

## **Governance and Security Challenges in Nigeria 2015-2019**

Journal of Management and  
Social Sciences  
© The Author 2022  
Reprints and permission  
fountainjournalmanagementandss@gmail.com

**Muideen, Usman**

Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria

### **Abstract**

The internal security challenges troubling the peaceful coexistence of Nigeria in the 21st century derive from within Nigerians. This paper examines the effect of governance on security challenges in Nigeria between 2015 and 2019. The paper adopts content analysis to investigate the nexus between governance and the security challenges confronting Nigeria. The paper is anchored on Prebendalism and Frustration Aggression Theories to provide theoretical orientation for the paper. The paper concludes that corruption and inadequacies in internal security policies are the major factors behind the security challenges in Nigeria in the period under review. The paper recommends that government at all level should truly fight against corruption, poverty, nepotism, favouritism and unemployment. If the country is to regain its peaceful coexistence that is being gradually eroded.

### **Keywords**

Governance, security challenges, corruption, internal security, Nigeria

### **Introduction**

A major responsibility of any government remains that of pursuing and maintaining the security and wellbeing of its citizens and its territory against internal insurrection and external aggression. However, since her independence from Britain on October 1st, 1960, the Nigerian state has been fraught with a plethora of political and socio-economic challenges as well as violent conflicts which have threatened the development, peace, and security of the nation. This stems largely from the overwhelming effects of defective governance on the nation and its defence sector, as well as the nature of interactions among the various ethno-religious and regional groups in the country which pursue their objectives through different means (the use of arms inclusive). Particularly the so called Islamic sect in Nigeria's Northeastern region, Boko Haram, and the activities of the Niger Delta Militant Groups whose deadly activities have posed dangers to the nation and its citizens by causing massive mortality and casualty rates, national disintegration, displacement of many families,

### **Corresponding author:**

Usman Muideen, Department of Political Science & International Studies, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria  
Email: usmanuideen13@gmail.com

destabilization of political and economic activities, and heightened insecurity and fear, as well as negatively affecting the country's global image. Boko Haram and operations of militia groups in the Niger Delta earned Nigeria a place among the least safe countries of the world (Otu and Dickson, 2017).

The link between governance and insecurity is rightly gaining increased attention as seen in the allegations against Nigerian senior officers who have been bribed to turn a blind eye to Boko Haram, or to short-change the military by providing substandard military materials (Otu and Dickson, 2017). In this vein, the poor state of security in Nigeria occasioned by the perpetration of crises and the corrupt-handling or theft of military appropriations meant for procuring the necessary equipment to confront and suppress these crises spells systemic failures and frustrates the Nigerian military's efforts at attaining national security demands (Otu and Dickson, 2017). It is against this backdrop that this paper seeks to examine the effect of governance on security challenges in Nigeria between 2015 and 2019. The paper relies on secondary data for analysis from which a logical conclusion is drawn. The sub-heading below discusses the concept of governance.

## **Conceptual Clarifications**

### ***Governance***

Governance refers to the exercise of political and administrative authority at all levels to manage a country's affairs. It comprises the mechanisms, processes and institutions, through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate their differences (CEPA, 2006). Specific reference is made to democratic governance as "a process of creating and sustaining an environment for inclusive and responsive political processes and settlements" (UNDP, 2011). The institutional and human capacities for governance determine the way in which the effectiveness of public policies and strategies is attained, especially in service delivery.

The theoretical meaning of governance is defined as directing "*the economy and society toward some collective goals*" in which the public sector is the fundamental focal point. Nevertheless, throughout the decades, the World Bank (WB) has had a few definitions of governance and in the year of 2007, the WB proposed the explanation of governance as "*the manner in which public officials and institutions acquire and exercise the authority to shape public policy and provide public goods and services*". Another definition proposes that governance is public and private activity that is "*concerned with creating the conditions for ordered rule and collective action*" (Heinrich, 2010; Kaufmann and Kraay, 2008; Peters, 2006).

In addition, it is widely agreed by other definitions, e.g. Heinrich 2010, Kaufmann and Kraay 2008 that the significance of governance lies within a state's ability to function in accordance to its regulations and in line with its customs and institutions by which power is utilized. As it is further argued that the elements dealt with in the concepts of governance can be measured, one can therefore investigate whether a state's governance is "good" or "bad". However, given the nature of measuring such capacities, it is important to take into account that no resulting measurement is free from error or has complete reliability. There are at least four broad approaches to evaluating the quality of governance: procedural measures, input measures, output measures, and measures of bureaucratic autonomy.

### **Procedural Measures**

The most classic effort to define governance in terms of procedures was Max Weber's famous characterization of modern bureaucracy in *Economy and Society* (i.e. *GDP and Infrastructure*). We continue to use the term "Weberian bureaucracy" as an ideal type to which we hope highly corrupt, neo-patrimonial states will eventually conform. It might be useful to review Weber's conditions here:

1. Bureaucrats personally free and subject to authority only within a defined area (i.e. within a geo-political entity);
2. They are organized into a clearly defined hierarchy of offices;
3. Each office has a defined sphere of competence;
4. Offices are filled by free contractual relationship;
5. Candidates selected on basis of technical qualifications;
6. Bureaucrats are remunerated by fixed salaries;
7. The office treated as the sole occupation of the incumbent;
8. The office constitutes a career;
9. There is a separation between ownership and management;
10. Officials subject to strict discipline and control.

Conditions 1-5 and 9 are probably at the core of what people think of when they talk about "modern bureaucracy": they clearly delineate such an organization from the kinds of venal or patrimonial office that existed in Europe under the Old Regime, or that exist in contemporary neo-patrimonial developing countries today (Max Weber, 1978). However, characteristics 6, 7, 8, and 10 are more problematic. Condition 6, fixed salaries, is not compatible with the kinds of incentives often offered bureaucrats under New Public Management (i.e. the salary is not static). Conditions 7 and 8 are not true of many mid-level officials in contemporary America, in both the public and private sectors. One could say that the US fails to live up to the Weberian ideal, but it does not seem likely that the quality of bureaucracy in the US would improve if it were impossible for talented individuals from the private sector or the academy to serve in government for periods of time. And condition 10 is

incompatible with civil service protection, which during the Progressive Era was seen as a hallmark of the modern bureaucracy that was replacing the patronage system (Max Weber, 1978). More importantly, condition 10 suggests that bureaucrats are simply robotic agents whose only purpose is to do the bidding of principals. The idea of bureaucratic autonomy—the notion that bureaucrats themselves can shape goals and define tasks independently of the wishes of the political executives is not possible under the Weberian definition (Fukuyama, 2013).

### ***Input Measures***

The problem with all procedural definitions of bureaucracy is that the procedures, however, defined, may not actually correlate with the positive outcomes expected from governments. We assume that a Weberian bureaucracy will produce better services than one that is highly discretionary and patrimonial; yet there may be circumstances where the latter's lack of rules results in faster and better tailored responses. Enforcement power is not part of Weber's definition; it is possible to have an impersonal, merit-based bureaucracy that nonetheless is extremely poor at getting things done. To say that a bureaucrat is selected on the basis of "merit" does not define merit, nor does it explain whether the official's skills will be renewed in light of changing conditions or technology (Fukuyama, 2013).

### ***Output Measures***

Good procedures and strong capacity are not ends in themselves. We want governments to do things like providing schooling and public health, public security and national defense. This suggests an alternative measure of government quality, a measure of final output. One could look at literacy, primary and secondary education test scores, or various measures of health to get some idea of how governments are performing (Fukuyama, 2013).

### ***Bureaucratic Autonomy***

A final measure of the quality of governance is the degree of bureaucratic autonomy possessed by the different components of the state. Huntington (2006) makes autonomy one of his four criteria of institutionalization; highly institutionalized political systems have bureaucracies with high autonomy. The opposite of autonomy in Huntington's terminology is subordination.

## ***Corruption***

Rousseau once pointed out that the legitimacy of the national public power comes from the people. The government is the executor of the sovereign. Its power comes from the people's trust and mandate. When the use of public power deviates from the original track, being abused, corruption problems arise. It accords with the definition of "the abuse of public office for private benefit". This definition is also the most widely used by scholars on the concept of corruption (Liu, 2016). There is no single definition of "corruption". It is usually defined as the corruption of public officials in the state; some of the public offices are used for bribery, corruption, extortion, fraud and other acts. But this term includes many aspects of economy, politics, culture, morality, law and so on. In recent years, the extension of corruption has continued to expand. The main body of corruption is no longer confined to the national institution. More subjects are included. For example, "academic corruption" refers to the corruption in universities and research institutions. The forms of corruption include not only public officials' personal gain behaviour but also interest exchange process, such as nepotism, nonfeasance etc. (Liu, 2016).

## ***Political Corruption and Bureaucratic Corruption***

Political corruption is any transaction between private and public sector actors through which collective goods are illegitimately converted into private-regarding payoffs (Heidenheimer et al., 1993). This definition does not, however, distinguish clearly between political and bureaucratic corruption. It establishes the necessary involvement of the state and state agents in corruption, without any notion as to the level of authority where corruption takes place (Amundsen, 1999).

In a stricter definition, *political corruption involves political decision makers*. Political or *grand* corruption takes place at the high levels of the political system. It is when the politicians and state agents, who are entitled to make and enforce the laws in the name of the people, are themselves corrupt. Political corruption is when political decision-makers use the political power they are armed with, to sustain their power, status and wealth. Thus, political corruption can be distinguished from bureaucratic or *petty* corruption, which is corruption in the public administration, at the implementation end of politics (Amundsen, 1999).

Thus, corruption can be seen as a conscious and well planned act by a person or group of persons to appropriate by unlawful means the wealth of another person or group of persons. It can also be seen as the act of turning power and authority into ready cash (Philips and Akpogighe, 2014).

Corruption occurs basically in four main forms: bribery, embezzlement, fraud and extortion (Andvig, 2000):

- i. Bribery is understood as the payment (in money or kind) that is given or taken in a corrupt relationship. Equivalent terms to bribery include, for example, kickbacks, commercial arrangements, or pay-offs. These are all notions of corruption in terms of the money or favours paid to employees in private enterprises, public officials and politicians. They are payments or returns needed or demanded to make things pass more swiftly, smoothly or more favourably through state or government bureaucracies.
- ii. Embezzlement is theft of resources by people who are responsible for administering them, e.g., when disloyal employees steal from their employers. It is not considered corruption from a strictly legal point of view, but is included in a broader definition.
- iii. Fraud is an economic crime that involves some kind of trickery, swindle or deceit. It involves manipulation or distortion of information, facts and expertise by public officials for their own profit.
- iv. Extortion is money and other resources extracted by the use of coercion, violence, or threats to use force.

Another popular way to differentiate various forms of corruption is by classifying them into petty and grand corruption. On the one hand, petty corruption is defined as street level, everyday corruption. It occurs when citizens interact with low-to mid-level public officials in places like hospitals, schools, police departments and other bureaucratic agencies. The scale of monetary transactions involved is small and primarily impacts individuals (and disproportionately the poor; (UNDP, 2008). On the other hand, grand corruption takes place at the policy formulation end of politics. It refers not so much to the amount of money involved as to the level at which it occurs (where policies and rules may be unjustly influenced). The kinds of transactions that attract grand corruption are usually large in scale. Grand corruption is sometimes used synonymously with political corruption.

### ***Insecurity***

In the view of Akin (2008) security refers to “the situation that exists as a result of the establishment of measures for the protection of persons, information and property against hostile persons, influences and actions”. It is the existence of conditions within which people in a society can go about their normal daily activities without any threats to their lives or properties. It embraces all

measures designed to protect and safeguard the citizenry and the resources of individuals, groups, businesses and the nation against sabotage or violent occurrence (Ogunleye et al., 2011). According to Igbuzor (2011) it involves safety from chronic threats and protection from harmful disruption.

Security, however, can be described as stability and continuity of livelihood (stable and steady income), predictability of daily life (knowing what to expect), protection from crime (feeling safe), and freedom from psychological harm (safety or protection from emotional stress which results from the assurance or knowing that one is wanted, accepted, loved and protected in one's community or neighbourhood and by people around. It focuses on emotional and psychological sense of belonging to a social group which can offer one protection). This description structures the concept of security into four dimensions. However, this dimension can be weaved together to give a composite definition of security as the protection against all forms of harm whether physical, economic or psychological. It is generally argued however that security is not the absence of threats or security issues, but the ability to rise to the challenges posed by these threats with experience and expertise.

Insecurity on the other hand, is the antithesis of security. However, because of this very many ways in which insecurity affects human life and existence, the concept of insecurity has usually been ascribed different interpretations in association with the various ways which it affects individuals. Some of the common descriptors of insecurity include; want of safety; danger; hazard; uncertainty; want of confidence; doubtful; inadequately guarded or protected; lacking stability; troubled; lack of protection; and unsafe, to mention a few. All of these have been used by different scholars and analysts to define the concept of insecurity. These different descriptors, however, run into a common reference to a state of vulnerability to harm and loss of life, property or livelihood. Beland (2005) defined insecurity as "the state of fear or anxiety stemming from a concrete or alleged lack of protection". It refers to lack or inadequate freedom from danger. This definition reflects physical insecurity which is the most visible form of insecurity, and it feeds into many other forms of insecurity such as economic security and social security (Achumba et al., 2013).

## **Theoretical Framework**

The paper is anchored on Prebendal and Frustration-Aggression theories in order to enhance our understanding of the governance-security challenges nexus.

### ***Prebendal Theory***

Prebendal Theory or Prebendalism refers to primitive acquisition. The concept is credited to Joseph Richard who depicts the politics of corruption in Nigeria

where cronies or members of an ethnic group are compensated when an individual from the group comes into power or where; “state offices are regarded as prebends that can be appropriated by office holders who use them to generate material benefits for themselves and their constituents and kin groups (Joseph, 1996).

This patron client or identity politics has encouraged corruption in the country to the extent that appointments, promotions, admissions, award of contracts among others are done with consideration for one’s ethnic or religious affiliations.

### ***Frustration Aggression theory (F-A)***

The frustration aggression theory which John Dollard and his research associates initially developed in 1939 and has been expanded and modified by scholars like Leonard Berkowitz (1962) and Aubrey Yates (1962) appears to be the most common explanation for violent behaviour stemming from inability to fulfill needs. Theorists who rely on this explanation use the psychological theories of motivation and behaviour, as well as frustration and aggression (Anifowose, 1982). In an attempt to explain aggression, scholars point to the difference between what people feel they want or deserve to what they actually get-the “want-get-ratio” (Fuerabends et al., 1969) and difference between “expected need satisfaction” and “actual need satisfaction” (Davies, 1962). Where expectation does not meet attainment, the tendency is for people to confront those they hold responsible for frustrating their ambitions.

The main explanation that the frustration aggression theory provides is that aggression is not just undertaken as a natural reaction or instinct as realists and biological theorists assume, but that it is the outcome of frustration and that in a situation where the legitimate desire of an individual is denied either directly or by the indirect consequence of the way the society is structured, the feeling of disappointment may lead such a person to express his anger through violence that will be directed at those he holds responsible or people who are directly or indirectly related to them (Best, 2006).

The two theories are quite relevant to this paper, in the sense that Prebendal theory explains how political corruption have been paralysing security sector in Nigeria, which gives birth to insecurity while Frustration-Aggression theory, demonstrates how the atrocities being committed by the political office holders left majority of Nigerians in frustration and there is no prospect to ameliorate their critical condition, which then forces them to resort to social vices.

## ***Causes of Insecurity in Nigeria***

### **1. Unemployment**

#### ***Unemployment Situation in Nigeria***

##### ***Unemployment Rate 2016 by National Bureau of Statistics (NBS)***

61.6% of Nigerians in the labour force (not entire population), aged 15 - 24 were either unemployed or underemployed in Q4, 2016, compared to 59.9% in Q3, 58.3% in Q2, 56.1% in Q1, and 53.5% in Q4 2015 (NBS, 2017). Of persons aged between the ages of 25 and 34, 37.5% of that group were either unemployed or underemployed in Q4, 2016 compared to 35.9% in Q3, 35.1% in Q2, 32.8% in Q1, and 31.3% in Q4 2015. Thus, out of a total youth labour force population of 40.74 million (representing 50.2% of total labour force in Nigeria of 81.15 million), a total of 19.3 million of them were either unemployed or underemployed in Q4 2016 (NBS, 2017).

##### ***Unemployment Rate 2017 by (NBS)***

Youth Unemployment Rate in Nigeria increased to 33.10% in the third quarter of 2017 from 29.50% in the second quarter of 2017. Youth Unemployment Rate in Nigeria averaged 21.73% from 2014 until 2017, reaching an all-time high of 33.10% in the third quarter of 2017 and a record low of 11.70% in the fourth quarter of 2014 (NBS, 2017).

##### ***Unemployment Rate 2018 by (NBS)***

Unemployment in the country reduced by 1.1% in the first three months of year 2018, data obtained from the National Bureau of Statistics showed. According to the statistical bulletin on formal employment and earnings for the first quarter of 2018, the average formal employment increased from 48,192 in the last quarter of 2017 to 48,708 in the first quarter of 2018, while the average earnings also increased by four per cent. The NBS said when compared with the same quarter in 2017, the formal employment and earnings showed an improvement 5.4% and 7.9%, respectively (Naira Watch, 2018).

The statistical records above indicate the rate of unemployment in Nigeria and the youths are worst affected. Despite the improvement on formal employment and earning in the first quarter of 2018. The unemployment situation is still bad in Nigeria, which leaves majority of the youths in frustration, as a result of poverty and lack of prospect to ameliorate their condition they find a means of surviving by resorting to social vices that result to insecurity.

## 2. Corruption

### ***Transparency International (TI)***

Global anti-corruption watchdog, Transparency International (TI), has again ranked Nigeria low in its 2017 Corruption Perception Index (CPI) released on Wednesday. The latest ranking has Nigeria in the 148th position out of 180. The country, according to the CPI, scored 28 out of 100, a figure lower than the average in the Sub-Saharan region. CPI score relates to perceptions of the degree of corruption as experienced by business people and analysts and ranges between 100 (highly clean) and 0 (highly corrupt).

Nigeria is the 144 least corrupt nations out of 175 countries, according to the 2018 Corruption Perceptions Index reported by Transparency International. Corruption Rank in Nigeria averaged 121.48 from 1996 until 2018, reaching an all-time high of 152 in 2005 and a record low of 52 in 1997.

## 3. Uneven development

Geographically, vast countries invariably face the problem of regional disparity because of bundle of factors that are multi-faceted in dimension. Basically, the factors can be grouped into two main categories termed the “hard and the soft” factors. The “hard” factors relate to those that cannot be changed or very slow to change. These are the natural endowments available to a country i.e. its geographical position and climate. On the other hand, the “soft” factors concern the institutional framework put in place by the governments; the policies, investments and programmes (UNDP, 2011). In Nigeria, uneven distribution of natural endowments, difference in climate and physical condition and lopsided institutional policies all translate to non-uniformity of economic opportunities available to population residing in different regions. All these put together explain the concentration of manufacturing industries, government institutions, transport terminus such as sea ports and airports and other developmental programmes in certain areas than the others.

## 4. Weak Judicial System

The scourge of corruption has overtime been described as one of the most discussed causes of under-development in any nation. But much cause for concern, is the weakness of the justice sector delivery system, the pervading low integrity of the judiciary, which is only an aspect of the justice system, has suffered greatly due to the alleged despicable acts of some members of the bench who most times collude with the bar to weaken the law thereby allowing corruption to grow on fertile ground (George, 2020).

### 5. Open borders of Nigeria

The challenges facing African states to manage their borders are compounded by globalization that is tearing down traditional borders through advancement in technology and transformation of international relations. At the moment crimes are committed without crossing borders and huge amounts of goods are sold through cyberspace. The internet has not only made it more difficult to manage borders and to combat cross-border crimes, but has also effectively dismantled borders by allowing imports without going through customs. Trans-border crimes are said to have manifested themselves with the coming of colonialism which regrouped states and communities into new nation-state with defined borders manned by law enforcement agent to protect the polity and its economy. Nigeria is a colonial creation whose final stage was the merger of southern and northern protectorates in 1914. Nigeria is known to share international land border with Benin, Niger, Chad and Cameroon, totaling about 4745sq.km. Nigeria also shares maritime boundaries with Equatorial Guinea and Sao Tome and Principe. Like other partitioned areas in Africa, the territorialisation of the Nigerian state poses some challenges that have affected the structure of interregional trade as a result of colonial and post-colonial economic system. Borderlands are both melting pots and security hot spots. Often neglected in the development strategies of postcolonial states, they are an arena for cross-border crime and represent a dynamic place of historically fostered cultural and socio-economic exchange at the same time (George, 2020).

### 6. High Influx of Arms

Proliferation of small arms and light weapons is increasingly and dangerously becoming a transnational organized crime in Nigeria with Boko Haram's insurgency, reemerging Niger Delta crisis and escalating kidnappings, communal crisis and armed robbery in the South East serving as hubs or impetus for arms trafficking. Some border towns particularly in the North Eastern flank serve as an outlet for trafficking of arms as well as centers for stolen goods, drugs and hostages perpetrated by criminals, terrorists and their collaborators (George, 2020).

It is disheartening and unfortunate that the "merchants of death" have since devised methods to beat security agencies at the borders and through the footpaths. These methods include the use of camels, donkeys and cows to traffic arms, ammunition and drugs, like cocaine into Nigeria. The fact that the weapons are small, light and collapsible makes it easy to be concealed and moved on camels and donkeys' back in a specially crafted skin or thatched bags mainly meant for the illegal "expedition" unexpected, unsuspected and therefore undetected. Similarly, some cows and grains merchants in the North-East sub – region of the country, devise means of hiding cache of arms and ammunition in empty fuel tankers, under vehicles' engines and inside bags of grains mostly undetected by security agencies at the affected border posts. The

“grains” are transported in large number via trucks, trailers, Lorries and old model pickup vans and jeeps with little attention given to them by security agents (George, 2020).

#### 7. Narcotics

No society is insulated from illicit drugs consumption and its negative consequences. Illicit drug consumption produces undesirable results which include mental disorder and deviant behaviours. It also encourages criminal activities. Contemporary security challenges in Nigeria which include criminal activities such as armed robbery, kidnapping, cultism, hooliganism, prostitution, cybercrime and violence are also associated with illicit drug abuse. Recent reports on drug abuse and drug related crimes by the police and drug law enforcement agency in the country buttress this claim (Obe, 2012). For example, Bolade Akinyele, the controller of Owo Prison in Ondo State maintained that most of the criminals convicted in Nigerian prisons are users of various drugs including cigarettes, Indian hemp, cocaine, heroin etc. (Akinyele, 2012). His assertion was corroborated by Barrister Abibu Akilu, who claimed that criminal activities among the youth which in recent times is on the rise is as a result of illicit drug use among the youth in the country (Akilu, 2012).

#### ***Analysis of effect of governance on security challenges in Nigeria***

According to Ubong (2016), for the Government to tackle insecurity, a key starting point should be to understand the causes of insecurity as well as to investigate their sources of social disorder and instability. Ubong pointed out that it is necessary to distinguish between different causes as each may require different remedy. Besides, it is to provide a holistic view to the suggestion or recommendations of solutions. More often, however, policy makers are disinclined to isolate and clarify particular causes. They prefer blanket references, with the consideration that the causes of insecurity are interwoven and contributory to one another. Like in many other societies, the sources of insecurity in Nigeria have been traced to a number of factors and explained by different people. These factors have been classified or grouped into external and internal factors. Beyond the external-internal dichotomy however, sources of insecurity have also been classified as either remote or proximate and immediate sources/causal factors. In Nigeria, the challenge is not so much about insecurity of external sources, but rather that of internal sources. We recognize that some internal factors have been enhanced and strengthened by the presence of external forces, but there is no doubt that, if the internal

situations did not present themselves, the external forces would be unable to infiltrate.

Ubong went further to expantiate on the remote (root) factors of insecurity in Nigeria. Lack of institutional capacity resulting in government failure described as the corrosion or breakdown of institutional infrastructure. The foundations of institutional framework in Nigeria are very shaky and have provoked deterioration of state governance and democratic accountability, thus, paralyzing the existing set of constraints including the formal and legitimate rules nested in the hierarchy of social order. The state of insecurity in Nigeria is greatly a function of government failure, or can be linked to government failure. This is manifested by the incapacity of government to deliver public services and to provide basic needs for the masses. The lack of basic necessities by the people in Nigeria has created a pool of frustrated people who are ignited easily by any event to be violent. The argument here, is that, Nigeria has the resources to provide for the needs of its people, but corruption in public offices at all levels has made it impossible for office holders to focus on the provision of basic public goods needs for the people Nigerian condition can be described as a 'Paradox of Plenty', that is, a situation where the country earns a great deal of revenue through oil sales, but fails to use these earnings to meet the needs of its people and to develop infrastructure as well as the economy. When these situations persist, crime rate is bound to rise and the security of lives and properties cannot be guaranteed Ubong (2016).

This dilemma is even more acute and pronounced in Nigeria. Faced with a growing increase in population explosion (Ogunleye-Adetona, 2010), and a corresponding decrease in economic productivity and political accountability, occasioned by many years of high-level political corruption, bad governance, weak institutions and absence of the wherewithal to transform abundant human and material resources, these countries turned into veritable incubation centers for the emergence of violent anti-state groups whose driving or underpinning ideology, it would seem, is antagonism against their states (Stern & Ojendal, 2010). This ideology, to a greater part, is fuelled by meaningful, purposeful and qualitative life. As a result, delegitimization process for many of them crept in whereby group loyalty, tribal and or religious, competes with state loyalty on one hand, and on the other hand, albeit the extreme one, crime, violence, anarchy, and lawlessness challenge the state's continued cohesion, stability and territorial integrity.

### ***Underdevelopment and Insecurity in Nigeria: The Three Variables***

From national security perspective, it is possible to make a number of deductions on Nigeria's threat analysis in the last decade. One, as a sovereign territorial entity, Nigeria faces no existential threat from any of its neighbors, as is the case with, say India and Pakistan, North and South Korea, or Iraq and Kuwait before the first Gulf War. In terms of military and economic

capabilities, the country towers over and above all her neighbors in such a way that declaration of open hostility is practically impossible by any of the Sub-regional countries. Although, it has for decades, maintained a love-hate relation with her eastern neighbor Cameroon over a disputed territory, the dispute has been eventually resolved by the International Court of Justice, The Hague.

Secondly, Nigeria has never been (except during Murtala and Abacha administrations) in an open altercation with any world power strong enough to invade it. But those altercations with the United States, under Murtala and Abacha, were in our opinion attempts by Nigeria to assert its independence and supremacy in Africa. Consequently, we can describe them as a competition between an established world super power and an emerging continental power for supremacy and hegemony in African affairs. Three, Nigeria's position and the respect it enjoys in the sub-Saharan Africa, akin to big brother, make it impossible as well as immoral to invade another country in the region. All its military interventions, and they are many, in foreign lands were sanctioned by international law. All these make the argument strong that the major sources of threats to Nigeria's national security will almost completely remain internal and predicated upon socio-economic and political imbalances. These challenges are structural and deeply embedded in Nigeria's socio-political and economic institutions over the previous decades. Challenges such as massive corruption, tribalism, poverty, poor governance, near-zero industrial bases, and a single-line economic sector are often described as characteristics of developing economies. While this may be true, it is important to observe that in the case of Nigeria, these characteristics have stayed very long for any purposive drive towards national development. Years of military rule, complemented with an ineffective and corrupt bureaucracy have destroyed, by the end of the last century, any semblance of political accountability and people-oriented leadership (Akilu, 2012).

## **Conclusion**

Bad governance has negative effect on the Nigerian security. Corruption, nepotism and favouritism have denied majority of the active and productive youths opportunities to be engaged in the society in one way or the other. Inadequate security policies and the failure to understand the missing link between the national interest and the security policies in Nigeria has negative effect on the security architecture of Nigeria as findings from this paper have vividly shown. This has resulted to frustration that triggers social vices which in turn worsens the security challenges.

The paper recommends that government at all levels should truly fight against corruption, poverty, nepotism, favouritism and unemployment. In order to regain our peaceful coexistence that is lost in Nigeria.

## References

- Achumba, O. S., Igbomereho, M. O. M. and Robaro, A. (2013) "Security Challenges in Nigeria and the Implication for Business Activities and Sustainable Development". *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 4(2), 79-99.
- Akin, I. O. (2008). "The Utility of Close – Circuit Television (CCTV). In intelligence Gathering by Security operatives in Nigeria". *Proceedings of conference on intelligent security Lagos*.
- Akilu, M. K. (2012). Nigeria's Security Challenges and the Crisis of Development: Towards a New Framework for Analysis. *International Journal of Developing Societies*, 1(3), 107-116.
- Amundsen, I. (1999). *Political Corruption: An Introduction to the Issues*. Chr. Michelsen Institute Development Studies and Human Rights, Norway.
- Anifowose, R. (1982). *Violence and Politics in Nigeria: The Yoruba and Tiv Experience*. New York: Nok Publishers.
- Andvig, J. C., Fjeldstad, O. H., Amundsen, I., Sissener, T. and Soreide, T. (2000). *Research on Corruption: A Policy Oriented Survey*, mimeo.
- Beland, D. (2005). "The Political Construction of Collective Insecurity. From Moral panic to Blame Avoidance and organized irresponsibility". *Centre for European studies working paper series*, 126.
- Best, S. G. (2006). *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa: A Reader*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
- Committee of Experts on Public Administration, Definition of basic concepts and terminologies in governance and public administration (E/C.16/2006/4) (New York, 2006).
- Davies, C. J. (1962). "Towards a Theory of Revolution". *American Sociological Review*.
- Dollard, J. et al. (1939). *Frustration and Aggression*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Fuerabends, I. K., Feirabends, R. and Nesvold (1969). "Social Change and Political Violence: Cross National Patterns". in Graham, H.T. and Gurr, T.R. (eds.). *The History of violence in America*, New York.
- Fukuyama, F. (2013). *What is Governance?* Working Paper 314, Center for Global Development, Washington DC.
- George, I. (2020). 10 Causes of Insecurity in Nigeria and the way out. Best News Website in Africa 2021.
- 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), 1-7, January.

- Joseph, A. R. (1996). *Democracy and Prebendal Politics in Nigeria: the Rise and fall of the Second Republic*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Liu, X. (2016). *A Literature Review on the Definition of Corruption and Factors Affecting the Risk of Corruption*. School of Government, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China.
- Max Weber (1978). *Economy and Society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, I, 220-221.
- Nigeria Fact Sheet, United States Embassy in Nigeria January, 2012.
- Ogunleye, G. O. (2011). "A computer based security framework for crime prevention in Nigeria". A paper presented at the 10<sup>th</sup> *International Conference of the Nigeria Computer Society* held from July 25th – 29th.
- Ogunleye-Adetona, C. I. (2010). Human Resources and Economic Resources in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 12(3), 204-211.
- Otu, O. D. and Dickson, D. A. (2017). Corruption and the Challenge of Boko Haram Terrorism in Nigeria: A Case of the Nigerian Armed Forces, *Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences*.
- Philips, O. O. and Akpokighe, O. R. (2014). Corruption in Nigeria: The Possible Way Out. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science*, US. 14, Issue 7, Version 1.0.
- Samuel P. Huntington (2006). *Political Order in Changing Societies*. With a New Forward by Francis Fukuyama. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. One could use the term "accountability" as the antonym for autonomy; however, accountability has certain normative implications that subordination does not.
- Stern, M. & Ojendal, J. (2010). Mapping the Security-development nexus: Conflict, Complexity, Cacophony, Convergence? *Security Dialogue*, 41(1), 5-29.
- Ubong, K. (2016). Security Challenges in Nigeria and the Implications for Business Activities and Sustainable Development. *Nigeria-South Africa Chamber of Commerce, Nigerian Orient News*.
- U4 - Anti-Corruption Resource Centre (2009). *Measuring International Trends in Corruption*. <http://www.u4.no/helpdesk/helpdesk/query.cfm?id=199>(accessed 31 July 2009).
- United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report* (2011). New York.
- Yates, A. (1962) *Frustration and Conflict*. London, Methuen.