation with evil is as much a moral obligation as is cooperation with good (4).

Summarily, civil disobedience is that public act of standing up in protection of your right. In fact, it is against one's right and conscience to allow someone to trample on your right and do nothing about it. In other words, there were protesters, though it is time for him to do something much larger and significant against evil and began the Salt March.

2. Resistance

This is the act of refusing to give in or comply; or to be in opposition to someone or something. The Oxford Learners Dictionary says it is the "refusal to obey". The Webster's Dictionary says it is "the act of exerting force in opposition more of contesting against an opponent". This is an extreme form of civil disobedience aimed at putting pressure on changing the policy of government by action. Sometimes, it resorts into violence and use of physical force by the resisters. They are usually prepared to do anything necessary, conceivable or unimaginable. In some cases, they come close to being rebels (someone who defiantly opposes authority). "In one respect, the resister is rebelling, openly, against certain uses of authority he deems illegitimate and immoral" (Cohen 66). These rebellious acts are quite disruptive in nature to include blocking of highways, obstruction of traffic, barricading of gates and doors to offices, coercion of others to join their cause, etc.

Despite the measures taken by resisters, they do not consider themselves traitors and saboteurs. They could be persons respected in the society and law-abiding citizens, who cannot betray their country or allow evil to perpetuate. Patience is a virtue but they usually feel they do not have that luxury, besides, they consider that since the law is broken, the democratic process of amending is also broken and would eventually yield no fruitful fruit. They "seek not the dishonor and defeat of their nation but its greater honor and success – through conduct they believe more moral and more in keeping with the ideals their countrymen profess" (67). As an example, there were loyal and patriotic Germans under the tyranny of Hitler, who could not be complicit to evil going on. They resist the enforcement of certain policies of government they considered grossly inhuman.

3. Revolution

The Webster's Dictionary's ideas on revolution is that of change or movement; radical, sudden, or permanent. It connotes the idea of protesting or staging an uprising against constituted authority with the aim of overthrowing it. A case in point is the revolutions that happened in the Arab states recently. They brought about changes in those countries; some positive and others negative; some resulted in more evil than the good they envisaged by impoverishing the entire citizenry and (innocent) casualties. To some extent, especially in Tunisia and Egypt, however, they brought about the will of the people by having a new government. In Tunisia, it led to Zine El Abidine Ben Ali abdicating his throne and fleeing into exile; in Egypt, the authoritarian regime of Hosni Mubarak was swept away and replaced by the military (vulture model power succession, where someone just waits, like a vulture, for the kill on the prey) (Alozieuwa 2). In this publication, Simeon Alozieuwa argues for the power and will of the people. He says that the end gain of any civil disobedience should be revolution – a change. He made mention of other Arab nations as Algeria, Libya, Yemen, and Syria

(which is close to a full-blown civil war).

It will however be noted keenly that, although there could be changes of leadership but in some situations, it is only a change from one evil government to another, leading to successive counter-revolutions. At some times, it could lead to coup d'etat, yet, a revolution is not a coup d'etat. The former is a public or civil act, which galvanizes a massive support of the populace and its aims at establishing historical transformation in governance and politics. The latter concentrates on a few individuals, usually within the caucus of government, and may not aim at far-reaching changes. It also minimizes casualties, accompanied within limited violence.

FORMS OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

The classification of civil disobedience depends on the classifier, however, most classifications go along two major parameters: judgment of the act and motivation. "None of these categories can be sharply defined, of course and the two major systems of classification can be super-imposed on one another, resulting in some complication" (Cohen 52).

Prior to looking at the major classification, we will state some variant classifications:

1) Violent versus Non-violent: Most definitions of civil disobedience is viewed in the light of non-violence, but a civil disobedience can be violent when it uses physical force to drive home its course. The definition of violent civil disobedience is relatively not clear especially between authorities and protesters. It is usually over-blown beyond proportion when protesters argue that it was non-violent but authorities would say otherwise.

2) Revolution versus Non-Revolution: The former deals with a civil disobedience that seeks the overthrowing of government and the latter only aims at achieving some far-reaching changes in government policies.

3) Solitary versus Collective: The former involves an individual undertaking a protest, by voluntary action, to press home a demand, like a hunger strike, as Gandhi did against the caste system in India and for India's independence. The latter is when the public is involved, like the Occupy Nigeria Protest of 2012.

Notwithstanding, the following are the major classifications of civil disobedience:

A. Judgement of the Act

Cohen says, "All cases of civil disobedience fall pretty clearly into one of two categories, which may be called direct and indirect" (52). That is, the act of civil disobedience can be channeled directly or indirectly at the law resisting. Firstly, a direct civil disobedience is when the grievance of the protesters is toward and against the unpleasant law or situation, for instance, suppose a students' body refuses paying a 100% tuition fee increment. Or, suppose a child refuses eating the food given to her in preference for another. Or still, suppose a religious institution refuses to dismantle her loudspeakers in defiance of the law prohibiting mounting of speakers. Generally, practitioners, sympathizers, critics and authorities easily and clearly understand direct civil disobedience, however, these are said to be easily resolved but usually not effective.

On the other hand, the most effective, usually grossly misunderstood, and mostly unjustifiable are indirect civil disobedience. Cohen says, it "includes all the rest, in which the law broken is other than (although more or less closely related to) the object of the protest" (52). As an example, a wife denying her husband his conjugal and marital right because he could not afford to purchase a particular type of wrapper. Or, suppose a husband refusing to eat

because his wife could not welcome him home properly. Or, suppose a young protester carries an empty coffin because he/she believes his/her government is dead and should be buried. Readily, we would call to mind the case of the Tunisian uprising where a young man hanged himself because his government could not provide employment to unemployed graduates, also, when ASUU (Academic Staff Union of Universities) go on strike and not teach students.

Indirect civil disobedience is mostly hard to resolve, especially when its actions are ambiguous. Despite the fact that Cohen says that it could also be associated with the symbolic tie accompanying it and the nature, location and time, he clarifies that there should be an understanding and clarification of the relationship, symbols and conventional to the community; otherwise, it will brew something else.

In spite of the fact that indirect civil disobedience is usually unjustified by many, Cohen says it is “wrong to maintain that cases of indirect civil disobedience cannot be justified because the law broken is not the object of protest” (55). Illustrating, he says, what can our direct and justifiable civil disobedience be against a bill passed at the National Assembly on Gay Union or the legalizing of Abortion? Or, how do we react against the military declaration of war against Boko Haram or the granting of amnesty for MASSOB (Movement for Actualization of the Sovereign State of Biafra) and IPOB (Indigenous People of Biafra)?

B. Based on Motivation

This is going beyond the objective act into the subjective sphere and aims of the actor. Indeed, civil disobedience acts are conducted by sane people and must be informed by some dramatic convictions. We should be able to read between the actions and hear every unsaid word all through the act, yet, this is also further divided into two: moral and political motivations. Cohen expresses how difficult it is to separate or justify these two subdivisions: Moral motivation and political motivation are the two major categories. No false division between moral and political affairs is intended here. Political acts are moral acts, having moral consequences and deserving moral judgment. Politicians or political theorists who think they can pursue their business clear of all moral commitments are seriously mistaken. Planning and theorizing without regard for moral principles often results in plans and theories in conflict with the moral principles that ought to have informed and guided them (57).

The intentions of men make them as out of the heart the mouth speaks. The self of experiencing understands these. The best of intentions, when expressed, could be worst just the worst intention could be applauded. The actor, who will always justify his/her actions, makes the motivation, thus, we find it difficult to classify his/her objective as a freedom fighter or rebel.

In spite of that, moral motivation for civil disobedience is concerned with, more or less, an individual's personal interest or conviction for the act. It is more of the solitary form discussed above, an act “being undertaken by a man for himself, out of chief regard for principles and values that he accepts as governing his conduct” (58). As a result, it is mostly limited and less effective perhaps, in developing countries, for instance, should one embark on a moral disobedience, he/she may hardly live to see the sunshine over his/her plight.

A case in point, Fredrick Femi Robinson says he is tired of Wole Soyinka's call for civil disobedience against his (Soyinka) imaginary enemies. He writes, “You and some educated ones like you have been drumming the sounds of war for so long. Many of your followers have lost their lives; some have been maimed because you do not know when to stop. It may interest

you to know that many people do not know what you say; what you write about and what you intend to achieve” (FocusNigeria.com). Robinson wrote against the backdrop of Soyinka's call for civil disobedience on 15th January 2010. On the said date, Soyinka had called Nigerians to prepare for a campaign of civil disobedience in order to force the government officials and politicians in positions of authority to do the right thing” (Nairalandforum.com). Soyinka was embittered by the way, the then president, Alhaji Musa Yar'adua, had refused to transfer the presidential powers to his vice, Goodluck Ebele Jonathan and given that he was in the second month at the hospital. This comatose situation, he said, was affecting Nigeria and both the president and the nation need healing.

We took time explaining the picture a lot clearer in order to point to the fact that moral civil disobedience hardly makes impact and at least not in the developing world. Fredrick Robinson, for whom we believe, is a Nigerian that Soyinka was challenging the government in his behalf, was here also protesting against Soyinka's action. Moral civil disobedience is not really about bringing change but clarification of the protester's conscience and declaration of his/her ethical beliefs to all who care. It may or may not produce the desired change though. The examples of Ralph Emerson, Henry Thoreau, Mohandas Gandhi, Martin Luther Jr., Nelson Mandela, etc produced impact in their right. A classical example from antiquity was the action of the Egyptian midwives is not complying to killing Hebrew male babies (Ex. 1: 15-20).

Political civil disobedience, on the other hand, is very common, popular and more effective and quickly understood; it is when certain acts are undertaken to correct some political aspects of the law that are not meeting the need of the populace. In spite of the fact that it normally starts from a moral point of view, one's ethical conviction about rightness and wrongness of a legislation is meant for the generality of the society. “Its effectiveness must be judged by the extent to which the protest speeds or otherwise advances that envisaged change. Its justification may depend upon the likelihood of its having such political consequences” (Cohen 58).

The effectiveness of a political civil disobedience however depends on the amount of pressure, intensity of confrontation and resistance as well as the place, time and number of participants or protesters. Cohen says, “the greater the mass of demonstrators the more likely they are to have the shocking effect sought, hence, the arguments after the demonstration is over, how many actually did participate both sides (protesters and authorities) often exaggerating (and sometimes lying) about the number of participants, in order to make the protest appear more (or less) significant than it really was” (64).

A point worthy of noting here is that the categorization of civil disobedience is not always clear-cut. The demarcating line is not crystal clear if anything, ours looks clumsy. This owes to the interrelatedness between direct and indirect as well as moral and political. Still, there is an interwoven connection between the two classes; judgement of the act and actor's motivation. As Cohen also notes, “the two pairs of categories do often but not always coincide” (7).

JUSTIFICATION OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

‘Is civil disobedience a right?’ To respond to this question would be, largely, depending on the person asking and the environment. A moral civil disobedience in a developing nation may hardly be seen as right: Most self-sacrifice of the protesters normally goes in vain. In

some nations, the impact has been minimal, with less far-reaching transformation. The story is not always the same with (some) developed nations. About the person asking, there will be argument between the protesters and authorities as well as sympathizers from each side, therefore, we proceed with caution at this level with our response.

Prior to cautiously seeking a justification or not, of civil disobedience, it is expedient for us to state the cause of any form of protest. The cause may set the springboard for the live into the justifiable of the act. From the preceding discussion and our discovery, civil disobedience, in all forms and categories and in every place, is against established authorities; from as small scale as the family unit to as large as democracy in the world. Our definition correlates well into this saying: refusal to obey demands or commands of governance.

Emmanuel Yeboah-Assiamah and Thomas AgyekumKyeremeh, discussing a critical assessment of public administration and institutional analysis of mob justice in Ghana, established that the cause of such acts (mob justice and as well as civil disobedience) is institutional ineffectiveness. This could lead to vote of no confidence in governance and security of lives and properties; thus, people will begin to take the law into their hands (in our case, making moves to step-up the process of amendment). They (Yeboah-Assiamah and Kyeremeh) looked at the way people now live in the community, with no one caring for the discipline and moral living of anybody's children, equally, the education sector has fallen where character-molders (teachers) now compromise the place of modelling and discipline. In political life, there are now sacred cows that are declared, 'Holy unto the Lord' and 'Touch not my anointed'. In administration, there is a lot of denial of justice to the poor and innocent through delayed administrative responsibilities and bureaucratic complications.

The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy says, the justification of civil disobedience must be dependent on two actors: the action of the disobedient and consequences and the motivation for the act. Michael Lacewing, in 'Justifying Civil Disobedience and Direct Action', says, we must find out the law the act is violating. What is better; he argues that we must first argue for the legitimacy and justness of the government and law before arguing that civil disobedience is a violation. Lacewing, arguing from Socrates' case, says if we discover what we are obligated to obey, we must require a justification for violation. This assumes that civil disobedience is automatically justifiable. Secondly, arguing from John Rawls' 'A Theory of Justice', Lacewing says, a civil disobedience is justifiable on two-grounds: one, when it has greater moral value than the law it violates; and two, since authorities are established for everyone's safety, civil disobedience must be non-violent – as violent disobedience will affect another's safety (Web).

Civil disobedience can also be justifiable from the basis of the violation of fundamental human rights. There are basic human entitlements that must be protected by the individual and government, for instance, every human should protest the violation of his/her rights to life, education, health, freedom of association, etc. The protection of an individual's rights must however be within his/her sphere of right; not to violate another's right.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE MOVEMENTS

There have been several civil disobedience movements placed across the globe. All these had a single connection, the 'disruption' word. Below are some of those:

The popular Salt March by Gandhi in India in 1930s

The Spanish Extremadura peasant land reform campaigns in 1936

The Flying Pickets and Sit-ins labour movements during the Great Depression in 1934 in the US.

The non-violent protest against segregation and racial discrimination of King Kr. In the US in 1960s.

The South African Cape Town peace march to end apartheid in 1989.

The Chinese Tiananmen sit-in and hunger strike for economic reform in 1989.

Dismantling of unwanted enterprises; MacDonald and related globalization factories in France by Jose Bove in 1999.

The Tiv riot (1962-1965), the Wase riot, the Aba Women Riot (1929), the Kano Riot (1953).

The anti-poll tax payment in London in 1990.

The Occupy Nigeria protest against removal of fuel subsidy in 2012.

The BBOG (Bring Back Our Girls) group sit-in led by ObyEzekwisili in Nigeria from April 2014.

The MASSOB and IPOB protest in Nigeria 18th January 2016.

The END-SARS protest in Nigeria 11th October, 2020.

IMPLICATION OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE IN NIGERIA

Civil disobedience has always had implications whether on short- or long-term basis, for instance, the Occupy Nigeria protest was said to have left 16 people dead while the government counted her economic losses. The removal of the oil subsidy was even based on economic reforms. The then Governor of the Central Bank of Nigeria, Sanusi Lamido Sanusi, he said that there was no going back on the issue, despite several failed attempts by past administration, the project is 'unsustainable'. He said that the government lost about \$8bn in 2011.

The report of the 18 January 2016 MASSOB/IPOB protest in Aba, Abia state says, It was a bloody day in Aba, the commercial nerve of Abia State on Monday as members of two pro-Biafra groups, ...clashed while the groups were protesting the continued detention of their leader and Director of Radio Biafra, Nnamdi Kanu... reports have it that about 30 injured members of the two groups who sustained degrees of gunshots were being treated in different parts of the commercial city; a total number of 7 persons were reported dead (Sahara Reporters.com).

The above reports confirm our argument above about civil disobedience in developing nations. The unconfirmed reports of the above casualties were because of gunshots from the military who have continued to say the deaths were from the protesters hurting each other or their sympathizers/critics. In other words, the reactions of the authorities in Nigeria on most occasions have not been civil, therefore, they condemn the disobedience as unjustifiable. If anything, civil disobedience in Nigeria is always meted with uncivil reaction from the authorities: remember the 'No Work No Pay' saying in the past administration on the Plateau.

Civil disobedience in Nigeria has hardly resulted in permanent transformation in Nigerian polity. Some have affected certain sections or made little changes, though. As an example, the 1919 Egba Revolt only hardened the government on high taxation; the Aba Women Riot of 1929 ended up absolving the British and blaming the protesters; the four plane hijackers against the annulment of 12 June 1993 election were arrested and incarcerated in Niamey, Niger for nine years; the 2005 Nigeria Labour Congress nationwide strike stayed the action on subsidy removal but the price of the product was maintained and many others like that.

Civil disobedience has often led to lasting reforms in governments; is it possible in Nigeria? Revolution in Nigeria: a reality or myth? One will be right to ask such questions, yet every keen observer of Nigerian politics will argue the point from both flanks of no and yes. We would however like to note the following conditions for both against and for the argument:

- The region Nigeria is located as a developing African country.
- Nigeria is larger than Tunisia, Egypt, Algeria, Libya, etc.
- The country is multi-religious and multi-cultural.
- The foreign policy of Nigeria allows the influence of world super powers.
- There are Nigerian elites who still believe in the single entity of Nigeria.
- Nigerian democracy is doing well as a developing nation and would allow for due process of amendment, etc.
- Arguing for the possibility of such revolution, note:
- Corruption is brewing and eating deep into Nigerian government and it is becoming a strong reason for brewing anger against government.
- The growth of insecurity is leading to lack of trust in government, e.g. armed banditry and kidnapping, Boko Haram insurgency.
- The sectional uprising of groups like MASSOB/IPOB, Boko Haram, ACF (Arewa Consultative Forum), OPC (Odua Progressive Congress), etc.
- The regional uprising and its consequent results.
- The insensitivity of government to the plight of people over their needs.
- The growth of the Nigerian population and unemployment rate of the youths.
- Secularization of the Nigerian traditional beliefs and practices, and
- The END-SARS protest in Nigeria 11th October, 2020.

CONCLUSION

Nigeria has survived through history with many challenges. We have our difficulties but the nation has remained a single entity. Civil disobedience has transformed many nations, and Nigeria is not left out, of course. The act itself has also had its weaknesses especially when it goes violent and tramples on others' rights. In spite of the fact that Nigeria can be checked in order to avert any possible uprising that could lead to secession of any part of the country. The worst enemy of Nigerian development is corruption. It is not just the government officials but all and sundry. Henry Thoreau believed that paying of poll taxes was just like cooperating with evil. If every Nigerian will drop the idea and saying that, 'It is Nigeria we are in' and do the right thing, we will perpetuate the act continuously. All civil disobediences have involved self-sacrifices and had starting points... it begins with you! The make-it-quick syndrome makes it worse as we are becoming increasingly impatient but want it now, now. Gandhi believed that people can always make a difference. We can stamp corruption out and thereby bring about a reformed generation that will be involved in the entrenchment of an effective and legalized authority. The social institutions are to brace up for 'civil disobedience'. Otherwise, Nigeria will definitely be inviting an anarchy in no distant time.

The paper before us was about a critical analysis of civil disobedience. Being a critical analysis, it sought to discuss the key term, civil disobedience, both from theoretical and practical perspectives. It drew its strength from the activities of civil disobedience from across the globe. It tried to have discussed greatly and made proper application to the Nigerian situation. It also provided a bedrock and blueprint on what to do in Nigeria in order to minimize these incessant protests since they are yet to provide the desired result.

WORKS CITED

- Alozieuwua, Simeon H. O. "People Power: Between Reality and Conjecture", in *Peace and Conflict Monitor*. Dated: 05 July, 2011 www.monitor.upeace.org Accessed 17th February 2016. Web.
- "Civil Disobedience (Thoreau)" 26th October 2015. Accessed 17th February 2016. Web.
- Cohen, Carl. *Civil Disobedience: Conscience, Tactics and Law*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971. Electronic Material.
- Lacewing, Michael. "Justifying Civil Disobedience and Direct Action". Routledge, 20th February 2016. Web.
- Rawls, John. "The Justification of Civil Disobedience" <http://oce.mit.edu/terms> 20th February 2016. Web.
- Robinson, Fredrick Femi. Soyinka's Call for Civil Disobedience", 20th January, 2010. www.focusnigeria.com 19th February, 2016. Web.
- Sahara Reporters.Com. Retrieved 21st February 2016. Web.
- Tredennick, Hugh. Tr. *Plato: The Last Days of Socrates*. Middlesex: Penguin. 1979. Print.
- "Yar'adua: Wole Soyinka Calls for Civil Disobedience". 16th January 2020, www.nairalandforum.com 20 February 2016. Web.
- Yeboah-Assiamah, Emmanuel and Thomas AgyekumKyeremeh. "A Critical Assessment of Public Administration and Civil Disobedience in Developing African Democracies: An Institutional Analysis of Mob Justice in Ghana" in *Journal of Law, Policy and Globalization*, Vol. 28. 2014. www.iiste.org. Accessed 17th February 2016. Web.