



**NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF  
NGERIA**

**SCHOOL OF LAW**

**COURSE CODE:LAW 100**

**COURSE TITLE:INTRODUCTION TO LAW**

majority of all disputes are settled without an adjudication by a judge, the proper comparison to be made is between mediation and negotiation between solicitors. Negotiations take place against the background of solicitors' awareness of the parties' legal rights and their assessment of the chances of success in litigation. Negotiations between solicitors, properly conducted, have many of the same advantages of cheapness and flexibility which are attributed to mediation, with the added advantages that the client is represented by a knowledgeable and articulate representative who will endeavour to gain the best possible settlement for the client. Negotiation is a form of alternative dispute resolution which has been at the heart of legal practice for generations.

There must be concerns therefore about whether governments' enthusiasm for ADR is motivated by the best interest of vulnerable citizens or be an overriding concern to process as many disputes as cheaply as possible. Those who are in a position of bargaining strength in a dispute are much more likely to favour mediation than negotiation between solicitors or litigation in the courts. The more vulnerable party in the mediation will not have the advantage of a representative, and if he or she has not received-and understood-proper legal advice, will not have the bargaining chips derived from knowledge of her or his legal entitlements.

Mediation, supported by legal advice and with agreements scrutinized for their fairness by legal representatives after the mediation, has a valuable role to play in the legal system for some people and in some kinds of disputes. However, where the primary motivation for its introduction or encouragement by governments is to cut costs, there is the danger that it will be used inappropriately, and that people will be forced to attend mediation as a precondition to receiving what they really want-an adjudication by the court in accordance with the law.

### **Access to Justice and the Problem of Centripetal Law**

While governments are increasingly encouraging people to settle their own disputes by alternative dispute resolution, and withholding legal aid for civil litigation, they have so far failed to recognize the problem of centripetal laws which have the effect of drawing parties inexorably towards a judicial resolution, rather than conferring upon them the clear bargaining endowments which would facilitate settlements.

Many Nigerian laws are written on the premise that they will be used by courts in deciding cases, rather than by parties in settling disputes in the shadow of the law. Numerous laws confer broad discretions on judges, for example, to set aside unfair contracts or to compensate for deceptive and misleading practices in trade and commerce. Discretion is a

particular feature of family law. Judges have a broad discretion in dividing the property of a husband and wife following marriage breakdown, and in resolving conflicts concerning with whom the children will live and how often the other parent will have contact with them. The legislation does not offer rules or fixed entitlements, but rather it lists the factors which judges should consider. Sometimes, the courts also have a discretion to divide the property of couples who have been in a de facto relationship.

The argument in favour of conferring broad discretions upon judges is that it gives them the necessary flexibility to tailor the relief awarded to the particular circumstances of each case rather than being fettered by fixed rules. However, this presupposes that a large number of cases will be the subject of judicial decision, and that governments are willing to bear the costs of providing access to the courts so that judges are able to achieve fair outcomes in each case. The greater the degree of discretion, the more difficult it is to bargain in the shadow of the law, for where there is a broad discretion, the law casts only an uncertain shadow. Judges may reasonably disagree on the appropriate outcomes of individual cases, and although experienced practitioners learn to predict outcomes with a certain degree of reliability, the complex messages concerning people's "entitlements" conveyed by the courts through the process of adjudication become simplified into some basic categories of case in order to make negotiations easier.

Centripetal laws assume that courts will make the decisions, and regulate the conduct and adjudication of cases within the court setting. Centrifugal laws send clear messages to people about their rights, obligations and entitlements, so that judicial resolution of disputes is made necessary only where the facts of the case or the scope of the rule are in dispute. For example, centripetal laws concerning family property guide judges on how to exercise their discretion when a dispute comes before the courts concerning the allocation of that property on marriage breakdown. Centrifugal laws would give the parties fixed entitlements, such as equal shares in all the property acquired after the marriage other than by gift to one party, by inheritance or as an award of damages for personal injury, subject to a power to vary those equal shares on application by one of the person's will after death where a dependant has not been adequately provided for. Centrifugal laws would provide that the surviving spouse and dependent children should receive fixed proportions of the estate. Centripetal laws empower judges to set aside or vary standard form contracts which contain unfair terms. Centrifugal laws would provide model standard form contracts, and place the onus upon the business which is relying on the standard form contract to justify variations from the legislative model.

Centrifugal laws may sometimes be arbitrary, but they simplify the messages the law gives, thereby reducing the numbers of disputes and assisting in the resolution of disputes by conferring bargaining chips. They provide a framework within which alternative dispute resolution may operate successfully. An emphasis upon private ordering combined with the conferral of broad discretions on judges in the few cases which come to courts, is the worst of all words; but it is the direction in which the Nigeria legal system is healing rapidly.

### **Conclusion: The Future of Tradition**

At the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Nigerians find themselves at a time when they are reflecting, and must reflect on their future. Questions are being asked not only about what it means for Nigeria to be a truly multicultural society, about the suitability of the federal constitution for a nation as she enter the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and about basis aspects of the legal system. How relevant are traditional modes of dispute resolution through adversarial litigation for the needs of modern society? Does Nigeria have a “Rolls-Royce” system of justice, when it can only afford a Holden? To what extent are traditional means of legal reasoning based upon premises which are unsustainable? How does the legal system incorporate the needs, aspirations and particular insights of groups which have not hitherto been part of the mainstream of public life.

To these questions about the future, the past may seem only faintly relevant. In one sense, Nigeria’s future cannot rest in recollecting its past, for the ties with Britain are no longer as significant as they once were, either economically, politically or culturally. To face the future, Nigerians must be secure in their identity, and embrace the unknown, or at least the little known.

Yet there is another sense in which Nigerians must recollect their past—the historical and ideological origins of their ideas and institutions—in order to chart successfully a new course for the future. It is only in understanding the origins of those aspects of law and society which constitute foundational ideas and assumptions, that we can assess them properly. With a profound understanding of the past, traditions which seem to be superfluous in the modern era may be seen to have a basis in the hard-fought struggles of another age, with implications for the present.

Above all, traditions have an intrinsic value merely for being traditions. The legitimacy of institutions is conferred as much by emotion as by reason, and as much by memory as by present consent. Sometimes, great trees must be felled in order to make way for new growth; but new saplings do not have the roots of the great trees. They are less able to

withstand storms, and are more vulnerable to the winds of change. Vibrant new growth may sometimes be purchased only at the price of instability. Traditions can insulate societies from what Alvin Toffler described as “future shock”.

The strongest traditions have grown from values which have energized a society towards the development of new structure and institutions. The energy which created the French and American revolutions and other revolutions before and since, was born not only from dissatisfaction with the existing situation, but from an ideological commitment, at least among some of the leaders, to a new order. None of the great revolutions in western society, whether social, political, or intellectual, were won without cost. It is in times when shared values are weak, and individual preoccupation displaces a commitment to the common good, that those traditions born in very different times have their greatest value, as representing a shared heritage.

Above all, it is the strength of traditions that, once established, they can outlast the disappearance of those conditions which were essential to their formation and early development. Many of the most significant ideas of the western legal tradition, respect for law, its prominence as a means of social ordering, the importance of law’s moral quality, the virtue of the rule of law, have all survived for a long time after the reasons which made them important values have disappeared from public consciousness. Similarly, the idea of natural human rights continues in our political discourse long after any consensus has gone about the basis for the existence or identification of these rights. Traditions have the virtue that at times, they can take on a life of their own.

Western societies are at a stage of history when they are living off their reserves. The intellectual conditions which gave birth to the traditions and values of legal and political life in western societies are no longer with us in the same way that they once were. The ideas of natural law, which, at their best, gave to positive law a standard of accountability, and called it onward to greater integrity, have been displaced from their prominence in jurisprudential thought. The Judaeo-Christian worldview, which gave to people a respect for law as intrinsically valuable, and called people to obey that law not only out of fear but out of civil duty, is not internalized in the values of the populace to the extent that it once was. Locke’s theory of natural rights, and Rousseau’s social contract are but a dim memory. Yet through all these changes in the beliefs and value system of the population, the legal and political traditions of western societies continue on.

The western legal tradition has changed much over the centuries of its life. No one century has left it unaltered. It is an evolving tradition, not a static one. The future, in Nigeria, as elsewhere, depends upon recollecting this past, valuing it, and allowing it to be the basis for further change.

Nonetheless, the tradition of law in Nigeria is in urgent need of renewal. The challenge of inclusion is a challenge to make the legal system relevant and accessible to all Nigeria, irrespective of age, disability, ethnicity, gender or wealth. In the new millennium, the challenge of inclusion appears to be the most urgent challenge of all.

### **Textbooks and References**

See above 2.1.2.

See above 2.1.3.

Johnston E, National Report of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody (AGPS, Canberra, 1991), Vol 1, p 4.

For histories, see Johnson E. National Report of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody (AGPS, Canberre, 1991), Vol 2, ch 10; Reynolds, H, Dispossession (Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1989).

Mabo v Queensland (No 2) (1992) 175 CLR 1.

See above, 5.1.3.

Australian Law Reform Commission, Recognition of Aboriginal Customary Law, (1986). Report No 31 Sydney.

Graycar, R and Morgan, J. (1990). *The Hidden Gender of Law*. Sydney: Federation Press.

Scutt, J. (1990). *Women and the Law*. Sydney: Law Book Co.

Where the Youngest Child is under five, 47 per Cent of Women are in the Workforce. Where the Youngest Child is of School Age, the Proportion Rises to 66 per cent. Australian Bureau of Statistics, Labour Force Status and Other Characteristics of Families (Canberra, 1993).

Glendon, M. (1981). *The New Family and the New Property*. Toronto: Butterworths.

Australian Law Reform Commission, *Equality Before the Law*, Report No 31 (Sydney, 1986); Naffine, N, *Law and the Sexes* (Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1990), Ch 5; Graycar, R (ed), *Dissenting Opinions* (Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1990).

Women are not Only the Primary Caretakers of Children. They also Constitute 72.6 per cent of those Caring for the Elderly, 75.9 per cent of those caring for Adults with a Mental Illness and over 60 per cent of those Caring for Disabled Adults: Australian Law Reform Commission, *Equality Before the Law: Justice for Women*, Report No 69 (Sydney, 1994). Vol 1, p 12.

Joshi H, "The Cost of Caring" in Glendining, C and Millar, J (eds) *Women and Poverty in Britain* (Wheatsheaf, Brighton, 1987), p 112.

See, eg, Australian Law Reform Commission, *Equality before the Law: Interim Report*, Report No 67 (Sydney, 1994).

Goldman, R and Goldman, J, "The Prevalence and Nature of Child Sexual Abuse in Australian" (1988) 9 *Australian Journal of Sex, Marriage and the Family* 94; Finkelhor, D, *Sexually Victimized Children* (Free Press, New York, 1979); Finkelhor, D, *Child Sexual Abuse: New Theory and Research* (Free Press, New York, 1984).

See generally, Parkinson, P, "The Future of Competency Testing for Child Witnesses" (1991) 15 *Crim LJ* 186; Warner, K, "Child Witnesses in Sexual Assault Cases" (1988) 12 *Crim LJ* 286.

Cashmore, J and Parkinson, P, "The Competency of Children to Give Evidence" (1991) 3(1) *Judicial Officers Bulletin* (Judicial Commission of NSW) 1.

Flin, R, Stevenson, Y and Davis, G, "Children's Knowledge of Court Proceedings" (1989) 80 *British Journal of Psychology* 285.

Cashmore, J, "The Use of Video Technology for Child Witnesses" (1990) 16 *Monash Unit LR* 228; on the Position in the Australian Capital Territory, see Australian Law Reform Commission, *Children's Evidence: Closed Circuit TV*, Report No 63 (Sydney, 1992).

In Western Australian, a Variation on this has also been used: the Defendant is in Another Room, Watching Proceedings through

Closed Circuit Television, and is Able TO Communicate with Defence Lawyers.

Of all States and Territories, Western Australian has the Greatest Variety of Means by which Children can give Evidence: Acts Amendment (Evidence of Children and Others) Act 1992 (WA).

Brennan, M and Brennan, R, *Strange Language: Child Victims Under Cross Examination* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed, Riverina-Murray Institute, Wagga Wagga, 1988); Cashmore, J, "Problems and Solutions in Lawyer-Child Communication" (1991) 15 Crim LJ 193.

Parkinson, P, 'Child Sexual Abuse Allegations in the Family Court' (1990) 4 Australian Journal of Family Law 60 at 66-72; Oates, K, "Children as Witnesses" (1990) 64 Australian Law Journal 129; Bussey, K, "The Competence of Child Witnesses" in Calvert, G, Ford, A and Parkinson, P (eds), *The Practice of Child Protection: Australian Approaches* (Hale and Iremonger, Sydney, 1992), p 69.

See generally, Seymour, J, *Dealing with Young Offenders* (Law Book Co, Sydney, 1988); Borowski, A and Murray, T (eds), *Juvenile Delinquency in Australian* (Methuen Australian, Sydney, 1985).

Andrews, R and Cohn, A, "Ungovernability: The Unjustifiable Jurisdiction" (1974) 83 Yale LJ 1383; Teitelbaum, L and Gough, A (eds), *Beyond Control: Status Offenders in the Juvenile Court* (Ballinger, Cambridge, Mass, 1977); Garlock, P, "Wayward' Children and the Law, 1820-1900: The Genesis of the Status Offense Jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court" (1979) 13 Georgia LR 341.

Morris, A, Giller, H, Szwed, E and Geach, H. (1980). *Justice for Children*. London: Macmillan.

See Bird, G (ed), *Law in a Multicultural Australian* (National Centre for Crosscultural Studies in Law, Melbourne, 1991); Bird, G, *The Process of Law in Australian: Intercultural Perspectives* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed, Butterworths, Sydney, 1993).

National Agenda for a Multicultural Australian (Offive of Multicultural Affairs, Canberra, 1989).

Ibid, p 17.



See, eg, Bullivant, B, "Australia's Pluralist Dilemma: An Age-old Problem in a New Guise" (1983) 55 Australian Quarterly 136; Jupp, J, "Multiculturalism: Friends and Enemies, Patrons and Clients" (1983) 55 Australian Quarterly 149; Jayasuriya, L, "Rethinking Australian Multiculturalism: Towards a New Paradigm" (1990) 62 Australian Quarterly 50.

See also Art 30 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

In the constitutional law of the United States, this fundamental principle was expressed by Stone J in his famous footnote 4 in *United State v Carolene Products Co* (1938) 304 US 144 at 152. He stated that one of the grounds on which legislation could be subjected to "more exacting judicial scrutiny" was if it was directed as particular religious, national or racial minorities, or expressed prejudice against "discrete and insular minorities".

D' Argaville, M, "Serving a Multicultural Clientele: Communication Between Lawyers and Non-English-speaking Background Clients" in Bird, G (ed), *op cit*, p 83.

Australian Law Reform Commission, *Multiculturalism and the Law*, Report No 57 (Sydney, 1992).

*Ibid*, Ch 3.

Australian Law Reform Commission, *Multiculturalism and the Law*, Report No 57, *op cit*, Ch 6. See also Goudge and Goudge (1984) FLC 91-534 (Evatt CJ dissenting); *DKI and OBI* [1979] FLC 90-661; *In the Marriage of McL; Minister for Health and Community Services 9NT* (Intervener) [1999] FCL 92-238.

For Example, in *R v Isobel Philips* (Northern Territory Court of Summary Jurisdiction, 19 September 1983, Unreported) the Defence of Duress was Allowed to an Aboriginal Woman from the Warumungu Tribe Because the Evidence Demonstrated that She was Required by Tribal Law of Fight in Public with any Woman Involved with Her Husband, and was under a Threat of Death or Serious Injury if She did not Respond. Australian Law Reform Commission, *Recognition of Aboriginal Customary Law*, Report No 31, *op cit*, para 430, fn 82. See also the Recommendation of the Australian Law Reform Commission on the Need to take Account of Cultural Factors in the Application of the Criminal Law. Australian Law Reform Commission, *Multiculturalism and the Law*, Report No 57, *op cit*, Ch 8.

There is a Specific Legislative Exemption for Sikhs in England: Motor Cycle Crash Helmets (Religious Exemption) Act 1976. For the position in Australia, see Australian Law Reform Commission, *Multiculturalism and the Law*. Report No 57, op cit, pp 175-176.

Australian Law Reform Commission, *Multiculturalism and the Law*, Report No 57, op cit, pp11-12. Legal Pluralism, in Relation to Tribal Aboriginal Communities, was also Rejected by the Australian Law Reform Commission in its Report on Aboriginal Customary Law, in Favour of the Limited Recognition of Customary Laws for Specific Purposes: Australian Law Reform Commission, *Recognition of Aboriginal Customary Law*, Report No 31, op cit. For Comment, see Poulter, S, "Cultural Pluralism in Australia" (1988) 2 *Int J of Law and the Family* 127.

*National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia*, op cit, vii.

For Example, in Relation to Arranged Marriages Where Pressure is exerted by Parents to Enter the Marriage Despite the Reluctance of the Young Woman to do so. On Arranged Marriages and the Law of Nullity in Australia, see *In the Marriage of S* (1980) FLC 90-820.

Sadurski, W, "Last Among Equals: Minorities and Australian Judge-Made Law" (1989) 63 *ALJ* 474 at 481.

See, eg, Parkinson, P, "Taking Multiculturalism Seriously: Marriage Law and the Rights of Minorities" (1994) 16 *Syd LR* (Forthcoming).

On the Issue of Child, see New South Wales Child Protection Council, *Culture-No Excuse* (Sydney, 1994); Korbin, J, "Child Sexual Abuse: A Cross-Cultural View" in Oates, K (ed), *Understanding and Managing Child Sexual Abuse* (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Sydney, 1990), p 42.

Cappelletti, M and Garth, B, "Access to Justice: The Newest Wave in the Worldwide Movement to Make Rights Effective" (1978) 27 *Buffalo LR* 181.

Opening address, Commonwealth Legal Aid Council Conference (1984) quoted in Disney, J, Redmond, P, Basten J and Ross, S, *Lawyers* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed, Law Book Co, Sydney, 1981), p 461.

Galanter, M, "Justice in Many Rooms: Courts, Private Ordering and Indigenous Law" (1981) 19 *Journal of Legal Pluralism & Unofficial Law* 1 at 6.

Mnookin, R and Kornhauser, L, "Bargaining in the Shadow of the Law: The Case of Divorce" (1979) *Yale LJ* 950.

*Ibid* at 968.

Fitzgerald, J, "Grievances Disputes and Outcomes: A Comparison of Australia and the United States" (1983) 1 *Law in Context* 15. See also Galanter, M, "Reading the Landscape of Disputes: What We Know and Don't Know (and Think We Know) About Our Allegedly Contentious and Litigious Society" (1983) 31 *UCLALR* 4.

Harris D et al, *Compensation and Support for Illness and Injury* (Clarendon, Oxford, 1984).

For a review of American, British and Australian Data see Casts, M and Western, J, *Legal Aid and Legal Need* (Commonwealth Legal Aid Commission, Canberra, 1980) Chs 3 and 4.

In Fitzgerald's Study, (above), Most Claims were made without Recourse to lawyers. In all those Cases where the Claim was disputed, only 21 per cent of People Consulted Lawyers. Lawyers were not consulted at all in regard to Landlord and Tenant Disputes, and were consulted in only 3.4 per cent of Discrimination Claims. Even in Consumer and Tort Problems where the Amount Involved was over \$1000, Lawyers were consulted in only 47 per cent of Tort Disputes and 12 per cent of Consumer Disputes. Lawyers were Involved Additionally, However, in Some Cases Where the Claim was not contested. About 19 per cent of Instances in which Lawyers were Involved could be so Categorized.

Cass, M and Sackville, R, *Legal Needs of the Poor* (Commission of Inquiry into Poverty, AGPS, 1975).

*Ibid*, p 8.

*Ibid*, pp 75-76.

*Ibid*, p 89.

Cass, M and Western, J, *op cit*, Ch 3.

Significantly, Cass and Sackville Found that there was no Difference between the Income Level of those who Consulted a Lawyer and the Whole Sample (Cass, M and Sackville, R, op cit, p 77).

In Some Courts and Tribunals, the Cost-Idemnity Rule does not apply, or is Only Applied in Certain Situations (where, eg, a Reasonable Offer of Settlement has been refused). See, eg, Family Law Act 1975 (Cth), s 117; Access to Justice Advisory Committee, Access to Justice: An Action Plan (Canberra, 1994), pp 167-168.

In New South Wales, a Completely Different Approach to the Calculation of Costs has been introduced. The Legal Profession Reform Act 1993 (NSW), Amending the Legal Profession Act 1987, Abolished Scales and Provides that Costs Should be Assessed by a Cost Assessor who is a Practicing Lawyer. The Assessor Should Consider Whether it was Reasonable to carry out the Work done, and also the Reasonableness of the Amounts Charged. See Legal Profession Act 1987, ss 208f-208s.

Researchers, Examining the Basis for Charging in Personal Injury litigation in Victoria and New South Wales Found that in New South Wales, 83 per cent Charged Wholly or Mainly by Reference to Time. In Victoria, 68.8 per cent used Court Scales. Worthington, D and Baker, J, The Costs of Civil Litigation: Current Charging Practices, New South Wales and Victoria (Civil Justice Research Centre, Sydney, 1993).

See, eg, Australia Legal Reform Commission, Multiculturalism and the Law, Research Paper No. 1, Family Law: Issues in the Vietnamese Community (ALRC, Sydney, 1991), pp 24-30.

ALRC, Multiculturalism and the Law, Report No 57, op cit, Ch 2.

Studies in the 1970s Indicated that Chamber Magistrates were the Most well known Source of Legal advice in the Community in New South Wales. See Cass, M and Sackville, R, op cit, and Tomasic, R, Law, Lawyers and the Community (Law Foundation of New South Wales, Sydney, 1976).

See, eg, Law Reform Commission of Victoria, Access to the Law: Restrictions on Legal Practice, Report No 47 (Melbourne, 1992); Senate Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, The Cost of Justice, Foundations for Reform (Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra, 1993) and The Cost of Justice, Second Report, Checks and Imbalances (Commonwealth of Australia,