



INTERNATIONAL LAWSUIT AND DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

Filed on behalf of: The United People of Horuba/Yoruba

v.

The Governments of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, the Republic of Benin, the Togolese Republic, and the Colonial Governments of the United Kingdom, France, United States of America, Saudi Arabia, Vatican City, and the Royal Monarch Families.

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

This lawsuit is filed in accordance with:

- The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR, 1948)
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR, 1966)
- African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (Banjul Charter, 1981)
- Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1969)
- Customary international law on statehood, sovereignty, and freedom from colonial domination

The lawsuit seeks:

- Recognition of the legal and historical injustice caused by the arbitrary division of the Yoruba/Horuba people in Nigeria, Togo, and Benin.
- Financial restitution in the sum of \$5,000,000,000 for historical trauma, displacement, and imposed conflict
- The right to secede and form a sovereign, self-governing nation called:

“The United People of Horuba/Yoruba”

The Horuba/Yoruba people, numbering nearly 100 million, remain without a sovereign homeland or full control over their own lives and over what happens in their land. This painful and destabilizing reality is the result of deliberate colonial strategies that have disrupted their progress and erased vital aspects of their identity and foundational structures.

The right to resist systemic erasure is not simply a privilege, it is an urgent necessity. It is a struggle for survival, for dignity, and for the rightful restoration of a people’s identity and place in the world. This trauma is not confined to the past; it remains a lived reality today. That is why it must be confronted and addressed without delay.

II. HISTORICAL AND LEGAL CONTEXT

A. Colonial Partition Without Consent

The Yoruba people, an ethnolinguistic and cultural nation were forcibly divided during the Scramble for Africa, formalized at the Berlin Conference (1884–1885). Colonial borders created by Britain and France, without consultation of the indigenous people, fragmented Yoruba communities across:

- Western Nigeria (British Colony)
- Eastern Benin (French Dahomey)
- Western Togo (French Togoland)

B. Treaties Signed Under Duress

Colonial treaties signed during and after the Scramble for Africa were:

- Not agreed to by Yoruba people, but by appointed chiefs under coercion or without mandate.
- Signed by individuals not legally empowered by their people to speak on behalf of generations to come.
- Conducted in contexts of violence, deceit, or trauma, violating the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (Art. 52):

“A treaty is void if its conclusion has been procured by the threat or use of force.” In the case of the Yoruba, it was clearly violent and systematically achieved in falsehood. The Amalgamation of Nigeria is an example of this.

III. CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS

A. Violations in National Constitutions

1. **Nigeria**

– 1999 Constitution

- Section 10 prohibits state religion, yet state practices allow religious dogma to influence legal frameworks.
- Section 14(2)(b): “The security and welfare of the people shall be the primary purpose of the government.”
 - This obligation has been violated repeatedly in Yoruba regions via political exclusion, economic underdevelopment, and suppression of monarchs.

2. **Benin**

– 1990 Constitution

- Article 23 guarantees freedom of movement and association.
 - Yoruba people in Benin are restricted from cross-border traditional and economic activities.

3. **Togo**

– 1992 Constitution

- Article 25 ensures freedom of belief and worship.
 - Yoruba religious practices face erasure and exclusion due to imposed colonial religions.

IV. LEGAL GROUNDS FOR SECESSION AND INDEPENDENCE

A. Right to Self-Determination

- UN Charter (Article 1.2): Right of peoples to self-determination.
- African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (Article 20):

“All peoples shall have the right to existence. They shall have the unquestionable and inalienable right to self-determination.”

B. Invalidity of Colonial-Era Treaties

Colonial treaties violate:

- Vienna Convention (Art. 53): Treaties are void if contrary to peremptory norms of international law (*jus cogens*), including the right to self-rule.
- Legal Precedent: *Namibia v. South Africa* (ICJ 1971) – illegal occupation and invalidity of racist policies; applies similarly to illegal partitioning.

C. Legal Capacity and Trauma

Under modern law, a witness under duress or cognitive trauma is not legally competent. Thus:

- All treaties signed during the colonial era—under war, threat, and psychological manipulation—are null and void.
- Leaders coerced into treaty signing were not qualified legal representatives of the Horuba/Yoruba people.

V. TRAUMA, ECONOMIC LOSS, AND RESTITUTION CLAIM

A. Cultural and Psychological Trauma

- The division of a cultural group led to:
 - Forced linguistic adaptation
 - Fragmentation of religious institutions
 - Suppression of traditional governance
 - Targeted persecution of Yoruba monarchs and leaders
 - Identity Crisis and Political Instability
 - Increase of Crimes and Insecurity of Indigenous Peoples

B. Economic Dislocation

- Cross-border barriers prevent internal Yoruba trade and resource management
- Estimated \$20 billion lost in inter-regional commerce and investment potential since independence

C. Claim for Compensation

We demand \$5,000,000,000 (Five Billion USD) from the colonial and post-colonial states for:

- Emotional trauma and historical abuse
- Cultural erasure
- Economic marginalization
- Undermining of traditional governance structures

VI. DECLARATION OF THE UNITED PEOPLE OF HORUBA/YORUBA

We, the United People of Horuba/Yoruba, declare:

1. We are a sovereign nation, entitled to govern ourselves under international law.
2. We are committed to peace, cooperation, and economic alliance with our neighbors.
3. We renounce all colonial treaties and border impositions that divided our people.
4. Any threat to our independence shall be treated as:
 - A crime against humanity
 - An act of economic sabotage
 - A violation of the UN Charter and African Union protocols

Name of Sovereign Entity:

The United People of Horuba/Yoruba

VII. SECURITY AND DIPLOMATIC WARNING

1. Any attack on our monarchs, leaders, or declarations shall be internationally prosecuted.
2. No religious propaganda shall be tolerated to destabilize our people.
 - Legal action will be pursued under defamation and psychological warfare provisions.
3. No treaty signed under colonial trauma shall be upheld.

It is the inherent right of the people to reject all treaties and alliances made by colonial governments and traditional monarchies that were established without their informed consent. Any treaty signed without consideration of their interests or acknowledgment of their existence holds no legal legitimacy over them.

The time of slavery is over, therefore, all such agreements must be revisited. New treaties and negotiations must be proposed, transparent, inclusive, and based on the active participation of all peoples who wish to be part of these alliances. Only upon proper registration and verification of identity should any treaty benefits or obligations be distributed or recognized. Without this documented legal process, no treaty or economic arrangement should be considered valid in any national or international court of law.

This process is essential for building a transparent and functional system, one that can eliminate corruption and prevent the misuse of economic and political resources. It establishes a clear trail of accountability and ensures that global resources allocated to the people are traceable, justly managed, and equitably distributed.

Evidence Exhibit: A1

VIII. PATH TO PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

We invite:

- The African Union
- The United Nations
- ECOWAS
- France, United Kingdom, Nigeria, Benin, and Togo
...to the table of truth and reparation to:
- Recognize the sovereignty of The United People of Horuba/Yoruba
- Facilitate treaties of cooperation and non-aggression
- Design shared immigration and border protocols for mutual benefit

Attached Exhibits are legal servings of invitations to these entities mentioned above to be aware of this case.

The African Union(AU) has played a huge role in the subjugation of the African people, and played their part in the ongoing modern day slavery.

The United Nations has the longest history of direct and indirect records of participation in the slavery of the African people and the disruption of African economic growth. The United Nations must prepare for renegotiations of treaties and economic reforms in the case of the United People of Horuba/Yoruba.

Ecowas has played their path in being an asset of the colonial governments disrupting the progressives of individuals and entities pursuing true security and independence, which we have all witnessed in their response to the Sahel alliance.

The African Union (AU), while established with the goal of promoting unity, peace, and development across Africa, has been criticized for its contributions to systemic failures on the continent, largely through institutional weaknesses, political compromise, and dependency on external powers.

KEY WAYS THE AU CONTRIBUTED TO AFRICA'S SYSTEMIC CHALLENGES:

1.

Lack of Enforceable Power and Political Will

- The AU often issues resolutions and statements without the enforcement capacity to ensure implementation. This leads to repeated violations of human rights, election fraud, and constitutional abuses by member states with no real consequences.
- Member states sometimes ignore AU directives entirely, especially when national interests or political elites are threatened.

2.

Failure to Address Corruption and Leadership Accountability

- The AU has not taken strong, consistent actions against corrupt or authoritarian leaders. Instead, it often promotes a “non-interference” policy that shields regimes guilty of gross misgovernance and human rights abuses.
- This undermines grassroots democratic movements and supports the continuation of kleptocratic rule in many regions.

3.

Over-reliance on Foreign Funding and Influence

- The AU is heavily funded by foreign donors, including the European Union, China, and the United States. Over 60% of its budget has, at times, come from outside Africa.
- This dependence compromises its ability to act independently and forces it to align with external geopolitical interests, rather than prioritizing the needs of African populations.

4.

Weak Response to Conflict and Militarization

- In regions such as Sudan, the Sahel, Ethiopia, and the Democratic Republic of Congo, the AU has been slow to act or ineffective in stopping violence and displacement.
- The African Standby Force and other peacekeeping initiatives have been underfunded and poorly coordinated, limiting the AU's capacity to protect civilian populations.

5.

Blocking of Pan-African Sovereignty Movements

- The AU has consistently upheld the sovereignty of post-colonial nation-states as defined by colonial borders, often at the expense of indigenous nations and movements seeking self-determination (e.g., Biafra, Ambazonia, the Sahel alliance).
- This stance prevents honest conversations about redefining African governance based on ethnic, cultural, or historical identities, and maintains colonial-era frameworks.

6.

Institutional Bureaucracy and Inefficiency

- The AU is frequently criticized for being bureaucratically bloated, slow-moving, and disconnected from the everyday realities of African citizens.
- Its top leadership structures are often politically appointed rather than merit-based, leading to inefficiency and lack of innovation.

7.

Failure to Develop Unified Economic Strategies

- Despite rhetoric around the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA), the AU has struggled to harmonize trade, currency, and infrastructure policy.
- This has left African economies vulnerable to exploitation by multinational corporations and continued resource extraction without wealth retention.

While the African Union was conceived as a force for good, it has often fallen short of its mission, reinforcing existing systems of exploitation and power imbalance. Its passivity in the face of injustice, dependency on foreign powers, and failure to support revolutionary movements have contributed to Africa's systemic failures. For meaningful change, the AU would need to reform from within, realign itself with grassroots movements, and redefine sovereignty in ways that center African people, not colonial frameworks. This is a demand that must be met before proceeding in dealings with the African nations and the African economic affairs, as with the United People of Horuba/Yoruba.

The United Nations (UN) was founded to promote global peace, security, human rights, and development. However, in the context of Africa, and Nigeria specifically, the UN has played a complex and often contradictory role. While it has supported many positive initiatives, it has also contributed, both directly and indirectly, to the systematic failure of African states, particularly in maintaining neocolonial structures, enabling elite corruption, and failing to protect vulnerable populations.

HOW THE UNITED NATIONS HAS CONTRIBUTED TO SYSTEMIC FAILURE IN AFRICA & NIGERIA

1.

Preserving Colonial Borders and Structures

- Upon decolonization, the UN endorsed the maintenance of artificial colonial borders in Africa, rather than supporting indigenous systems of self-governance or cultural territories.
- In Nigeria, for example, the British-imposed borders grouped together multiple distinct nations (Yoruba, Igbo, Hausa, etc.), creating a deeply unstable national structure. The UN's failure to challenge these borders preserved internal conflict and division.

2.

Legitimizing Corrupt and Oppressive Regimes

- The UN often recognizes and works with governments regardless of their legitimacy or track record, so long as they are the “official” state actors.
- In Nigeria, successive military dictatorships and corrupt civilian governments have been treated as legitimate international partners despite widespread electoral fraud, state violence, and mismanagement.

- This gives international legitimacy to local tyranny, disempowering civil society and grassroots resistance.

3.

Complicity in Economic Exploitation

- Through its specialized agencies (e.g., World Bank, IMF, and even UNDP), the UN has supported structural adjustment programs (SAPs) and neoliberal policies in Nigeria and other African nations.
- These programs forced cuts to public services, privatized national assets, and opened economies to foreign exploitation, resulting in poverty, unemployment, and social decay while benefiting multinational corporations and local elites.
- The UN often promotes these programs under the banner of “development,” despite their long-term harm.

4.

Weak Response to Conflict and Humanitarian Crises

- In numerous conflicts, such as the Nigerian Civil War (Biafra), Boko Haram’s terror in the northeast, and Fulani-herder violence, the UN has provided only minimal, delayed, or politically constrained responses.
- In the Biafran War, over 2 million people died, many through starvation. The UN failed to intervene meaningfully, either diplomatically or with humanitarian aid at the necessary scale.

5.

Enabling NGO-Industrial Complex & Aid Dependency

- Many UN programs support NGOs and international aid organizations that often bypass local governments and communities while reinforcing dependency.

- Instead of building sovereign, self-sufficient African systems, aid is delivered through foreign intermediaries, diluting local agency and perpetuating “poverty management” instead of poverty eradication.

6.

Inconsistent Human Rights Enforcement

- While the UN speaks of human rights, it often fails to hold powerful nations or their allies accountable.
- When Nigerian citizens suffer from state brutality, extrajudicial killings, or electoral manipulation, UN statements are often symbolic and rarely followed by concrete action.
- There has been minimal accountability for security forces, even after global attention from movements like #EndSARS.

7.

Selective Peacekeeping and Inaction

- The UN deploys peacekeeping missions in many African countries but has avoided robust engagement in Nigeria, despite ongoing internal conflicts.
- When intervention happens, it’s often underfunded, ill-equipped, and limited in mandate, rendering it ineffective.

8.

Failure to Support Indigenous Sovereignty and Self-Determination

- Indigenous movements, such as Biafra, Oduduwa Nation, or other regional autonomy efforts, are often ignored or labeled threats to “state integrity,” even when they are based on legitimate grievances.
- The UN’s focus on protecting national borders over people’s rights reinforces colonial constructs and suppresses efforts for meaningful sovereignty.

Dependency on Colonial and Neocolonial Powers

- The UN is still heavily influenced by its most powerful members, especially the P5 (U.S., U.K., France, Russia, China). Many of these nations have vested colonial and economic interests in Africa.
- This means the UN often avoids confronting or regulating these powers' ongoing exploitation of Africa's resources and people.

The United Nations, while claiming neutrality and global responsibility, has repeatedly failed to stand up for the true sovereignty, justice, and self-determination of African nations, especially in the case of Nigeria and **The United People of Horuba/Yoruba**. Whether through inaction, late response, Economic sanctions and accountability, complicity, or flawed development models, it has supported systems that keep Africa dependent, fragmented, and vulnerable to exploitation.

To move forward, a radical reevaluation of the UN's role and policies in Africa is necessary, one that centers African voices, respects indigenous sovereignty, and dismantles the lingering structures of neocolonial control. Until this is addressed, the UN has been declared an untrusted entity on African soil, and is now seen as a terror alliance against the African people and sovereignty. The United People of Horuba/Yoruba cannot honor any treaty established, nor be obligated to any alliance formed that has ties with the United Nations until all concerns are resolved.

ECOWAS, the Economic Community of West African States, was created in 1975 with the goal of promoting regional integration, economic development, and political stability in West Africa. However, over the decades, ECOWAS has been widely criticized for contributing to the systematic failure of Africa and Nigeria through political hypocrisy, foreign influence, economic dependency, and suppression of self-determination movements.

BELOW IS HOW ECOWAS HAS CONTRIBUTED TO THESE SYSTEMIC ISSUES AFFECTING AFRICA:

1.

Protecting Corrupt and Undemocratic Governments

- ECOWAS has consistently aligned with incumbent regimes, even when those regimes are deeply corrupt, undemocratic, or repressive.
- Instead of defending the will of the people, ECOWAS often defends the status quo, silencing revolutionary or independence movements under the guise of preserving “regional stability.”
- In Nigeria, ECOWAS has largely ignored widespread election rigging, police brutality, and elite impunity, failing to hold leadership accountable.

2.

Suppression of Sovereignty and Self-Determination Movements

- ECOWAS strictly upholds the colonial borders left by European powers, refusing to recognize indigenous sovereignty or nationalist aspirations such as those of Oduduwa Nation (Horuba/Yoruba), Biafra (Igbo), or the Sahel Alliance.
- When countries or groups seek autonomy or independence, ECOWAS often responds with sanctions, isolation, or military threats—as seen in Mali, Burkina Faso, and Niger.

- This preserves colonial-era frameworks and blocks decolonial restructuring of African governance.

3.

Acting as a Proxy for Foreign Interests

- ECOWAS receives substantial funding, training, and strategic support from foreign powers, especially France, the U.S., and the European Union.
- As a result, it often enforces the geopolitical interests of these powers rather than those of African people.
- The organization's hostility toward the Sahel alliance, which aims to free itself from French neocolonial influence' is a clear example of ECOWAS acting as a tool of external control.

4.

Failure to Foster Real Economic Integration

- Despite decades of promises, ECOWAS has failed to deliver on true economic integration. Trade between member countries remains limited due to:
 - Poor infrastructure
 - Tariff and non-tariff barriers
 - Overlapping customs regimes
- Multinational corporations and external actors dominate regional markets, while local industries remain underdeveloped and heavily taxed.

5.

Weak Conflict Resolution and Peacekeeping

- ECOWAS has been ineffective in preventing or resolving major regional conflicts, including insurgencies, civil unrest, and coups.
- In Nigeria, ECOWAS has failed to address long-standing issues like:
 - Boko Haram insurgency
 - Banditry in the north
 - Fulani-herder conflicts in the Middle Belt and south
- Peacekeeping missions are often under-resourced, politicized, or compromised by the interests of dominant member states.

6.

Selective Enforcement and Political Bias

- ECOWAS often enforces its rules inconsistently. For example:
 - It condemned the coups in Mali, Burkina Faso, and Niger, yet remained silent or supportive of election fraud and constitutional manipulation in countries like Togo or Côte d'Ivoire.
- This double standard delegitimizes the organization and shows it to be a protector of elite power rather than people's rights.

7.

Ignoring Grassroots Voices and Civil Society

- ECOWAS operates mostly at the governmental and elite level, with little to no engagement with civil society, youth, women's movements, or traditional leaders.
- It is disconnected from the aspirations of everyday West Africans, many of whom feel unrepresented or even oppressed by ECOWAS policies.

8.

Resistance to Pan-African Reimagining

- ECOWAS has not supported calls to rethink Africa's political and economic systems beyond colonial legacies.
- Rather than encouraging a shift to indigenous governance models, cultural unity, and regional sovereignty, it continues to enforce Western-style systems that have proven ineffective and alienating.

ECOWAS, though founded with noble intentions, has evolved into an institution that protects existing colonial power structures, reinforces colonial borders, and suppresses movements for genuine liberation.

In Nigeria and across West Africa, it has protected corrupt regimes, ignored systemic injustice, resisted transformative change, acted under foreign influence, and failed to empower ordinary people. To play a truly progressive role, ECOWAS would need radical reform, shifting from elite protectionism to people-centered governance, embracing indigenous identities, and breaking free from neocolonial dependencies. Without these reforms, The United People of Horuba/Yoruba declared them a terrorist alliance against the African people and the African interests.

THE AFRICAN MONARHS:

The role of African monarchs and traditional chiefs in the systematic failure of Africa, and Nigeria in particular' is deeply intertwined with colonial history, neocolonial structures, and ongoing elite complicity. While some traditional leaders have stood for their people, many have historically, and continue to act as gatekeepers of oppression, benefiting from privileges granted by colonial and postcolonial powers while the masses remain in suffering.

1.

Instrumentalization by Colonial Powers

During the colonial era, especially under British indirect rule, monarchs and chiefs were strategically co-opted and placed on the payroll of colonial administrations.

- British Indirect Rule System: The British realized they could rule vast regions by empowering traditional rulers as intermediaries. In exchange, these rulers received salaries, titles, and privileges for helping maintain colonial control.
- They were used to collect taxes, enforce colonial laws, and suppress dissent. Those who resisted were dethroned or replaced.
- Example: Obas, Emirs, and Chiefs in Nigeria were made colonial agents, often punishing their own people for rebelling against colonial authorities.

2.

Continuation of Colonial Patronage in Post-Independence Era

Even after African countries gained nominal independence, many monarchs continued to enjoy the same privileges:

- State stipends and ceremonial recognition: Traditional rulers still receive funds, security, and political perks from national governments, many of which are aligned with neocolonial agendas.

- Some continue to receive grants, awards, and recognition from former colonial nations (such as the UK and France), reinforcing loyalty to foreign powers.
- These relationships discourage them from supporting revolutionary or anti-colonial movements that threaten the existing power structure.

3.

Silence and Complicity Amid Oppression

Rather than using their influence to challenge injustice, many monarchs remain silent or complicit in:

- Police brutality
- Corruption
- Land grabs by foreign corporations
- Exploitation of resources without benefit to local communities

This silence is often motivated by a desire to maintain access to international privileges, diplomatic invitations, elite events, and foreign grants. In many cases, they prioritize image and alliances over the well-being of their people.

4.

Cultural Legitimization of Elite Rule

Traditional rulers often lend cultural and moral legitimacy to corrupt governments:

- By publicly endorsing presidents and politicians (regardless of their records), they reinforce oppressive regimes.
- Ceremonial visits and honors from monarchs are used as tools of propaganda to portray political stability, even when the population is suffering.

5.

Failure to Advocate for Decolonization and Reparations

While global movements call for reparations, land return, and the rewriting of colonial histories, most monarchs remain absent or passive in these efforts.

- Rarely do they use their platforms to demand justice for stolen artifacts, looted wealth, or genocide committed during colonization.
- Their access to foreign palaces, universities, and diplomatic circles comes at the cost of their moral responsibility to the people.

6.

Maintenance of Hierarchical Power Structures

Traditional leadership often reinforces elite domination, sustaining systems that:

- Deny youth, women, and grassroots communities decision-making power
- Uphold patriarchal and feudal norms that stifle democratic growth
- Support neocolonial economic policies that benefit foreign companies and local elites at the expense of the masses

7.

Symbolic Presence, Minimal Substance

While monarchs play significant ceremonial roles, they rarely use their platforms to:

- Organize collective action
- Confront state oppression
- Educate communities on decolonization and self-determination

Instead, they are often more visible at international conferences, royal galas, and luxury events than in protests, community mobilizations, or grassroots advocacy.

The Betrayal of Custodianship: A true custodian protects the people, not the crown.

Far from being mere cultural figures, many African monarchs and chiefs have become agents of neocolonial control, benefiting from a system that rewards silence, submission, and elite alignment. Their historical and ongoing financial ties to colonial and postcolonial powers compromise their ability and willingness to challenge the very systems oppressing their people.

Until traditional leaders:

- Are free from foreign influence, their role will remain one of symbolic leadership and systemic complicity, rather than transformative custodianship.

Traditional Rulers, Colonial Legacy, and Systemic Complicity: A Report on African Monarchs and the Politics of Privilege.

Traditional rulers across Africa have historically held immense influence within their communities. However, during and after colonization, many of these monarchs were co-opted into foreign and state-controlled systems that have limited their capacity to serve as true custodians of the people. This document provides a research-based report detailing how African kings and chiefs have been financially sustained by colonial and postcolonial structures, and how that funding contributes to systemic failure and sustained oppression across the continent.

1. Historical Context: The Colonial Strategy of Indirect Rule. Colonial administrations, particularly the British and French, employed a strategy known as "indirect rule," where they empowered traditional rulers to govern on their behalf. In return, monarchs were placed on official payrolls, given military protection, and rewarded with symbolic prestige. This system ensured control over vast populations while maintaining an illusion of indigenous authority.

- British colonial records show that many Nigerian kings, such as the Obas and Emirs, were salaried government agents.
- Chiefs were used to collect taxes, suppress resistance, and enforce colonial laws.

2. Post-Colonial Continuity: Monarchs on Modern State Payrolls.

Even after independence, many African monarchs remained financially dependent on state structures:

Nigeria

- Oba of Lagos, Ooni of Ife, Emir of Kano, Oba of Benin, and other traditional leaders receive state salaries, palaces, vehicles, and security.
- Local governments and governors often provide stipends and ceremonial budgets to monarchs in exchange for political endorsement.

Ghana

- The Asantehene and other regional kings are supported through government subventions and recognition.

Cameroon

- Fons and chiefs in Anglophone regions are sustained by the state and often used to manage political tensions.

South Africa

- Kings such as the AmaZulu monarch receive stipends, palaces, and political recognition from the central government.

Morocco and Eswatini

- Monarchs with real political power are heavily funded through national budgets. King Mswati III of Eswatini, for example, has been criticized for excessive spending despite national poverty.

3. Complicity and Silence Amid Oppression

Many monarchs, bound by financial dependence on governments and foreign allies, have been complicit in systemic oppression:

- Rarely do they speak out against state brutality, corruption, or electoral fraud.
- Their influence is used to legitimize political regimes rather than to protect grassroots movements.
- Few have taken a stand for indigenous sovereignty or reparations for colonial crimes.

4. International Privilege and Colonial Loyalty.

Though direct colonial funding has ended, monarchs continue to receive indirect benefits:

- Invitations to royal events and diplomatic ceremonies in Europe.
- Foreign honors such as knighthood from the UK or awards from France.
- Access to embassy-funded cultural projects and royal foundation grants.
- Travel benefits and partnerships that deepen dependency.

These privileges create soft-power incentives that discourage monarchs from challenging their historical benefactors.

5. The Structural Outcome: A System Preserved, Not Transformed. The continued existence of state-dependent and foreign-aligned monarchs contributes to:

- Preservation of colonial borders and governance models.
- Lack of support for decolonization or national restructuring.
- Cultural tokenism without political or economic transformation.
- Disconnection from the youth, civil society, and independence movements.

African monarchs must decide whether they will continue to be symbolic figureheads benefiting from colonial privilege or rise to become true custodians of their people. Breaking free from state and foreign dependency is a necessary step toward reclaiming sovereignty, dignity, and justice. All monarchs must now be in positions to facilitate economical contributions and developments of their jurisdictions if they want to continue with their delegates.

It is essential to acknowledge the precolonial displacements of both people and resources that took place during the formation of many kingdoms and empires. Large populations were annexed into these structures, not by consent, but through warfare, coercion, and terror. These acts, though precolonial, laid the foundation for ongoing patterns of internal colonization and exploitation.

Without a deliberate restructuring of our economic systems, social relations, and national alliances, these historical injustices continue to manifest as issues of identity erasure and resource theft. Ignoring this reality perpetuates a cycle where minority groups remain marginalized, silenced, or entirely forgotten, lacking the legal protections necessary to safeguard their sovereignty, rights, and heritage. Addressing these truths is not about revisiting the past for blame, but about correcting systems for the future. Only through such recognition and reform can we foster a more just and functional system of governance, one that upholds the dignity, identity, and rights of all people under both national and international law.

Declaration for the Restoration of Traditional Leadership and Communal Sovereignty

We declare that until traditional leadership realigns fully with the people and the government as one unified force for economic independence and collective development, rather than serving the interests of foreign paymasters, they shall remain complicit in the ongoing oppression and destruction of our communities.

We recognize that without confronting this hard truth, many traditional rulers stand as modern-day slave traders and overseers, beneficiaries of systems designed to exploit the very land and people they were entrusted to serve. This betrayal can no longer be tolerated.

We therefore demand a total realignment of traditional authority toward the service of the land, the culture, and the people, with accountability, transparency, and a renewed purpose rooted in justice and dignity.

We affirm that every individual and every community holds the sovereign right to educate and empower themselves in matters of ancestral heritage, historical truth, economic agency, and traditional responsibilities.

We further declare the inalienable right of all people to organize for their own maximum security and lawful self-protection, as guaranteed under all natural, ancestral, and international laws.

Let this be known that we are awakened to the reality of what was and what is becoming. This is a declaration from the United People of Horuba/Yoruba to reclaim and to rebuild, not an attempt to ridicule our traditional leaders and monarchies.

The Vatican City and Christianity, particularly in their institutional forms, have played complex roles in Africa's colonial past and its ongoing struggle for true independence. While Christianity has brought aspects of education, healthcare, and community organization to parts of Africa, it has also contributed significantly to Africa's systemic challenges, especially in Nigeria in several key ways:

1.

Spiritual Colonization and Cultural Erosion

The Vatican, as the central authority of the Catholic Church, supported and benefited from the missionary movements that accompanied European colonial expansion. Christian missionaries often worked in tandem with colonial powers to “civilize” African societies. This meant:

- Suppressing indigenous belief systems, labeling them as “pagan” or “satanic.”
- Encouraging the abandonment of ancestral customs, languages, and governance structures.
- Instilling a theology of submission, patience in suffering, and reward in the afterlife, all of which discouraged resistance to oppression.

This spiritual colonization weakened indigenous identities and undermined cultural sovereignty, replacing African cosmologies with Eurocentric worldviews.

2.

Sanctioning Colonial Conquest

The Catholic Church, alongside other Christian denominations, often legitimized European imperialism.

Papal bulls such as *Dum Diversas* (1452) and *Romanus Pontifex* (1455) gave moral and spiritual justification for the conquest, enslavement, and exploitation of non-Christian peoples, including Africans. These papal decrees laid the theological foundation for the transatlantic slave trade and later colonialism.

In Nigeria, missionary schools and churches played dual roles: spreading religion and reinforcing colonial control.

3.

Undermining African Unity

Christianity introduced deep religious divisions into African societies:

- Many communities that once shared spiritual beliefs and customs were divided into Christian, Muslim, and traditionalist camps.
- The spread of denominationalism (Catholic, Anglican, Pentecostal, etc.) created further fragmentation, weakening social and political unity necessary for national liberation movements.

These divisions persist today, influencing everything from family dynamics to electoral politics.

4.

Displacement of Indigenous Governance

Missionaries often disregarded or undermined traditional leadership structures. In many cases, they:

- Reported traditional rulers who resisted conversion to colonial authorities.
- Supported converts to take over leadership positions in local governance and education.

- Encouraged the shift from communal African governance to individualistic, Western systems that prioritized church-aligned loyalties over kinship and land stewardship.

This disempowered indigenous political systems and replaced them with structures more aligned with colonial, and later neocolonial interests.

5.

Moral Cover for Neo-Colonialism

Post-independence, many churches, especially those affiliated with European or American missions continued to align with foreign interests. For example:

- Church charities and aid organizations sometimes distribute resources selectively, in ways that reinforce dependency and foreign influence.
- Religious rhetoric often promotes passivity rather than political or economic resistance.

The Vatican, despite being a powerful global state actor, has rarely spoken out forcefully against modern Western exploitation of African nations, whether through debt traps, resource extraction, or political interference.

6.

Economic and Land Control

In some African countries, including Nigeria, religious institutions (Christian and otherwise) control vast amounts of land, real estate, and wealth, often tax-free.

These resources:

- Are rarely redistributed for community development.
- Allow religious elites to gain political power without democratic accountability.
- Create a moral aristocracy that can be more loyal to foreign theological institutions than to national interests.

While Christianity has undeniably played roles in education and social services, it is important to look within the surface, ask whose education are Africans being taught. To be truly educated is to be educated on the understanding of self.

Declaration on the Role of Foreign Religious Institutions in the Spiritual and Economic Liberation of Horuba/Yoruba Land

The Vatican and broader Christian institutions have historically resisted the authentic education and liberation of African peoples. Instead of advancing enlightenment, they have contributed significantly to Africa's spiritual colonization, cultural disintegration, and political fragmentation.

These deep-rooted influences continue to obstruct Africa's and Nigeria's struggle for true independence, not merely from colonial rule, but from the enduring mental, spiritual, and structural chains of imperial domination.

In light of this, and in the defense of our cultural sovereignty, dignity, and economic future, the United People of Horuba/Yoruba formally declare these imperial religious entities and their affiliated churches as instruments of psychological warfare and neocolonial terrorism.

As such, the following declarations are made law within the United Nation of Horuba/Yoruba:

1. All churches operating within Horuba/Yoruba territory must integrate economic development departments, educational factories, and productive community services as a condition of continued operation. Religion must serve the people materially and intellectually, not just spiritually.
2. **All churches shall be taxed equitably as business entities** under national economic law. No religious institution is above the law of the land.
3. Any sermon, speech, publication, or religious activity that promotes fear, violence, or hostility toward indigenous traditions and traditional communities shall incur heavy fines and may result in the immediate closure and confiscation of the offending institution's property.

This **declaration** affirms that religious freedom in Horuba/Yoruba land **does not mean the freedom to oppress, exploit, or erase** the heritage and humanity of our people. Faith institutions must align with the national interest, cultural respect, and economic progress of the land.

Let it be known: any religion or doctrine that wages war against our traditions wages war against our future, and shall be met with the full force of the law.

Saudi Arabia and Islam, particularly in their institutional and political forms, have had a profound and often controversial influence on Africa and Nigeria's struggle for true independence from colonialism. While Islam, like Christianity, brought with it education, law, and trade networks, the relationship between Islamic expansion (especially through Saudi-backed channels) and African independence is complex and, in many cases, problematic. Here's a critical analysis:

1. Precolonial Islamic Expansion and Indigenous Displacement

Long before European colonialism, Islamic conquests and jihadist movements, many inspired by or later supported by Arabian ideologies had already initiated a form of cultural and spiritual imperialism across West and North Africa:

- In regions like present-day Nigeria, the Fulani-led **Usman dan Fodio jihad** (early 1800s) created the Sokoto Caliphate, subjugating numerous indigenous groups and non-Muslim communities. Many still hold this idea of subjugation.
- Many of these conquests imposed **Sharia law**, Arabic language influences, and Islamic education systems that displaced indigenous traditions and spiritual systems. This Sharia has recently been reintroduced by certain Muslims in the land, which many foundational Yoruba people are against. This history set a precedent of internal colonization agenda by the caliphate, long before European powers arrived and contributed to fragmented identities and tensions between ethnic groups.

2. The Role of Saudi Arabia in Modern Religious Imperialism

In the postcolonial era, Saudi Arabia has exported its version of Islam, Wahhabism, across Africa, using vast oil wealth to influence religious, educational, and political systems:

- **Funding for mosques, madrasas, and preachers** in Nigeria and across Africa has often come with ideological strings attached, promoting a rigid, intolerant interpretation of Islam.
- These efforts have displaced traditional, Sufi, or Africanized forms of Islam, which were historically more syncretic and peaceful.
- This shift has contributed to **sectarian divisions** and **increased radicalization**, weakening national unity and undermining indigenous autonomy.

3. Undermining Indigenous Islamic Traditions

Saudi-backed institutions have often viewed traditional African Islamic practices, such as those found in Mali, Senegal, and Northern Nigeria, as corrupt or impure:

- **Sufi brotherhoods**, Islamic mysticism, and community-based Islamic traditions were delegitimized in favor of purist, literalist interpretations.
- This led to **intra-Muslim conflicts** and disrupted centuries-old religious balances, especially in multicultural and multi-religious states like Nigeria.

These internal religious tensions continue to erode social cohesion and complicate the national project of true independence.

4. Political Influence and Soft Power

Saudi Arabia has used religion as a form of **soft power diplomacy** in Africa:

- By offering scholarships, Hajj subsidies, oil aid, and elite partnerships, Saudi Arabia has created **networks of loyalty** among African elites, especially within Islamic clerical and political classes.
- These ties often **align African leaders with Arab geopolitical interests**, instead of prioritizing local development and cultural sovereignty.
- Nigeria, for example, has seen Islamic clerics and politicians who take ideological guidance or funding from Saudi institutions, which can influence local policy, education, and interreligious relations.

5. Radicalization and Security Challenges

One of the most damaging long-term effects has been the unintended (or neglected) consequence of radicalization:

- The export of Wahhabi ideology has indirectly influenced the rise of extremist groups like **Boko Haram**, which, while not directly funded by Saudi Arabia, share ideological roots with global Salafi movements.
- Boko Haram's rise in Northern Nigeria has caused **tens of thousands of deaths**, displaced millions, and severely disrupted economic and social development.
- This has weakened Nigeria's national integrity and diverted attention from sovereignty-building to emergency responses and military campaigns.

6. Religious Identity as a Tool of Division

Like colonial Christianity, Islam has also been **used to create identity fault lines**:

- In Nigeria, the Muslim North and Christian/traditionalist South have become deeply polarized, often along lines reinforced by foreign religious ideologies.
- These divisions affect national elections, federal resource allocation, and constitutional debates, making it harder for Nigeria to establish a unified postcolonial identity.

While Islam remains a diverse and historically rooted faith across Africa, Saudi Arabia's strategic export of purist Islamic ideologies has played a significant role in displacing indigenous spiritual systems, deepening sectarian divides, and obstructing Africa's and Nigeria's quest for true independence.

Just as European Christian powers used religion as a tool to colonize minds and suppress native cultures, Saudi-backed Islamic institutions have often operated as instruments of neocolonialism, imposing foreign ideologies, weakening local autonomy, and obstructing pathways to national unity, sovereignty, and self-determination.

Since its introduction, Islamism, particularly in its rigid, politicized forms, has hindered the rise of a progressive revolution among the people. Its influence has often stifled cultural evolution, gender equity, critical education, and economic innovation.

We therefore declare the urgent need for systemic reform:

- Mosques and religious institutions must be brought under equitable national taxation policies, especially when functioning as centers of economic or political influence.
- All mosques must include economic empowerment and educational development departments, dedicated to vocational training, civic education, and local enterprise for their congregations.
- Any doctrine, preaching, or speech that incites hatred, denigrates indigenous spiritual traditions, or promotes division among citizens shall be banned and prosecuted under a national and international code of offense against human dignity and unity.

This reform is not an attack on faith but a demand for accountability. Religion must serve the people, not enslave them. Faith institutions must evolve to uplift society, protect human rights, and contribute meaningfully to national development and cultural preservation.

IX. FINAL DECLARATION

“Our right to life, liberty, and movement is ancestral, spiritual, and lawful. We are a peaceful people, but we are not weak people. Any attack on our sovereignty shall be seen as a declaration of war and met accordingly. We choose peace, trade, unity, and growth, but not submission. Let the world recognize our claim, or bear the burden of ignoring justice when it speaks boldly.”

As our people now span across the globe, it is vital that we recognize and embrace every member of our community, regardless of where they now call home or are considered indigenous. Our identity is not bound by geographic borders, but rooted in our shared heritage and collective aspirations. We envision a world where all lands are rightfully governed by their own people and laws—free from barriers that foster division or undermine unity. For this reason, we do not adopt the title “the United States of Horuba,” but instead affirm our identity as the United People of Horuba/Yoruba.



