Citizenship And Self-Determination: A Longitudinal Study Of Southern Cameroon Agitation

[1]Pelumi Alo; [2]Jide Ibietan, PhD & [3]Oluwatimilehin Deinde-Adedeji

**Department of Political Science & International Relations,
Covenant University, Ota-Nigeria**
[1]Oluwapelumialo1@gmail.com; [2]olajide.ibietan@covenantuniversity.edu.ng;
[3]oluwatimilehin.deinde-adedeji@covenantuniversity.edu.ng

ABSTRACT
The Southern Cameroon agitation, otherwise known as Anglophone crisis or Ambazonia crisis is a culmination of perceived marginalisation and suppression of the English-speaking Cameroonians. The problem forms part of the colonial hangover resulting from the partitioning of Africa by some European powers. Essentially, the paper is a longitudinal study pivoted on historical design and relied on secondary sources of data which were analysed textually. Findings show that the Reunification of Francophone Cameroon with the Anglophone parts amounted to a marriage of unequal and unwilling partners' underscored by 'domination' and 'subterfuge' spanning almost six decades. It is imperative for the African Union, Economic Community of Central African States, United Nations and international organisations of allied mandates to take more than a passing interest in this issue with the intent of effectively playing mediatory roles. Other recommendations are capable of attenuating or addressing the crisis.
Keywords: Agitation; Citizenship; Longitudinal; Self-Determination; Study

INTRODUCTION
At first sight, Cameroon is an ideal case of an African country that has managed to merge different political, historical and cultural backgrounds into one 'united nation'. However, things are not as they seem as the reality of the political, economic and social structure in Cameroon is one operating in division, with major tensions in the Anglophone province of South Cameroon which lies in the southern half of the country that the League of Nations approved, and later United Nations Trust Territory under United Kingdom's administration. A Home Office (2020) data predicated on CIA World Fact Book on Cameroon, documents that the Anglophone Cameroon comprises 20% (or 5million) of the total population of the country. Awasom (2000) contends that the beginning of the issue in Cameroon is traceable to the division of the region by Britain and France in 1916. The ongoing issues of citizenship and self-determination in the Southern part of Cameroon are hinged on colonial and post-colonial decisions that were made for and by Cameroon.

The political evolution and development of Cameroon particularly during colonisation is viewed as a contributing factor to the heterogenous nature of the country on account of the differences in cultural and political ideologies that infiltrated Cameroon as it was colonised by Germany as a whole, Britain and France later separately colonised present-day Anglophone and Francophone parts of Cameroon. The southern Cameroon's self-determination crisis began with the story of a self-governing people with a homeland, a defined territory and fully functioning democratic institutions (Manzu, 1993). Prior to World War I, Cameroon was the German protectorate of Kamerun from the partition of the African continent at the Berlin Conference of 1884-85. After 1916, the Protectorate was occupied by Great Britain and France, the victor powers in World War I. The western portion of the territory, was done in a way that suited the interests of the respective powers (Ngoh, 1988; Awasom, 2000; Anyangwe 2000). The partition of Cameroon in 1916, as authorised by the League of Nations for Britain and France left both parties to colonise their designated portions of the country. Britain on its part and for its own exclusive reasons and interests went on after 1916 to annex British Cameroons to Nigeria (Anyangwe, 2000).

Following World War II, the United Nations, which replaced the League of Nations, noted that British Cameroons had "never been managed as a distinct territory, … but … as two" (UN, Official Records of the Trusteeship Council, 22 Session, Doc. T/1393). The arrangements almost led to the total neglect of British Cameroons in the political, economic and social evolution of Nigeria's territory. During the period, and specifically from 1953, the area and its people developed to a self-governing region with full institutions within the British Empire (Ngoh, 1990; Awasom, 1998). Between 1954 and 1959, the people of Southern Cameroons participated in multi-party democratic elections in 1957, 1958 and 1959, and changed governments with favorable outcomes in 1959.

The growth of nationalist movement in British Cameroon, prompted the holding of a plebiscite in British northern and southern Cameroon on February 11 1961. Ironically in 1960, while other African colonies were granted independence, in execution of the United Nations General Assembly Resolutions 1514, including Nigeria and French Cameroon, the territory and people of British Cameroons with all the attributes of a state were compelled by Britain and the UN to rather gain independence or autonomy by annexing either to French Cameroon, (Republique du Cameroun) or the Federal Republic of Nigeria (The Two Alternatives – Un Resolution 1608). By October 1961 when "independence – by-joining," was foisted on the territory, Southern Cameroons had feasible and functioning political structures and economic potentials (Awasom, 2000).

The plans for a reunification of Cameroon were made based on an equality position as the two different delegations in Cameroon assured. Hardly a few years after the reunification of two Cameroons, Southern Cameroon (The Anglophones) have continuously appealed against disparity. This has led to the pressure of self-determination by the Anglophones who are being marginalized like other colonial countries, the yearnings of British Southern Cameroon people were independence and sovereignty to unite with either the Federal Republic of Nigeria or Republique du Cameroun, the United Kingdom as Trusteeship regulating authority and the United Nations as the Trusteeship supervisor laid the foundation for conflict that was to come sooner or later by their activities as corroborated by the above mentioned scholars.

Cameroon has a complex past, its involvement and historical ties with Germany, France, Britain and Nigeria made the process of state building or nation building very difficult; Cameroon battles the jihadists of Boko Haram in the north, manages an intrusion of refugees from the Central African Republic in the east and most disastrously, the Anglophone crisis in the west. The 'Anglophone crisis' is a term used to describe the issues of marginalization, citizenship and self-determination and unease and distress experienced by English speaking Southern Cameroonians as a result of the procedure through which government business and public affairs are managed under the present (predominantly Francophone) Cameroon government administration.

The advancement of Cameroon's political scene, combined with the Anglophones' interest for self-determination prompted the formation of several Anglophone Cameroon pressure groups during the 1990s, their expressions began with peaceful protests with the main aim of re-asserting the identity of the Anglophones which has been marginalised by the Francophones, they had the objective of returning Cameroon to a two-state federation; the peaceful protests developed into what is presently alluded to as the 'Anglophone Crisis' – a conflict which reappeared in November 2016, in the wake of closure of some institutions occasioned by teachers' and lawyers' protest before transforming into a civil war involving killings.

The Anglophone parts of Cameroon feels marginalised by the administration of President Paul Biya (who has been President since 1982) in sectors like education, employment and administration. This way, what began as a strike and specific requests from parts of the Cameroon population has transformed into the struggle for true democracy, freedom of utterance, the right to a decent life and a shift from the original goal of the Anglophones which was an advocacy for a two-state federation or the secession option. Cohen (1995:11), a former United Stated Under Secretary of State for African Affairs, avers strongly that the present-day African State was generated by colonial powers out of cultural and regional diversities, and rendered conflictual by irregularities. The Anglophones feel that their distinct origin, culture and history have been gradually assimilated to the Francophone majority for the sake of national solidarity and this part explains the quest for secession from the Republic of Cameroon. Violence has escalated as the separatists are accused of utilising brute force leading to several attacks and killings in urban communities like Bamenda and Douala by the Cameroonian government.

METHODOLOGY, MAIN ARGUMENTS AND STRUCTURE OF THE PAPER

This paper is a longitudinal study anchored on historical design. Data were collected mainly from secondary sources. The study adopts Social Exclusion Theory as framework and complemented by textual analysis, which illuminated the discussion, findings, conclusion and recommendations of the paper.

The main argument of this paper is that suppressed citizenship exacerbated by the merger of two unequal and unwilling partners is bound to result in backlash and reverberating consequences which is emblematic of the Ambazonian crisis, snowballing into agitations for self-determination underlined by violence. Suggestions have been proffered to redress the alleged marginalisation and sundry ills characterising the Anglophone Cameroon crisis.

This paper is structured as follows: Abstract; Introduction; Methodology; Main Argument and Structure of the paper; Literature Review; Theoretical Framework; Research Setting: Cameroon and the Anglophone Crisis; Discussion; Conclusion and Recommendations.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The concepts of citizenship and self-determination are explained in this section. Types of citizenship and reasons for self-determination are also discussed under this theme.

The Concept of Citizenship

Citizenship has recently been a focus of political theory. The collapse of post-World War II consensus and the recent increase in Western countries' xenophobic attitudes have made citizenship issues even stronger. Citizenship has different connotations. On one hand, there are the migration problems from one nation to another, such issues often have to do with residence permits, voting rights, or seeking asylum. On the other hand, the issues of equal treatment of citizens who may come from different backgrounds are also germane.

According to Carens (2000), the definition of citizenship comprises three main features or aspects. The first is citizenship as a legitimate status which is characterized by civil, political and social rights. The citizen is the legalised person who can act in accordance with the law and who has the right to claim protection of the law. It does not mean that the citizen is involved in the making of the law, nor does it require uniform rights among citizens. The second considers people as political representatives, engaging actively in the political institutions of a nation. The third refers to citizenship as a member of political community that provides a distinct identity source. Igwe (2005) opines that citizenship is synonymous with nationality. He further asserts that citizenship theoretically relates to membership of the state, while nationality relates to membership of a nation, as well as the corresponding privileges, rights, duties and obligations. To the extent that both the state and the nation have a common referent as the nation-state, citizenship and nationality apply to the same phenomenon and are used interchangeably by many scholars.

Types of Citizenship

Depending on the country, method of obtaining citizenship varies. Universally, the most common forms of citizenship are:

    a. Citizenship by birth (Jus Soli i.e. Right of Soli)

This is the case where a person automatically becomes a citizen of a state or country because he/she was born there.

    b. Citizenship through Parentage (Jus Sanguinis i.e. Right of Blood)

This implies that either one or both of parents are citizens of a state, an individual becomes a citizen automatically. As long as one or both parents are citizens or residents of that country, even though the person is born outside the country. Prior to the emergence of the campaign for sexual equality in the 20th century, this right was once limited to paternal lineage only, as it can still be found in certain African ethnic nationalities where citizenship depends on paternal ancestry or ethnicity.

    c. Citizenship by Marriage (Jure Matrimonii i.e. Right of Marriage)

In this situation, by marrying a resident or citizen of a specific state or country, citizenship is obtained. This type of citizenship faces questioning today, as a result of fraud or arranged relationships in immigration bound countries where residents marry non-citizens to help them in obtaining citizenship with the aim of living as married couples for payment purposes.

d. Citizenship through naturalization

This is where citizenship is conceded to individuals who have entered a country legitimately in order to live in or be allowed to take political refuge. The immigrant is granted citizenship upon application as a result of living in this country for a predetermined period as recommended by law and having indicated a specified level of understanding of the state's culture and language and being of good behaviour without criminal record. Raphael (1970), referred to this as "contract of citizenship". In contrast to birth and parenting, this form of citizenship can be revoked by legal authorities, in instances of consequential or significant violations, therefore it is bound by a sensibly decent conduct.

The Concept of Self-Determination

There is no generally accepted definition of this term by scholars and experts in the field of Political Science and International Relations as it means different things to different people. Cobban (1969) characterises it as the 'privilege of a nation and its kin to select their administration and political frameworks'. Some of the definitions of self-determination are based on the fundamental equality of individuals, another basic premise of liberalism, which ensures equal rights of all nations. Moore (1997) emphasises this aspect thus: "an unbiased acknowledgement of contrasting national identities". In the words of Cobban (1969), it is the right of a nation to constitute an independent state and determine its own government.

Originally, self-determination is to free people from colonial or foreign rule by seeking independence and freedom. However, some authors have expressed that the basic thought process of self-determination is the democratisation of government and can be applied through coalition, deviated federalism, self-rule, affiliation, self-governance or independence, minority rights or different types of individuals – worthy legitimate relations.

Self-determination underscores the principle that people should control their political destiny, a right recognised in many unique and modern political treaties, enshrined in the United Nations Charter and other treaties, protocols and conventions which constituted the bases for the American, French, Chinese and other revolutions (Igwe, 2005). By the beginning of the twentieth century, self-determination was a widely upheld idea all over Europe and the United States. It is apparent in the writings of Woodrow Wilson and Joseph Stalin early in the twentieth century and was preserved in the United Nations at its inception. However, self-determination had evolved to mean something quite different in Central and Eastern Europe than in Western Europe and the United States of America. It was founded on the notion of popular sovereignty that gave rise to representative government in Western Europe. Ideally, individuals exercised their right to self-determination primarily through the choice of representatives to act in the interests of their constituents. By contrast, it was rooted in an exclusive nationalism in Central and Eastern Europe that led ethnic groups to clamour for a separate countries. The idea of self-determination quickly spread across Europe in the nineteenth century. In the continent, the Industrial Revolution brought about major changes in areas such as communication, transport, trade and industry, and there was tremendous growth. The landowners and aristocracy's social power was challenged, and the new bourgeoisie gradually replaced it. In the same period, bureaucratic activities and government penetration also grew into nearly all spheres of life. Urban centers developed rapidly, and the working class became politically active in the urban areas.

Reasons for Self-Determination

A lot of people have been motivated by self-determination over the last two centuries. People with different political views, such as socialists, Marxists and romantic nationalists, followed the idea and often led movements for national liberation. However, various schools justify the right to national self-determination. These reasons often go against one another. Liberal theorists' sympathy for self-determination originated primarily from their impact on individuals. These thinkers see a strong correlation between the self-determination in a country and the individuals' well-being, independence, personal development and autonomy. Different liberal thinkers have clarified such relationships according to Moore (1967), and have repeatedly justified self-determination as the close association between national and individual identity and its effect on individual dignity.

It is known that the sense of identity by individuals is linked to their affiliation to groups, and their self-respect is brought about by the way in which these groups are kept. Human integrity and self-respect demand that the organisations whose participation imparts on one's sense of self, be generally

regarded and not become a subject of ridicule, hatred, prejudice or persecution. National self-determination therefore relies on the recognition of the great importance of participation and group identity in the lives of individuals, and the importance of such groups' stability and self-respect for the well-being of their members. Another factor helpful in explaining self-determination is the importance of a national culture when it comes to providing viable choices. National culture, in other words allows or enables individuals to choose their beliefs, priorities and norms. According to Kymlicka (2000), national culture provides the most significant condition in which people expand and express their autonomy. In this view, freedom entails making selections among different options, and not only does one's societal culture provides these options, but makes them more significant. So, the gradual wearing away of one's societal culture results in a deterioration of individual's autonomy (Kymlicka 2000).

Besides, issues such as justice and morality have also emerged as significant concerns among liberal thinkers. Having identified the social welfare and cultural reasons for self-determination, Miller (2000) observes that self-determination is valuable only to the extent that its exercise leads to greater justice in the world. To Miller, national self-determination is only practical as long as it inheres within the limits set by a just order (Miller, 2000).

Marxists view national self-determination in an instrumental context. Their approach to national self-determination claims is largely influenced by its effect upon the proletariat's revolutionary mission. Since Marxists see the country as a class-divided society, often unconditional/universal, support for national self-determination will lead to support of the ruling classes. Marxists also often think that complete self-determination can only be achieved in a socialist system. Therefore, in Marxist theory, the priority of the socialist cause is unambiguous over the national cause. Only after they became persuaded of its value for the progress of the revolutionary cause did Marx and Engels give their assistance to the Irish and Polish Cases.

In the context of oppressed nationalities, Lenin may have given the only exemption to this view in which claims for self-determination gained support on its own. Lenin claimed that the national affirmation of the oppressed people deserves the support of the proletariat on its own merit because of its revolutionary nature and given its imperialist character, he supported the national affirmations in the colonial world (Lenin, 1986). Yet, Marxists also prioritised democratic revolutionary politics over national self-determination. Given the instrumentalist approach, only from this camp came uncompromising support for national liberation movements.

The urge by English-speaking people of Cameroon to regain their freedom -from La Republique did not arise out of spontaneity, but as a result of several considerations. Togue (2017) compares the relationship between the Anglophones and the Francophones in Cameroon with a man who goes to court with one wife and signs for monogamy and then later begins to bring other women when all the documents show that the marriage was supposed to be monogamous. This allusion clearly illustrates the frustration of the Ambazonia people. The quest for self-determination to a large extent was borne out of the grievances which some analyst highlighted to include political and economic marginalisation.

Theoretical Framework and Application of Theory
This research is anchored on the Social Exclusion Theory as analytical framework.
The Social Exclusion Theory was propounded by Dr. Lynn Todman. Social exclusion has been depicted as a situation in which people or groups are ostracised in their entirety or to some extent from full engagement in the community where they live. Social exclusion is the mechanism through which people or group of individuals are deliberately prohibited/excluded from rights, services and opportunities like jobs, health care, housing, civic engagement, democratic participation and due process which are generally available to members of society and are essential for social integration. It is a multi-dimensional process of gradual social division that separates groups and individuals from social relationships and organisations and prevents them from participating fully in the normal or normatively prescribed activities of the society they inhabit.

The challenge in providing adequate definitions of social exclusion is typified by what can occur when people or places suffer from a mixture of related problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low income, poor housing, high crime, poor health and family life. Aasland and Flotten (2001), however suggest that the concept of social exclusion is no more unmistakable than the concept of

deprivation. When the term was first used in France in the 1970s, individuals who were unable to adapt to the mainstream society were taken into account and the concept was redefined in the following years and more classes were included, such as dropouts from school, unemployed youth and immigrants.

Until about a decade ago, it was popular to define social divisions and disparities, at least in the Anglo-Saxon world, in terms of words such as poverty, inequality and disadvantage. Most of these terms were underpinned by the idea that impoverished or underprivileged members of society lacked sufficient resources to attain satisfactory qualities of well-being and take part in society's usual activities (Townsend, 1979). While theorists contend on the basis of such poverty, there was common agreement that it was socially unacceptable and morally inexcusable, at least in its extreme manifestations. Despite many criticisms of this theory, such as its subjectivity and its ability to fine-tune claims in accordance with its point of view, it is relevant to this study. Anglophones in Cameroon have been systematically deprived of the rights usually available to members of the Cameroonian population and, as Ted Gurr (1994) puts it, this relative deprivation leads to revolt as epitomised by their desire for independence.

Research Setting: Cameroon and the Anglophone Crisis
The birth of the Federal Republic of Cameroon on 1 October 1961 denoted the restoration of two regions that had experienced separate colonial encounters following the First World War (Johnson, 1970), when the former German Protectorate of Cameroon was split between the British and the French, as 'commands' under the League of Nations and later as 'trusts' under the UN (Ardener, 1962). Southern Cameroon before 1954 was originally part of the Eastern Province of Nigeria as a British mandate trust territory. In 1954, it gained a quasi-regional standing and a full regional position in 1958. There can be no question that the control of Southern Cameroon as an annex to Nigeria has contributed to a flagrant neglect of its development (Kale, 1967), as well as the main condition of Ibo and Efik-Ibibio migrants in its economy.

The political landscape in Southern Cameroon was already complex at the time of the 1961 referendum. Majority of Cameroonians wanted independence according to historians, but the United Kingdom and some Western countries countered the independence desire on the grounds that Southern Cameroon cannot stand economically, and aside creating a micro-state is not an option. They advocated a vote to join Nigeria. Accordingly, the UN dismissed the alternative of independence and limited the referendum to a decision between joining Nigeria and reuniting with Cameroon.

The constitution of the Federal Republic of Cameroon promised protection for the Anglophone regions' cultural identity. Yet, President Ahmadou Ahidjo outlawed all political parties other than the ruling Cameroonian National Union in 1966. A national referendum approved a new constitution in May 1972, which replaced the federal structure of the government with a unitary form (Campbell, 2018). The Southern Cameroon Crisis, is also called the Ambazonia War (Abah, 2018). It is a contention in Cameroon's Southern area, a portion of the long-standing Anglophone locale. Fights over sectoral demands have degenerated into a political emergency in the Anglophone areas of Cameroon since October 2016. This emergency has prompted the reappearance of the Anglophone problem, uncovering the limits of the Cameroonian mode of governance typified by top elite centralisation.

The Anglophone territory contains two of the ten domains of the nation, the Northwest and the Southwest. It takes up to 16,364 sq km of the complete territory of 475,442 sq km of the nation and comprises 5 million of the 24 million citizens of Cameroon. It is the focal point of the principle restriction part, the Social Democratic Front (SDF), and assumes a significant role in the economy, particularly in its different farming and exchange divisions. The Anglophone issue goes back to the independence era (Achankeng, 2018). A poorly managed re-unification, on the basis of assimilation and centralisation, caused the Anglophone minority to feel strategically, politically and economically insignificant and that their social and cultural contrasts are disregarded. Most scholars like Lyombe, (2003), Nkumbe (2016), Nkongho (2018) and Okereke (2018) conclude that the Anglophone crisis emanated from the unification of the Anglophone and Francophone (which some analysts have described as "cat" and "mouse relationship).

DISCUSSION
Reunification of the Republic of Cameroon (French Cameroon) and Anglophone Cameroon

As anti-colonial sentiments swept through Africa after World War II, colonisation was coming to an end in Africa and different parts of the world, nations began seeking and fighting for their independence and state sovereignty. On 1 January 1960 French Cameroon gained its independence when British Cameroon was still under the administration of Nigeria. However, this posed the question of the status of the British Cameroon. The British persuaded the UN that Southern Cameroon was not economically feasible and could only survive by joining either Francophone Cameroon, which had gained independence earlier, or with Nigeria which was on the verge of independence. This was a bone of contention, due to the fact that the two key political elites of British Southern Cameroon – Emmanuel Endeley of the Kamerun National Convention (KNC) and John Foncha of the Kamerun National Democratic Party (KNDP) did not agree on the issue (Emmanuel Endeley's position was agreeable to the joining of Southern Cameroon with Nigeria, while John Foncha was a big fan of the unification of British Southern Cameroon with French Cameroon). This led to the holding of a referendum which was organised and supported by the UN on 11 February 1961.

Voters were presented with the following choices:
   a. Do you wish to achieve independence by joining the Independent Republic of Cameroon?
   b. Do you wish to achieve independence by joining the Independent Federation of Nigeria?

The citizens of Southern Cameroon were skeptical about picking between these two choices as it were. John Foncha was trusted to lead an assignment in London in November 1960 to voice the worries of the populace who desired a third alternative of independence as an autonomous or self – sufficient political entity (BAPEC, 2016).

The option of total autonomy was barred by the UN since it expected and feared that it would prompt another balkanisation of the colonial domains in Africa (ICG, 2010), however the Muslim majority in Northern Cameroon voted 60% in favour of Nigeria, while the Christian majority of Southern Cameroon voted 70.05% for joining French Cameroon. Northern Cameroon formally turned out to become an official part of Nigeria and Southern Cameroon became a part of Cameroon on 1 October 1961.

When the two regions reunited in 1961, a new constitution was drafted to characterise the new association of Francophone Cameroon and Anglophone Cameroon as a federal autonomy, in which the autonomy of the English-speaking minority would be ensured. Be that as it may, in 1972, a disputable and highly controversial referendum changed the federation back into a unitary state (which is what the Francophone Cameroon state called the Republic of Cameroon, which formerly was, or prior to the reunification) effectively ending the autonomy of the Anglophone region. The desire of the Anglophone populace was overruled in 1961 and the subsequent systematic segregation and marginalisation they endured under the Francophone dominated administration, planted the seeds of the current separatist struggle. The pressures experienced in Southern Cameroon arose out of a perplexing and challengeable procedure of decolonisation in Cameroon starting from the 1950s to 1960s when the nation gained independence. Unfortunately for British Southern Cameroon, what appeared by all accounts, to be a major accomplishment towards expanding their sovereignty turned out to be a trap. Their reunification with the Francophones, did not represent the disparities of social character as it was formerly arranged with the English. Instead, the merger, turned into a transitional procedure in which the state became an exceptionally unified unitary state where they became a minority (Ebune, 1992). The reunification discourse has created contention in Cameroon since the 1990s and relies on the issue of the level of responsibility of Anglophone and Francophone Cameroonians to its acknowledgment (Awasom, 2000).

At the time, the topic of reunification was warming up in the mid 1960s, Le vine symbolically alluded to British Cameroon as the "lady of the hour" and inferred that The French Republic of Cameroon was the "husband", this symbolism of more fragile and stronger partners is suitable when one thinks about the way that the Republic of Cameroon was multiple times the territory of the British Southern Cameroons, and had about four times the population and more prominent resources and a higher level of social and economic development (Le vine, 1976:273).

During the first Cameroon republic (1961-1982), Ahmadou Ahidjo and John Ngu Foncha stood tall as the architects of reunification and dominated Cameroonian governmental issues until Ahidjo's political impact blurred after his renouncement. First and foremost, the reunification of the opposite

states was seen as an incredible accomplishment. Following political advancements in the second republic under the administration of President Paul Biya, reunification began to be seen as a bothersome and a disastrous event. Under this administration, reunification became represented as a regrettable act, with the conclusion that it was basically an Anglophone undertaking, being supported by Charles Assale, implying that the Anglophones singularly picked to accomplish autonomy by joining the Republic of Cameroon.

However, Anglophone Cameroon public opinion was neither vanquished, particularly outside Cameroon, with a contention that Francophone politicians have double-crossed the premise of reunification. They placed emphasis on the way Southern Cameroon, the former British Cameroon was neither vanquished, captured nor annexed by the Republic of Cameroon. The Southern Cameroons National Council (SCNC), an umbrella Anglophone pressure group battling the rebuilding of federalism and equity status with the Francophones, featured that the Anglophones alone took an interest in the 1961 plebiscite that brought about the reunification with Francophone Republic of Cameroon.

Matters Arising from the Reunification of Francophone Cameroon and Anglophone Cameroon
The absence of unity and extreme suppression, hindered Anglophone pioneers from transparently communicating reactions about Francophone domination in Cameroon until 1982, when Paul Biya, became president. On the fourth of February 1984, President Biya, suddenly and without warning and consultation, changed the name of the country from the United Republic of Cameroon, to the Republic of Cameroon, earlier christened as independent Francophone Cameroon before the reunification of both British and French Cameroons.

The new name seemed to deny that Cameroon was made up of two distinct entities. For the Southern Cameroonians/the Anglophones, this was a clear proof that they definitely had lost their identity. This difference in name prompted and challenged state structures, as it was followed by a change of national flag, from the two-star design (symbolising the coming together of the Francophones and the Anglophone parts of Cameroon), to a single star, and the adoption of a new constitution that changed Cameroon into a decentralised unitary state. These changes led to protests by the Anglophones as they began to witness the feelings of entrapment. The inability to grant freedom to Southern Cameroon and a constrained plebiscite to choose whether to join Nigeria or French Cameroon exacerbated the despondency of the Anglophone Cameroonians, and a feeling of being overwhelmed by the Francophones.

The Bamenda Provincial Episcopal Conference (BAPEC, 2016) adduced reasons for dissatisfaction to include marginalisation of the Anglophone Cameroonians in the country's human resource development and deployment skewed to the advantage of their francophone counterparts, the relegation of English Language in the public life of Cameroon, the utilisation of Francophone administrators, the management of the Anglophone patrimony, the "Francophonisation" of the English educational subsystem and the Common-Law systems of the Anglophone Cameroonians have been serially undermined.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The paper interrogated the contested nature of citizenship leading to agitation for self-determination by the Southern Cameroonians. It is observable that the issues feeding/fueling the crisis have colonial roots and festered over decades. It is noteworthy that perceived injustice which remains unaddressed could lead to agitations for self-determination, and this can escalate to become fundamental rights issue. The re-unification of the two Cameroons appeared to be a marriage of unequal partners that sowed seeds of discord which fertilised issues that this study investigated. The Ambazonia agitation is an extension of verifiable historical resistance to the French colonial policy of Assimilation. The replacement of the Federal system of government with Unitarism in 1972 remains a bone of contention and is perceived as a raw deal by the Southern Cameroonians. The asymmetric posture of Francophone administrations under Ahidjo and Biya's presidencies seem to worsen the long term frustrations of the Ambazonians, thus aggravating demands for a self-governing state.

Based on the foregoing, the paper recommends that African Union, ECCAS, United Nations and international institutions of similar mandates play urgent mediatory roles in this crisis. There is also the necessity for decentralising the governance structure in Cameroon and promoting inclusiveness in

the management of public affairs. Additionally, the need for national dialogue before the next elections cannot be overemphasised in creating order and peaceful atmosphere for successful electoral outcomes. There is also a compelling need for regime change, based on the obvious fact that the current president's hold onto power is considered too long (having stayed for about three and half decades). Severing himself from power could guarantee fairness, peace and freedom from fear based on the neutrality of state power and by extension, instruments of coercion.

REFERENCES

Aasland, A. & Flotten, T. (2001). Ethnicity and Social Exclusion in Estonia and Latvia. *Europe-Asia Studies.* 53(7), 1023-1049.

Abah, I. (2018). '*Ambazonia War' Drowns SDF 28th Anniversary*. Accessed at https://www.journalducameroun.com/en/ambazonia-war-drowns-sdf-28th-anniversary/ on 6th January, 2020.

Achankeng, F. (2018). Conflicts and Crisis in the Cameroon Anglophone Region. Accessed at https://www.e-ir info/2018/11/11/conflicts-and-crisis-in-the-cameroon-anglophone-region/ on 17/10/2020

Anyangwe, C. (2000). People of the Southern Cameroons. Mimeograph

Ardener, E. (1962). '*The Nature of the Reunification of Cameroon.'* London: Macmillan

Awasom, N. F. (1998). Colonial Background to the Development of Autonomist Tendencies in Anglophone Cameroon 1946-1961. *Journal of Third World Studies, 15*(1), 163-183.

Awasom, N. (2000). The Reunification Question in Cameroon History: Was the Bride an Enthusiastic or a Reluctant One? *Africa Today*, *47*(2), 91-119. Accessed at https://www.jstor.org/stable/4187333 on 24th Oct. 2019.

BAPEC (2016). Memorandum Presented to the Head of State, His Excellency President Paul Biya by the Bishops of the Ecclesiastical Province of Bamenda on the Current Situation of Unrest in the Northwest and Southwest Regions of Cameroon on 22nd December, 2016.

Buchanan, A. (2017, June 22). Secession. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall Edition). Accessed at https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/secession/ on 9th January, 2020.

Campbell, J. (2018). *Anglophone Crisis in Cameroon was Decades in the Making*. Accessed at https://www.cfr.org/blog/anglophone-crisis-cameroon-was-decades-making on 5th January, 2020.

Carens, J. H. (2000). *Culture, Citizenship, and Community: A Contextual Exploration of Justice as Evenhandedness*. Oxford University Press,

Cobban, A. (1969). The National State and National Self-Determination. New-York: Thomas J.

Cohen, H. (1995). What Should We Do When Nations Get Angry? *Nexus Africa*, 1(2), pp 11-14.

Ebune, J. B. (1992). *The Growth of Political Parties in Southern Cameroons, 1916-1960*. CEPER.

Gurr, T. R. (1994). Peoples against States: Ethnopolitical Conflict and the Changing World System: 1994 Presidential Address. *International Studies Quarterly*, *38*(3), 347-377.

Home Office (2020). *Country Policy and Information Note* (Cameroon: Anglophones). Version 1.0 March, 2020.

ICG (2010). Cameroon: Fragile States? *Crisis Group Africa Report* No 160, 25th May.

Igwe, O. (2005). *Politics and Globe Dictionary*. Aba: Eagle Publishers.

Johnson, W. R. (1970). *The Cameroon Federation: Political Integration in a Fragmentary Society*. Princetion: Princeton University Press.

Kale, P. M. (1967). Political Evolution in the Cameroons. Beau: Government Printer.

Kymlicka, W. (2000). Nation-building and Minority Rights: Comparing West and East. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *26*(2), 183-212.

Lee, A. & Schultz, K. (2012). Comparing British and French colonial legacies: A Discontinuity Analysis of Cameroon. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science, 7*, 1–46.

Lenin, V. I. (1986). *On National Liberation and Social Emancipation*. (Place of Publication - not stated): Progress Publishers.

Le Vine, B. B. (1976). *Exploring Sex Differences*. London; New York: Academic Press.

Lyombe, E. (2003). The English-Language Press and the ''Anglophone Problem'' in Cameroon: Group Identity, Culture and the Politics of Nostalgia. *Journal of Third World Studies, 20*(1), 79-102.

Manzu, S. (1993). *The Anglophone Dream*. Cameroon Post. 0214. April 20 – 24 p.8

Miller, D. (2000). *Citizenship and National Identity.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Moore, M. (1997). On national Self-Determination. *Political Studies*, *45*(5), 900-913

Ngoh, V. J. (1988). *Cameroon 1884–1985: A Hundred Years of History*. Limbe: Navi Group Publication.

Ngoh, V. J. (2011). *The untold story of Cameroon Reunification:1955-1961*. Limbe: press print Plc.

Nkongho, A.B. (2018). Cameroon's Crisis: Interview with Lawyer A. B. Nkongho (16th October). Accessed at https://www.dw.com/en/cameroon-crisi-interview-with lawyer-agbor-balla-nkongho/av-45903255.

Nkumbe, E. R. (2016). *Anglophone Marginalisation and their Struggle for Self-Determination in Cameroon: An Appraisal*. [Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Buea].

Okereke, C.N. (2018). Analysing Cameroon's Anglophone Crisis. *Counter Terrorist Trends and Analyses*. 10(3), pp8-12.

Radan, P. (2008). Secession: A Word in Search of a Meaning. In P. Pavkovic & P. Radan (Eds.), *On the Way to Statehood: Secession and Globalization* (pp 17-32). Aldershort: Ashgate.

Raphael, D. D. (1970). *The Problems of Political Philosophy*. London: Macmillan.

Searcey, D. (2018). *Cameroon on Brink of Civil War as English Speakers Recount 'Unbearable' Horrors*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/06/world/africa/cameroon-election-biya-ambazonia.html (Accessed 6th January, 2019).

Togue, M. (2017). The status of sexual minorities in Cameroon, in Namwaso, S. & Jjuuko, A. (Eds) *Protecting the Human Rights of Sexual Minorities in Contemporary Africa*. Pretoria: Pretoria University Law Press. Pp245-259.

Townsend, P. (1979). *Poverty in the United Kingdom*. London: Allen and Penguin Books.

United Nations (1960). Resolution 1514 – *Declaration to Grant Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples*. UN Res. 1352 (XIV) of October 16, 1959.
.