

# Governance Deficit and Nigeria's Security Quagmire

Journal of Management and  
Social Sciences  
© The Author 2020  
Reprints and permission  
fountainjournalmanagementandss@gmail.com

**Murana, Asimiyu Olalekan**  
Summit University Offa, Nigeria

**Bakare, Rafiu Adebola**  
University of Ilorin, Nigeria

## Abstract

Nigeria is currently troubled with a security challenge that poses a threat to the continuing existence of the country as a united corporate entity. Bad governance pioneered by military dictatorship but sustained in the post-military era has been advanced as a major cause of the perennial security crisis. This trend has robbed the nation of peace and security, which are necessary ingredients for sustainable development. This paper employs secondary data and qualitative analysis in the examination of issues involved in using good governance as an antidote for peace and security. The study reveals that good governance remains a viable instrument for achieving peace and security in the country and other developing nations of the world.

## Keywords

Good governance, peace, security, sustainable development, military dictatorship and democratic governance

## Introduction

It is arguable to say that peace and security of lives and properties are the primary obligations of any government. This is because peace and security are the minimum requirements to maintain the survival of a state through the use of socio-political and economic power. A state that is not capable of managing its human and material resources to ensure a realization of these basic requirements is, therefore, not worthy to be called one. The capacity or otherwise of government the world over are often subjected to constant tests as regards its ability to maintain peace and security because of the herculean task of ensuring a conflict-free society. This challenge is aggravated more by the global wave of democratization which preaches governance based on the free consent of the ruled, unlike autocracies where the ruler simply equates himself to state in which, all security issues are addressed through the prism of his

## Corresponding author:

Asimiyu Olalekan Murana, Department of Political Science, Summit University Offa, Kwara State, Nigeria  
Email: asimiyumurana@gmail.com

whims and caprices. Therefore, achieving peace and security demand as a prerequisite, a good governance platform that promotes human security, economic security as well as environmental security which will put a nation at a vantage position to attract direct foreign investment for sustainable development.

Since the return of Nigeria to democratic governance on 29th May, 1999, studies on governance and security has been a subject of intense debate by scholars of diverse orientations (see, Abioro and Daramola, 2018; Fukuyama, 2013; Omodia and Aliu, 2013). The rising concern about the governance project in Nigeria cannot be explained outside the country's historical experience, a history that has bequeathed the current wave of ethnoreligious and politico-economic crises on the country. This state of affairs raises some serious concerns about the question of good governance in Nigeria where the politics of deprivation and mismanagement of resources appear to be taking over the principles of accountability, transparency and responsibility. This has thrown up security challenges in poverty-ridden society. The questions here are; whether the good governance can guarantee peace and security in Nigeria? Is there a link between good governance, peace and security that can be harnessed for a better future for Nigeria? Thus, the thrust of this paper is to unfold the elements of good governance towards achieving peace and security in Nigeria.

### ***Conceptual Issues***

#### ***Governance and Good Governance***

Governance refers to the exercise of political and administrative authority at all levels to manage a country's affairs. Governance entails the proper management of state institutions and structures to enhance the socio-economic and political transformation of society. The governance process embodies the social bond existing between the government and the governed, and its capacity to enhance popular trust and galvanize popular participation in the political system (see Egwu, 2006 and Adejumobi, 2004). The institutional and human capacities for governance determine how the effectiveness of public policies and strategies is attained, especially in service delivery. This is in tandem with the definition given by World Bank Report (1989), that Governance connotes the exercise of political power in the management of a nation's affairs. Put differently, governance encompasses the state's institutional and structural arrangements, decision-making processes and implementation capacity, and the relationship between the governance apparatus and the governed. According to the Report of the Commission on Global Governance "Our Global Neighbourhood" (1995) governance is:

The sum of the many ways individuals and institutions, public and private, manage their common affairs. It is a

continuing process through which conflicting or diverse interests may be accommodated and co-operative action may be taken. It includes formal institutions and regimes empowered to enforce compliance, as well as informal arrangements that people and institutions either have agreed to or perceive to be in their interest.

With regard to the term “good governance”, analysts may disagree about the best means of achieving good governance, but they are quite often agreed that good governance is absolutely imperative for social and economic progress (Oburota, 2003 cited in Ogundiya, 2010: 201). The categorization of governance as good or bad is perhaps a philosophical question given that the question of good and bad is essentially ethical/moral. According to Madhav (2007), good governance has much to do with the ethical grounding of governance and must be evaluated with reference to specific norms and objectives as may be laid down. Therefore, to describe governance as a good or bad one requires the understanding of the essence of the state which are not only embedded in the constitution but also a function of the religious ideals and the nature of current problems confronting the state (see Ogundiya, 2010). The question about the essence of the state formed the major preoccupation of the earlier philosophers like Aristotle, Plato, Rousseau and others. The essence of the state to these early thinkers was to promote the common good (economic interest, political interest and the security of lives and property). Thus, public authorities have the common good of the state as their prime responsibility. The common good stands in opposition to the good of rulers or of a ruling group. It implies that every individual, no matter how high or low, has a duty to share in promoting the welfare of the community as well as a right to benefit from that welfare (Eboh, 2003). Common here implies that the “good” is all inclusive. In essence, the common good cannot exclude or exempt any section of the population. If any section of the population is in fact excluded from participating in the life of the community, even at a minimal level, then that is a contradiction to the concept of the common good (Eboh, 2003). Good governance can therefore be seen as democratic governance which is largely characterized by high valued principles such as rule of law, accountability, participation, transparency, human and civil rights. In this sense, Odock (2006) defines good governance as a system of government based on good leadership, respect for the rule of law and due process, the accountability of the political leadership to the electorate as well as transparency in the operations of government.

Good governance, as a concept, applies to all sections of society such as the government and its agencies/institutions, media, private sector, corporate sector, trade unions and even Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs). Public accountability and transparency are as relevant for the one as for the

other. It is only when all these and various other sections of society conduct their affairs in a socially responsible manner that the objective of achieving larger good of the largest number of people in society can be achieved (Madhav, 2007). The United Nations Development Programme UNDP (1996) conceives good governance as a commitment and the capability to effectively address the allocation and management of resources to respond to collective problems. Sasmal (n.d.) states that:

Good governance establishes the rule of law, enforces contracts and agreements between the individuals, maintains laws and order and guarantees security to the people, economises on cost and resources, determines the optimal size of government and makes best possible use of government resources (p. 53).

Following the foregoing, good governance has eight major attributes. It is participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive and follows the rule of law (United Nation's Committee for Development Planning, 1992). It assures that corruption is minimized, the views of minorities are taken into account and that the voices of the most vulnerable in society are heard in decision-making. It is also responsive to the present and future needs of society.

Therefore, we must note that, it is only when we appraise how the affairs of a country are run that we can discern which government is good or bad or which has been a success or failure. Failure of governance implies that those in political control have not properly managed the economy and other social institutions. According to the World Bank (1992), bad governance has many features, among which are: failure to make a clear separation between what is public and what is private, hence a tendency to divert public resources for private gain; failure to establish a predictable framework for law and government behaviour in a manner that is conducive to development, or arbitrariness in the application of rules and laws; excessive rules, regulations, licensing requirements, etc, which impede the functioning of markets and encourage rent-seeking; priorities that are inconsistent with development, thus, resulting in a misallocation of resources and non-transparencies in all official responsibilities. According to Obadan (1998) when these features occur together they create an environment that is hostile to development. In such circumstances, he further argues, that the authority of governments over their people tends to be progressively eroded. This reduces compliance with decisions and regulations. Government then tends to respond through populist measures or, as in some authoritarian regimes, resort to coercion. Either way, the economic cost tends to be high, including a diversion of resources to internal security and escalating corruption. In essence, bad governance is the absence of good governance and may not necessarily mean the absence of

democracy. It is evident in the inability of a state to achieve or realise its essence at a particular time. Also, bad governance by entailing corruption, and lack of accountability and transparency, provides opportunities for the well connected elites and interest groups in the society to corner for themselves a sizeable proportion of the society's resources at the expense of the masses (Obadan, 1998). Thus, bad governance is contrapuntal to a nation's socio-economic, political development and security. Therefore, resources of the state must be managed in such a manner as to achieve the desired level of socio-economic progress for all members of the political community. To be precise, good governance is about the performance capacity of a government or as it relates to leadership capability. Failure of governance therefore, could expressly mean failure of leadership. Indeed, the best governors are those who met their society in a condition of social and political nadir and can save the society or lift it from doldrums to the position of fame and prosperity. Governance is good provided it can achieve the desired end of the state defined in terms of justice, equity, protection of life and property, enhanced participation, preservation of the rule of law and improved living standard of the populace. Governance is termed bad when it fails to achieve the purpose(s) of the state.

Obama (2006) pointed out that for all the progress that has been made, the African continent generally has not yet created a government that is transparent and accountable, one that serves its people and is free from corruption which undermines the governance process. In his words:

Governance in Africa is crisis ridden and it is a crisis that is robbing honest people of the opportunities they fought for. Corruption erodes the state from the inside out, sickening the justice system until there is no justice to be found, poisoning the police forces until their presence becomes a source of insecurity rather than a source of security. In the end, if the people cannot trust their government to do the job for which it exists, to protect them and to promote their common welfare, all else is lost.

### *Peace*

Peace is a relative condition of security friendly climate that allows individuals and group relations to progressive order and stability. Peace is not the absence of conflicts or war; it is a political condition that ensures justice and social stability through formal and informal institutions, practices and norms (Aja, 2007). Ibeanu (n.d.) cited in Aja (2007: 1) defines peace as security friendly system that frees individuals and groups of people from fears and dangers of

losing such inalienable human rights as life, liberty and property. Ibeanu (2005) also tries to explain peace in sociological terms as a condition of social harmony in which there are no social antagonisms. Implicit in the sociological perspective is the value of socio-political education of the society so that each discovers itself, its role; its creative abilities, the value of cooperation and collaboration, as well as respect for rules and regulations.

Peace, from a political perspective, is seen as a contraction within states and between states. Peace is created and maintained when both the ruler and the ruled carry out their constitutional, political social and economic obligations (Aja, 2007: 6). Broadening the conceptualisation of peace, Galtung (1990) outlines two dimensions of peace. The first is negative peace, which is the absence of direct violence, war and fear perceived by the individual, nation, and region and indeed by the international community. The second dimension is positive peace, which obtains when the peace in existence, in addition to the above, also includes the absence of unjust structures, unequal relationships, justice and inner peace of the individual. In sum, we can conceive peace to be the absence of fear, conflict, anxiety, exclusion, deprivation or suffering and violence. It is primarily concerned with creating and maintaining a just order in society. Galtung further states that:

Peace and indeed peace theory is intimately connected not only with conflict theory, but equally with development theory. Therefore, a peace research must be one that looks into the past, present and future conditions for the realization of peace which is intricately connected with conflict research and indeed development research (1991: 131).

According to Omotor and Efayena (2008), peace can be classified into the following levels:

*Harmony*: This can be defined as a relationship between communities and nations in which there are virtually no conflicts of interest or values.

*Durable Peace*: This is 'lasting', 'positive', or 'just peace', which involves a high level of cooperation.

*Stable Peace*: or 'cold peace' is a relationship of limited communication and cooperation within a context of basic order, mutual respect and generally, absence of violence.

*Unstable Peace*: or 'cold war' involves palpable tension and suspicion among parties with sporadic overt violence, for instance, US/Iran conflict and, in Nigeria, the case of the Niger Delta militants and Federal Government along with oil multinational companies in the region.

## *Security*

Security as a national condition is conceived by the United Nations (1996) as a state at which countries think that there is no danger of military attack, political pressure, or economic coercion, so that they can develop and progress freely. Hornby (1995) defines security as the activities involved in protecting a country, building, or person against attack, danger etc. For decades, issues relating to security have tended to occupy the centre stage in the development discourse with scholars interpreting security as tantamount to development (see, McNamara, 1968; and Mijah, 2007). There can be no development without security. The inclusion of development issue in the discussion of security matter as pointed out here is particularly important because, development essentially focuses on the transformation of the individual to eliminate poverty, unemployment and inequality. The prevalence of these elements constitutes monumental threats to the security of any nation. It is in this sense that the Kampala Document on Security (1992) clearly states that:

The concept of security goes beyond military consideration. It embraces economic, political and social dimensions of individual, family, community, local and national life. The security of a nation must be constructed in terms of the security of the individual citizen to live in peace with access to basic necessities of life while fully participating in the affairs of his/her society in freedom and enjoying all fundamental human rights (1992: 9).

Deriving from this, the non- conventional conception of security emphasizes human security. Thus, Fayeye (2011) describes security as the maturation of the structures and processes that can engender and guarantee political space and sufficient conditions for the realization of personal, group or national aspirations. Annan (1998) equally emphasizes human perspective of security when he contends that security means much more than the absence of conflict but also that lasting peace, an inherent ingredient of security should encompass areas such as education, health, democracy, human rights, the protection against environmental degradation and proliferation of deadly weapons. Indeed, there can hardly be security amidst starvation, peace building without poverty alleviation and no true freedom built on the foundation of injustice. In a closely related manner, Aligwara (2009) asserts that security of the individual citizens is the most important thing. He argues that security is for the citizens and not citizens for security. Thus, for the citizens to live in peace, the basic necessities of life such as food, good health, job opportunities, justice, freedom and all other ingredients of life must be provided.

In line with the preceding discussion, this study shifts conceptualization of security from a state-centric perspective to a broader view that places premium on individuals in which human security that embodies elements of national security, human rights and national development remains major barometer for explaining the concept of security. And, this is in tandem with the two major contending perspectives that provide the basis for the conceptualization of human security. The first one is the neo-realist theoretical framework, which is predicated on the primacy and centrality of state in conceptualizing security. It explains security from the standpoint of state primary responsibility. Within this context, Buzan (1991) argues that the 'straitjacket' militaristic approach to security that dominated the discourse during the Cold War was 'simple-minded' and subsequently led to the underdevelopment of the concept. For him, human security includes political, economic, social and environmental threats including those that are militaristic. Buzan (1991) undertakes a tripartite conceptual analysis of security based on international level, state level and individual level. He however maintains that sovereign states should remain the most effective security provider.

The second approach is a post-modernist or pluralist view that seeks to displace the state as a major provider of security but rather places greater emphasis on non-state actors. Advocates of this approach tend to argue that the concept of security goes beyond a military determination of threats. According to Booth (1994) states and implicitly governments must no longer be the primary referents of security because governments which are supposed to be the 'guardians of their people's security' have instead become the primary source of insecurity for many people who live under their sovereignty. As a result, Booth contends that human security is ultimately more important than state security. While concurring with Booth, Nwabueze (1989: 2) posits that "economic security of the individual is or should be of far greater concern to the government and society than the security of the state". Thus, some scholars seem to emphasize absence of threat to acquire values or tendencies that would undermine national cohesion and peace as criteria for determining what security connotes (see Wolfers, 1962; Oche, 2001 and David, 2006). In his view, David (2006 cited in Igbuzor, 2011: 2) argues that security is "the condition or feeling of safety from harm or danger, the defence, protection and the absence of threats to acquired values". While Wolfers (1962) surmises that security in an objective sense, measures the absence of threats to acquire values, and in subjective sense, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked.

Therefore, security is defined as "the search to avoid, prevent, reduce, or resolve violent conflict- whether the threat originates from other states, non-state actors, or structural socio-economic conditions" (Stan, 2004: 2). Deriving from the foregoing, it could be inferred that security is a sine qua non for economic growth and development of any country. Security is fundamental in the life of any nation as it attracts and propels development.

### ***The Interface between Good Governance, Peace and Security in Nigeria***

The evolution of democracy and democratic governance in Nigeria has been a turbulent one. Since independence, democratic governance in Nigeria has been devoid of what Egwu (2006) describes as the key elements of governance: accountability, transparency, openness, answerability, enforcement and responsiveness. As a result of this development, political corruption, perversion of the rule of law and due process, subversion of the institutions of accountability and transparency, reckless and rudderless political leadership, violation of human rights, authoritarianism, criminalisation of dissent, widespread impunity and personalisation of political power have become significant attributes of democratic governance in Nigeria. These governance deficits have greatly affected development and security in Nigeria. Meanwhile, the interplay of colonialism, military rule and poor leadership is central to the poor institutionalisation of good governance and the attendant security challenges in Nigeria (Abdullahi & Saka, 2007). It is within this milieu that the winner takes all nature of politics, the contradictions inherent in the character of the Nigerian state and its power to generate social tensions and violence, and entrenched economic inequality and poverty crucial to understanding the impact of governance on national security and instability in Nigeria are founded (Lewis, 2011). Though democratic governance can minimise the capacity of the socio-economic divisions and tensions in the country to undermine national security and stability, the problems of widespread unemployment, poverty, infrastructural decay, political corruption, ethno-religious conflicts, politically motivated violence and general insecurity of lives and property constantly plaguing the country under the current democratic dispensation greatly underscore the complex nature of governance in Nigeria.

Therefore, to enjoy effective peace and security in Nigeria, all hands must be on deck to ensure a link among the elements of good governance by the leadership and the people. These elements include rule of law, accountability and transparency in the management of resources, political stability, provision of basic needs and services as well as the absence of corruption. The role of leadership is very important in the governance project. The primacy of leadership in the governance project rests on the ability of the leadership to see beyond the perceptual view of the people, appreciate their needs, and inspire and motivate them to cherish and desire these needs as goals that should be achieved (Chikendu, 1987 cited in George and Eugenia, 2013: 61). Indeed, ensuring good governance for achieving peace, security and sustainable development rests with the leadership. This is dependent on the ability and capacity of the leadership to allocate scarce resources, determine policy

choices and outcomes that affect the direction and nature of development in the society.

Peace and security in any political system are better enhanced when there are elements of good governance that can make the people the very source of policies as well as the sole beneficiaries of policies. Any insensitivity to the emotions, needs, values, and aspirations of the people is a negation of peace; a negation of order and stability, and social injustice. Essentially, there is a strong relationship between good governance and security. Governance that enhances the delivery of public goods and improved standard of living for the people can guarantee improved security of lives and properties and minimise potential risks to national security (Akpan, 2010). The catastrophic episodes of poor governance evident in the perversion of the constitution and constitutionalism, subversion of the rule of law and institutions of probity and accountability, and the abuse of political power for personal aggrandizement by the political leadership in Nigeria; and the attendant devastating challenges of development, poverty, insecurity and conflict underscore the import of good governance on development and security (Egwu, 2006). By extension, the failure of governance is at the core of the socio-economic and political development challenges confronting Nigeria and the spate of violence that threatens national security (Omodia, 2012). Without doubt, good governance and security are interlinked in the sense that good governance can provide an enabling environment for peace and stability of a nation (national security), and national security on its part, can provide a conducive socio-political and economic atmosphere that will facilitate growth and development.

Mohideen (1997) suggests that governance becomes good when it is operated as conceived by society. It is the expectation that the state will practice and promote the core values of constitutionalism, respect for the rule of law and human rights, popular participation, accountability and transparency, all of which translate to probity in the management of people and resources. It is correct to say that peace, security and good governance are basic ingredients for the growth and sustenance of socio-economic and political development of any nation. This is because the three concepts can be seen as elements that are linked and tend to support and reinvigorate one another. The argument here is that the three concepts help to nurture one another. It follows that socio-economic and political development (the ability of the people to harness their potentials positively as well as enjoy socio-political stability) can be better realized through good governance. The synergy between good governance and security must be harnessed to ensure the right atmosphere for the development of Nigeria. This is hardly the case at the moment as the citizenry is confronted with such vices as terrorism, kidnapping, poverty and hunger, ethnoreligious conflicts, bad leadership, crimes, corruption and other social vices. The situation and general condition of things in Nigeria today are disturbing. The elements of good governance must be adhered to by

both political and bureaucratic leaders in Nigeria to achieve long term development, national integration, peace and progress in the country.

Besides, the multi-ethnic nature of Nigeria and the failure of the governing machinery to evolve a true nation and corresponding national identity (Ibrahim, 2002), ethnic, religious and other primordial elements have assumed points of relevance in Nigeria. In this wise, Mijah (2009) observes that the eventual transformation of identities along primordial lines and the entrenchment of negative identity politics have made ethnic and religious identities the basis of inclusion or exclusion in the distribution of national values or resources. Thus, dominant ethnic groups systematically exclude minority ethnic groups from national and even regional or state processes and opportunities for individual and collective development. Therefore, as protection of communal and group resources, ethnic nationalities have defined citizenship along the lines of indigeneity. This has created the conundrum of indigene-settler dichotomy. Consequently, indigenes claim and receive greater benefits, opportunities and resources than the settlers. In other words, this native-settler phenomenon has become an instrument for inclusion or exclusion in the distribution of available resources and opportunities (IPCR, 2003; Sanda, 2003; Mustapha, 2004). It must be pointed out clearly that the manipulation of such identities logically explains the various ethnoreligious and even communal conflicts in Nigeria such as have been witnessed in Zangon-Kataf, Ife-Modakeke, Jukun/Tiv, and Jos crises. -

The desperation for political power and by extension for unrestrained access to economic privileges has also deepened the insecurity situation in the country. The primacy of political power as a springboard to economic prosperity and higher social status has led to the militarization of politics and the society in Nigeria. This elevates violence as an instrument in the struggles of social forces as against peaceful political competition and conduct. Ake (1989: 57-58) explains the nature of politics that generates conflicts in African societies such as Nigeria thus:

The militarization of society is the outcome of the over valuing of political power in Africa and intense struggle to obtain and keep it. This transformed politics into warfare. In this competition every form of force is mobilized and deployed; the winners have the prospect of near absolute power and the losers not only forgo power but face a real prospect of losing liberty and even life.

The above simply amplifies the character of a post-colonial state such as Nigeria. The premium on power is exceptionally high and the system lacks the institutional arrangement to moderate political competition and to mediate

between classes thereby creating a fertile ground for insecurity in society. The current democratic governance in Nigeria has continued to witness repeated abuses of state power that have manifested in different forms and guises. No doubt, the political elites still see politics or state power as an avenue for primitive accumulation of wealth. This conclusion by scholars (see Anifowose, 1982; Ake, 1985; Ikpe, 2000) is still the order of the day. According to *Tell Magazine* (October 17, 2005), many public office holders in Nigeria especially state governors, ministers (past and present), members of the National Assembly, etc. are stupendously wealthy. These public officers, according to the Magazine, have huge investments both at home and abroad which cannot be explained. This basically explains why corruption has remained endemic in the country. When public officers who are supposed to be the vanguard in the fight against corruption now elevate the ignoble practice to statecraft, good governance, peace and security cannot but be at risk. From the foregoing, there is no doubt that corruption undermines and/or hampers the governance process and indeed development.

## Conclusion

Flowing from the findings, the study concludes that the current security challenges in Nigeria are attributed to governance deficit that was started by the military rule but sustained by the civilian government when the country re-democratised two decades ago. The study affirms the indispensability of good governance to peace, security, and sustainable development. It argues that there is a strong relationship between the poor state of governance in Nigeria and the widespread threats to peace and security. This is in part connected to the colonial experience, decades of military rule, zero sum character of politics and the recklessness of political leadership. Importantly, the failure of the ruling elite to provide purposeful and responsible political leadership has affected the delivery of public goods and services and undermined popular trust in the governance institutions. It is also deducible from our study that though, Nigeria transited from military dictatorship to electoral democracy, efforts at consolidating this hard-won democracy appear to have become a tall dream, not only as a result of legitimacy crisis but also due to governance deficit. The social life of the citizenry has considerably deteriorated due to high unemployment, leading to hunger and deprivation, disease and insecurity, as a result of which endemic poverty now pervades the land.

The paper contends that the only way to avert the looming chaos and violence in the society is to ensure that Nigerians feel the impact of government accountability and prudence, in the form of democratic dividends, and that every Nigerian citizen who is ready and willing to work can find gainful employment. In addition, workers should be paid commensurate wages that can cater for their immediate needs and guarantee a good living condition. This is what is considered good governance, especially in the African context where the enjoyment of basic standards of living is still considered a rarity.

Such governance springs from deep thought about how to better the lot of the downtrodden and a genuine desire to leave good legacies for future generation. This involves getting leaders that will manage the abundant resources in the country very well for the benefit of all Nigerians. It is perhaps germane to conclude this section by drawing from the comments of Achebe (1988: 130-131) who argues that “the problem with Nigeria can’t be massive corruption though its scale and pervasiveness are truly intolerable; it isn’t the subservience to foreign manipulation, degrading as it is; it isn’t even this second-class, hand me down capitalism, ludicrous and doomed”. He contends that whereas all such miseries of malice and incompetence or greed could be blamed for the prime failure of the government, with respect to Nigeria, these were not the cause; rather they were actually the effects. The cause is to be found elsewhere. According to him, the cause lies in:

the failure of our rulers to re-establish vital inner links with the poor and dispossessed of this country. It was the failure of post-colonial communities to find and insist upon means of living together by strategies less primitive and destructive than rival kinship networks, whether of ethnic clientelism or its camouflage in no less clientelist multi-party systems (Achebe, 1988: 130-131).

To ensure sustainable peace and security, actions must be taken to work towards good governance which is about equity, justice, fairness, proper implementation of people-centered policies, participatory governance, consensus building, accountability, transparency, responsiveness, effective and efficient service delivery, rule of law, a virile and active civil society, revamping of the economy and proper socialization in the society.

## References

- Abdullahi, A.A. and Saka, L. (2007) Ethno-religious and Political Conflicts: Threats to Nigeria Nascent Democracy. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 9(3): 21-36.
- Abioro, T. and Daramola, T. (2018) Governance, Human Security, Safety and Rule of Law in Nigeria’s Fourth Republic from the Twin Eye of WGI and IAG. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 8(2).
- Achebe, C. (1988) *Anthills of the Savannah*. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday.
- Adejumobi, S. (2004) Democracy, Good Governance and Constitutionalism in Africa. In S. Odion-Akin (ed.). *Governance: Nigeria and the World*. Lagos: Centre for Constitutionalism and Demilitarisation, pp. 11–22.

- Aja, A. (2007) *Basic Concepts, Issues and Strategies of Peace and Conflict Resolutions (Nigerian-African Conflict Case Studies)*. Enugu: Keny and Brothers Ent.
- Akanji, T.A., Danjibo, N.D., Eselebor, W.A. (eds.). *Challenges of Democratic Governance in Nigeria*. Ibadan: John Arches Ltd.
- Ake, C. (1985) *Political Economy of Nigeria*. London: Longman.
- Ake, C. (1989) How Politics Underdeveloped Africa. In J. Ihonbvere (ed.). *The Political Economy of Crisis and Underdevelopment in Africa: Selected Works of Clande Ake*. Lagos: Jad Publishers.
- Akpan, S.N. (2010) Governance and Communal Conflicts in a Post-democratic Nigeria: A case of the oil-producing Niger Delta Region. *Journal of African Studies and Development*, 2(3): 65-74.
- Aligwara, P.O. (2009) National Security and the Challenges of the 21st Century. In O. Mbachu and M.C. Eze (eds.). *Democracy and National Security: Issues, Challenges and Prospects*. Kaduna: Medusa Academic Publishers.
- Anifowose, R. (1982) *Violence and Politics in Nigeria: The Tiv and Yoruba Experience*. Lagos: Nok Publishers.
- Azeez, A. (2009) Contesting "Good Governance" in Nigeria: Legitimacy and Accountability Perspectives. *J Soc Sci*, 21(3): 217-224.
- Booth, K. (1994). *A Security Regime in Southern Africa: Theoretical Considerations*. *Southern African Perspectives*, No. 30, Centre for Southern African Studies, University of the Western Cape.
- Bunzan, B. (1991) *People, States, Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Chabal, C. (1992) *Power in Africa: An Essay in Political Interpretation*. New York: Saint Martins Press.
- Chikendu, P.U. (1987) Political Leadership and Nation Building in Nigeria. In Olugbemi, S.O. (ed.). *Alternative Political Future for Nigeria*, Lagos: NAPSA.
- Egwu, S.G. (2006) *Promoting the social contract through the due process mechanism: The role of the Legislature*. A lecture delivered at the Kogi State House of Assembly, Lokoja.
- Fayeye, J.O. (2011) Role of the Security Sector in Promoting Democratic Governance in Nigeria, in Violence and Peace. In P. Smoker, R. Davis and B. Munske (eds.). *A Reader in Peace Studies*, Oxford: Pergamin Press.
- Fukuyama, F. (2013) What is Governance? *Centre for Global Development (CGD)*, Working Paper 314, Washington DC, Centre for Global Development.
- Galtung, J. (1990) Cultural Violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 27(3): 27-33.
- Hornby, A.S. (1995) *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary: Students edition*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Ibeanu, O. (2005) Conceptualizing Peace. In S. Gaya Best (ed.). *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books.

- Ibrahim, J. (2002) *Consolidation of Democracy and Minority Rights in Nigeria: Religion, Sharia and the 1999 Constitution*. Paper for Politics of Development Group (PODSU), Department of Political Science, University of Stockholm Book on Rights of Groups and Differentiated Citizenship.
- Igbuzor, O. (2011) Peace and Security Education: A Critical Factor for Sustainable Peace and National Development. *International Journal of Peace and Development Studies*, 2(1).
- Institute for Peace and Conflict Resolution (IPCR) (2003) Strategic Conflict Assessment Report, Abuja.
- Johnson, I. (1997) Redefining the Concept of Governance. Gatineau, Quebec: Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).
- Madhav, G. (2007) Report of the one-man Committee on Good Governance, Human Right Watch "Election or "Selection"? *Human Rights Abuse and Threats to Free and Fair Elections in Nigeria*" <http://hrw.org/background/africa/nigeria0407/index.ht>.
- McNamara, R. (1968) *The Essence of Security*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Mijah, B.E. (2009) Democracy, Internal Security and the Challenges of Policing in Nigeria. In O. Mbachu, and C.M. Eze (eds.). *Democracy and National Security: Issues, Challenges and Prospects*. Kaduna: Medusa Academic Publishers.
- Mohideen, A. (1997) Stock taking and assessment of democracy, and good governance. Proceedings of the Development Policy Management Forum (DPME) Conference on Democracy, Civil Society and government in Africa. December 1-4, Addis Ababa Ethiopia.
- Obadan, M.I. (1998) *The State, Leadership, Governance and Economic Development*. A Presidential Address Delivered at the Annual Conference of the Nigerian Economic Society, Kano at the National Centre for Economic Management and Administration (NCEMA).
- Oburota, A. (2003) Governance as a Source of Social Violence in Africa. In O. J. Obi (Ed.). *Philosophy, Democracy and Responsible Governance in Africa*, New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, pp. 388-398.
- Oche, O. (2001) Democratization and the Management of African Security. In Akindele, R. and Ate, B. (eds.) *Nigerian Journal of International Affairs*, 13(1), Lagos: NIIA.
- Odock, C.N. (2006) *Democracy and Good Governance*. Lagos: NOUN.
- Okafor, G.O. and Malizu, C.F. (2014) Exploring the synergy of democracy and national security for good governance in Nigeria. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 19(1): 21-28.
- Omodia, S.M. & Aliu, M. (2013) Governance and Threat to National Security in Emerging Democracies: A focus on the Nigerian Fourth Republic, *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(4).

- Omodia, S.M. (2012) Political leadership and national security in the Nigerian fourth Republic: A discourse. *African Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(4): 90-96.
- Omotor, D.G. and Efayena, O. (2008) Introduction to Basic Concepts and Theories of Peace and Conflict. In A. Ohwnon, D. Omotor and A. Atubi (eds.). *Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution*. Benin City: Gofem Ventures, 1-11.
- Report of the Commission on Global Governance (1995) *Our Global Neighbourhood*. <http://www.itcilo.it/english/actrav/telearn/global/ilo/globe/gove.htm>.
- Sasmal, J. (n.d.) Size of Government, Distributive Politics and Governance: A Simple Political Choice Model in A.K. Thakur and P. Singh (eds.). *Economics of Good Governance*. New Delhi: Deep & Deep Publications Pvt. Ltd., pp. 53-65.
- Stan, F. (2004) *The Security-Development Nexus: Conflict, Peace and Development in the 21st Century*. New York: IPA Report.
- The Kampala Document (1992) Towards a Conference on Security, Stability and Cooperation. *African Leadership Forum*.
- The United Nations* (1992) Poverty Alleviation and sustainable Development: Goals in conflicts? Committee for Development Planning in its report issued from google search security: <http://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/securing> accessed on October 5, 2016.
- United Nation Development Programme (1996) Report on the Workshop on Governance for Sustainable Human Development, MDGD, New York, April UNDP (1999) *Compendium of African Governance Performance: Good Governance and Conflict Management*, New York. p. II.
- Wolfers, A. (1962) National security as an ambiguous symbol. In wolfers, A. (ed.). *Discord and collaboration. Essay*.
- World Bank (1992) Governance and Development. Washington: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.