INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, MANAGEMENT, PEACE AND CONFLICT RESEARCH (IJSMPCR)
Journal homepage: https://ijsmpcr.com/

In search of what is security and whose responsibility should be security in Nigeria

[1]ASHINZE Philip Ikechukwu, [2]ONOJA Adoyi (Prof), and [3]ADAMA Ahmed Mohammed
By
[1-3]Department of Security and Strategic Studies, Nasarawa State University, Keffi

International Journal of Social Science, Management, Peace and Conflict Research, 2023, 2(1), 50–65
Publication history: Received on October 21, 2023; Revised on November 6, 2023; Accepted on 9 November, 2023

Abstract
This study engaged critical security theory to examine what should be security in Nigeria given the fixation with the work of the military, intelligence and law enforcement (MILE) as security. This is in the light of the democratic transition of the last almost quarter century and the need to construct or reconstruct security in the image of civil democracy. It equally looks at the lack of clarity on who has responsibility to provide security in Nigeria. The study adopts the exploratory research design with reliance on secondary data through the examination of literature on what security is and whose responsibility it is to be accountable for security. Findings from the study reveals that Nigeria does not have a clear definition of what security and security issues means apart from seeing security as the work of the military, intelligence and law enforcement agencies. Equally, revealed is that both the Constitution and various Laws do not indicate what security is and who has to be responsible for ensuring security of the citizens of the country, even as section 14(2)(b) of the Constitution merely stated that security and welfare of the citizen shall be the primary purpose of government without further specification. The study concludes that security should be the welfare and well-being of the people in line with the mandates of civil rule and governance. Thus, economic development should be a major driver of security as its attainment will lead to the welfare and well-being of citizens. Consequently, the study recommends that the Constitution (as amended) should be subject to further amendments to clearly define security as the well-being and welfare of citizens and that the three tiers of government; local, state, and federal have the responsibility to provide security to citizens, through all their policies.

Keywords: Critical Security Theory, Military, Intelligence and Law Enforcement, Responsibility, Security

Introduction

The word 'security' is used regularly in Nigeria by government officials, politicians, business people and ordinary citizens. Whether everyone who uses the word means the same thing as understood by others is an entirely different matter. Generally, government officials and most citizens tend to mean safety from something untoward, protection from harm and maintenance of law and order when they use the word 'security'. With such a mindset, 'security' is also seen as the work or profession of what Onoja, (2020) coined as the military, intelligence and law enforcement (MILE) agencies of government who are saddled with the responsibility to provide protection to lives and property, enforce obedience to laws and ensure the non-violation of the territorial integrity of the country.

In the run up to the 2023 presidential elections, MahmoodYakubu, Chairman of the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC), submitted that the nation's "security forces" have been working with the commission to provide safety for the commission's staff and election materials (Obiezu, 2023). The

*Corresponding author: **Ashinze et al.**
Department of Security and Strategic Studies, Nasarawa State University, Keffi, Nigeria.

Copyright © 2023 Author(s) retain the copyright of this article. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0.

nation's "security forces" alluded to by the INEC Chairman invariably mean the military, intelligence and law enforcement agencies whose work is seen as security.

To some politicians security means protection from removal from office. Regime protection is 'security' to some public office holders especially those who are unpopular among their citizens. Such regimes have no qualms turning their police and armies against their fellow citizens such as in the alleged use of chemical and biological weapons against its rebellious citizens in Aleppo by Syria (Arms Control Association, 2021). To the average business person, security may mean the safety of their investments in addition to law enforcement agencies and the justice system.

Personal protection is seen by some as 'security' such that those who provide home or office guard services are regarded as providing 'security'. Just as some law enforcement agents see themselves as security officers, the cadre of those who provide private guard duties tend to see themselves also as security officers. Those empowered to provide intelligence gathering and dissemination, such as the Department of State Services (DSS), see themselves as providing 'security' rather than purely actionable intelligence which is their main duty. In like manner, agencies of government who bear arms for the defense of the territorial integrity of the country, see and think themselves as providing 'security'. In the realm of information and communications technology, those who provide capabilities for protection of information assets believe that they are providing security and hence are security officers.

To some citizens, the possession of material wealth is 'security'. According to Williams and McDonald (2018) there is a philosophy of security which equates security with the accumulation of power. This accumulation could be by individuals or nations, in the form of money, property, weapons and armies.

As a result of the multiple meanings attached to the word 'security' in Nigeria, who to hold responsible for its provision remains shrouded in controversy and undefined. Many Nigerians who believe that security has only to do with protection and safety assume that it is the sole responsibility of the federal government to provide 'security' to lives and property of citizens from the murderous activities of terrorists, bandits, kidnappers and other murderous non-state actors because it has control over law enforcement and intelligence agencies and the military. The federal government is also generally called upon to provide economic security in the form of either employment or other opportunities for livelihood to citizens. Meanwhile, some officials of the federal government, such as Minister Babatunde Fashola (SAN), hold the view that 'security' is not solely the responsibility of the federal government as the extant Constitution did not have such a provision. Rather the view is held that 'security' is an all government affair of the local, state and federal governments (Fashola, 2022).

The main objective of this study is to bring to the fore the need for a shared understanding of what 'security' means in order that responsibility for its provision can be detached from the realm of uncertainty and controversy. This is specifically the case following the enthronement of civil rule in the last almost quarter century. There is a world of difference in ideas, persons and institutions compared to military rule and thus requiring re-conceptualisation to fit civilian and democracy conceptions. Other specific objectives are:

(i) To create some clarity that 'security' should be defined in a manner that is specific to a people depending on, according to Onoja (2017), their particular histories, experiences and realities (HER);
(ii) To show that the work of the military, intelligence and law enforcement agencies may not be 'security' but tools devised to achieve versions of underlying well-being and welfare of a people.
(iii) To suggest where to situate the responsibility for the provision of 'security' to citizens of Nigeria.

Literature Review

Conceptual Clarification

Security

In the view of Onoja (2018) what currently obtains in Nigeria in the name of security is about treating the effects which is actually the domain of the military, intelligence and law enforcement establishments. According to Ochoche (1997) military security or security from external attacks does not fully represent what security means. Such that for many people, in the developing countries security means, the basic level of the struggle for survival. He opines that security should encompass food security, equality of life security, technological security, social security and economic security. The phrase struggle for survival (Ochoche, 1997) coheres very closely with the idea of welfare as enunciated by Greve (2008) who sees welfare as the most possible access to economic resources, an elevated level of well-being, which will include citizens'happiness, a minimum income level sufficient to live beyond the poverty level and capacity to live a good life.

The concept of security in this paper refers to the well-being and welfare of the people who should be the main focus of all activities of government at all levels in Nigeria. The main reason for the existence of a state and the government should be the well-being and welfare of the people and therein should be security.

Responsibility

Responsibility infers having a duty to deal with, be accountable for, or control something. For example, a Nigerian public servant should ideally have a responsibility for the welfare of the Nigerian state and its citizens. Responsibility is similarly associated with trust, accountability, obligations, and reliance (Winter, 1992; Winter and Barenbaum, 1985). According to Voegtlin (2016) a most common notion of

responsibility derived from legal studies and centred on a liability model of responsibility. On the basis of this model, responsibility is assigned to particular agents knowing their actions are as causally connected to the outcome for which we seek to assign responsibility' (Young, 2003).

The study situates that responsibility refers to the liability model of responsibility in which certain agents and organs of government will be held liable for the achievement of stated objectives.

Empirical review

What is Security?

According to Williams and McDonald (2018), the concept of security is found in most societies around the world in the speeches of politicians, newspaper columns and radio waves. The images of security and insecurity are conspicuous on television screens and in the Internet. This perhaps arises because those concerned prioritize issues of interest to them as security issues to achieve immediate attention and possibly resources. Williams and McDonald (2018), however opined that security was basically associated with the mitigation of threats to adored values which if not checked will be a threat to the survival in future of a particular referent. Threats to adored or cherished values may be found in developed societies unlike a developing country, such as Nigeria, that is grappling with the basic issues of nation building and economic underdevelopment which are confronting her citizens.

Similarly, to Wolfers (1962), security, will in an objective way measure the absence of threats to acquired values while subjectively it measures the absence of fear of attack of the values. On Wolfer's (1962) view of security as the non-existence of threats to acquired values, Baldwin (1997) reformulated it to a small probability of danger to acquired values. He felt that a response to threats of military security will see states developing deterrence policies purposely to reduce the probability of an attack. While Nigeria faces very minimal military threats from her neighbours, most of the threats to the welfare and well-being of citizens of the country arise from within the country. Therefore, whilst most developed countries faced threats from outside their borders, Nigeria, as a developing country, has encountered mainly internal threats in various forms such as kidnapping, banditry, unemployment, urbanization, poor housing and health facilities, etc. The question which ought to be asked in a security discourse is what are the causes of these threats or what are the factors that give rise to them.

In the view of Ayoob (1995), security is defined as vulnerabilities whether internal or external which threaten or have the capacity to incapacitate state structures and governing regimes. This definition is purely euro-centric as its focus is essentially the state. According to Ochoche (1997) security should be viewed as not just military security or security from external attacks. He posits that to many people living

in the developing countries, security is seen as the struggle for survival. In the researcher's view security should have a single referent – the people – whose welfare and well-being should be the primary purpose of the state and all its institutions.

Robert McNamara, former US Secretary of Defence, put it succinctly in a speech in 1966 when he stated among other things, that security is development and development is security. Therefore, development in all its ramifications should lead to a continuous improvement in the welfare and well-being of citizens which ultimately should be tantamount to achievement of security (Ball, 2019, Perilocity, 2004). Consequently, it is opined that most resources should be devoted to development rather than on law enforcement, the military and intelligence agencies. It is the failure in economic development that leads to dis-satisfied citizens who may turn to all sorts of criminality which the military, intelligence and law enforcement agents may be called upon to deal with.

Buzan (1991) described security as an underdeveloped concept. Smoke (1975) stated that inadequate attention had been paid to the varied meanings of "security". The views of Buzan (1991) and Smoke (1975) remain very true in Nigeria which has very limited scholarship in security studies. Baldwin (1997) holds that security scholars during the Cold War were mainly made up of those who were interested in use of the military state affairs. In his view, if an issue required military force it was considered a security issue and if it did not then it was relegated to the level of low politics. It is this securitization strategy that obfuscates what security should mean in an under-developed country such as Nigeria. Also the long stay of the military in political leadership propagated the extant idea that whatever threatened the military hold on power was a security issue to be dealt with decisively. Thus the threats to the people to whom sovereignty belong were not considered security issues as long as the interests of the military and political ruling classes were not affected.

According to Brooks (2009) the use of the concept "security" to describe varied activities and vocations has made a clear understanding quite difficult. He examined how the concept has been described by Fischer and Green's (2004) statement that security implies a predictable environment in which an individual may pursue its affairs without harm, fear of disruption or injury; the definition by Craighead (2003) that security can be the private provision of services in the protection of people, their assets or community; and the view of Post and Kingsbury (1991) commercial security can be considered as the offer of paid services to prevent loss to an organization's assets. Furthermore, Brooks opined that security can be expanded to include national security and the defence of a nation by armed forces or use of force to control the citizens. Included, in his view, may be policing, crime prevention, security technology, risk management or loss prevention.

Therefore, the view of Brooks (2009) supported the view of Manunta (1999) that the differences in the use of the word "security" has resulted in the lack of clear understanding of what security is and that of Davidson (2005) who stated that security presents different meanings to people, which varies based on time, place and context. These views of non-specificity of the meaning of security are very much applicable to what obtains in Nigeria currently. It is so ridiculous that any citizen who wears a government provided uniform to enforce or discharge certain responsibilities of law enforcement regards themselves as security agents.

Yakubu and Mohammed (2016) set out, in their paper, to examine the concept of security from different perspectives. They reviewed the views of realists, social constructivists, neo-realists and those of human security advocates. They equally touched upon the work of the Welsh, the Copenhagen and the Paris Schools. Thereafter, they did a review of what they called the dimensions of security ranging from international security, human security, environmental security (under which they discussed water, energy and food security), transnational security, to information security and financial security. At the end, they opined that the concept of security, being very broad with different dimensions and indicators, was not an easy task to explicate. They recognized that security will have different meanings to people who live in various parts of the world as their challenges, threats and on-going experiences may not be the same. In conclusion, Yakubu and Mohammed (2016) stated that security can be divided into the Traditional Westphalian dimension and the Human dimension. Therefore, to them, security can be seen as the freedom from all sorts of threats to the existence and survival of the state, human race and other living creatures. The researchers herein hold the view that security should imply the prioritization of the welfare and well-being of citizens. The state is a social creation whose existence should be for the sole benefit of citizens.

To Onoja (2017), Nigeria's security theory should be based on her history, experience and reality in what he called "A Security Theory based on Nigeria's History, Experience and Reality (HER)". The theory states that Western and American security conceptions were purely based on their needs which arose from their histories, experiences and realities. Hence he proposed that Nigeria's security theory should evolve from the history, experience and reality of Nigerians. The views of Onoja should be self-evident as social concepts should ideally be influenced by people's experiences and their environments. Security, as a concept, should have a historical development synonymous to the experiences and realities of the people concerned.

According to Ekeh (citing Arendt, 1951) limitations to economic expansion by the ruling capitalist class in industrialized countries gave birth to imperialism. The security practices of the colonialists in the colonial territories reflected their economic interests. These practices were the outward manifestations of the

security theory of the imperialists whereas the true underlining drivers were economic and political in nature. This is exemplified by Onoja (2020) when he used the civic public and primordial public of Ekeh (1975) to analyze the practice of security in the United States of America by stating that civic public is the military, intelligence and law enforcement (MILE) representing the internationalized face of security while the primordial public is the land, market and economic resources/opportunity. The MILE merely paves the way for the acquisition of land, market and economic resources/opportunity anywhere and everywhere in the world and this is the version of security – MILE – that countries such as Nigeria take as security whilst the land, market and economic resources/opportunity are hidden (Onoja, 2020). Unfortunately, most developing countries of the South lend their military, intelligence and law enforcement agencies to the developed North in their exploitation of the economic resources of the people of the South. In some cases these developed countries prop up unpopular and undemocratic governments which essentially exist to serve the interest of the developed countries through the deployment of force to the detriment of their people.

Furthermore, Onoja (2018) holds that what currently obtains in Nigeria in the name of security is "about treating the effects" which is actually the domain of the military, intelligence and law enforcement establishments. He opines that "treating the causes" is the responsibility of government through governance at all levels. Thus, he posits that security is the political task of government in their overall responsibility of providing for the basic needs of the people. A philosophy of security, anchored on the economy, according to Onoja (2018), will begin the process of recovering institutions and people who are on the verge of a revolt. He emphasized that security should be the umbrella that houses everything and the basis of this umbrella is the economy for it is the economy that gives rise to every other sector of public and private life. He concluded that security is about the economy and economy is about the people. Onoja's assertions perhaps convey the intention of Section 14(2)(b) of the Constitution which stated that the security and welfare of the people should be the primary purpose of government. Unfortunately because of the years of military political leadership the word 'security' which comes before welfare, in the Constitution, has been mistaken to refer to prioritization of the military and other law enforcement agencies. This gives the unreasonable impression that welfare of the people is secondary to whatever is considered as security which in the case of Nigeria is seen as the work of the military, intelligence and security agencies.

At the passage of the National Social Investment Programme (Establishment, etc.) Bill 2023, (SB. 1078), the Senate President, Ahmad Lawan (2023), congratulated members and stated that no community will ever have peace if it failed to address the issue of poverty. He added that the insecurities which Nigeria faces can be attributed to very high level of poverty. In his view, therefore, it is obligatory on leaders to ensure

that poverty is alleviated in order to engender stability in the country. The statement of the Senate President seems to cohere with the view of Onoja (2018) that security is about the economy and economy is about the people. The responsibility begging for attention is for the National Assembly to make relevant laws to address the issues of high level of poverty which, as the senate president had mentioned, would take care of the existing insecurities and stabilize the country. The continued budgeting of humongous amounts to the military, intelligence and law enforcement agencies, the national assembly must recognize, is like the proverbial putting the cart before the horse.

Whose Responsibility is Security in Nigeria?

The three sources of law which are the Constitution, Acts of the National Assembly and military Decrees (during the military era in political governance) did not seem to have provided policy direction, framework or accountabilities for "security" in Nigeria (Onoja, 2022). According to Onoja (2022), he knows law enforcement as Sections 214, 215 and 216 of the Constitution and other enabling laws are the basis for holding the government to account on law enforcement. Also, he opined, defence, military or armed forces are known given Sections 217, 218, 219 and 220 of the Constitution and other enabling laws which are the basis for holding the government to account on defence. But he does not know "security" as according to him, the Constitution was silent on "security" and/or "national security". Onoja's latter view arises from his review of the fifteen mentions of "security" in the Constitution after which he found that the questions as to what security is and who should be held accountable were neither asked nor answered (Onoja, 2022).

In the view of Nwolise, as cited by Abolurin (2011), a country may have well-equipped armed forces, police and other law enforcement agencies but still be a very insecure nation arising from defence and security problems emanating from bad governance, suffering masses, unemployment and activities of foreign agents. A further look at the views of Nwolise is important here as his reference to 'defence and security' requires a search for clarification as to what this defence and security mean. To some writers, these words are used interchangeably but as used by Nwolise they seem to denote two different things. We may find help in the forest metaphor for security and tree metaphor for defence of Onoja (2022). He views security as a forest and defence as one of the many trees in the forest. According to him, "the defence tree was the least of the trees in the forest assuming every other tree took its place in the hierarchies of trees and work satisfactorily" (Onoja, 2022, p. 14). Simply put therefore, we can surmise that the problems which still persist even with the best equipped military, intelligence and law enforcement agencies are well-being and welfare issues which will entail making use of other trees in the security forest metaphor and these should fall under the responsibilities of the three tiers of government in the country.

The Nigerian Constitution (as amended) in Section 14(2)(b) provides that the security and welfare of the people shall be the primary purpose of government. Thus, Fashola (2022) was emphatic that there is nowhere in the Constitution that security is listed as the responsibility of the Federal Government or President alone. In the second schedule of the Constitution, the responsibility of the Federal Government is set out for the police, the armed forces, etc. which are law enforcement agencies, but the word security was not used (Fashola, 2022). To him security is an all-government affair going by Section 14(2) (b) of the Constitution which provides that "the security and welfare of the people shall be the primary purpose of government" as security involves more than the deployment of armed personnel but rather the effective deployment of socio-economic resources to create a state of harmony. From Fashola's perspectives, we can surmise that the police and the armed forces do not constitute security which he avers is not listed as the responsibility of the federal government alone. What then is this security (and welfare) mentioned in Section 14(2) of the Constitution? Starting from his view that security entails the effective deployment of socio-economic resources to create a state of harmony, one may interpret this to mean the deployment of resources to secure the well-being and welfare of the people which alone can provide a state of harmony. However, given how funding has been prioritized to the military, intelligence and law enforcement agencies since the advent of the 4th Republic in 1999, can we really accept that Fashola's statement on security transcending more than deployment of armed personnel to effective deployment of socio-economic resources to create a state of harmony has been the case in practice? What appears to have been at play is the prioritization of the wielders of force (the military, intelligence and law enforcement agencies) in the so-called fight against insecurity or the effort to enthrone security while relegating the effective deployment of socio-economic resources to create a harmonious state to the background.

The National Security Agencies (NSA) Act of 1986 repealed the Nigerian Security Organization (NSO) Act of 1976 and established the Defence Intelligence Agency, the National Intelligence Agency and the State Security Service. The latter is now known as the Department of State Services (DSS) though there is no known law that changed its name. On the website of the DSS it was stated, under its history and evolution, that the NSO during its existence was charged with the responsibility of timely procurement of relevant and well analyzed intelligence necessary to meet the highlighted challenges and other matters bordering on National Security. The work of the then NSO was intelligence gathering rather than security. While two of the agencies that were created by the National Security Agencies Act of 1986 had "intelligence" in their name (Defence Intelligence Agency and the National Intelligence Agency), only the third one, the State Security Service (which has changed its name), had "security" in its name. Meanwhile, an examination of its functions, both as stated in the National Security Agencies Act of 1986 and on its

website, show that these are mainly in the domain of intelligence gathering and law enforcement, which are within the responsibility of the federal government.

The appreciation by Lawan (2023) that the insecurities we face in Nigeria can be attributed to very high level of poverty and those leaders have the obligation to work to ensure alleviation of poverty comes to a close realization of what security should mean. Unfortunately, this is yet to become a state policy as the National Assembly which he leads has not found it necessary to do a thorough review of the extant security as bequeath to the country by the military when it held political power. The obligation which he expects of leaders can only become potent and accountable when there is a law that clarifies what is security and allocates responsibilities for its attainment.

Theoretical Framework

Critical Security Theory

The Realist or Traditional family security theory has been the mainstream security model among many scholars and practitioners in America and Europe and most developing countries. The main thread of the realist theory is the prioritization of the state as the referent and actor in security studies and practice. Additionally realism takes, as a given, that the international system is anarchical. On who or what is to be secured, it is the view of realists that the state has to be protected from external threats. Realists make the assumption that the people will be secure to the extent that the state is secure. This assumption may be applicable to developed Europe and America which already have matured states. It is Mutimer (2019) who raised a pertinent question about those times when states did not show interest in the security of some of their people, even deliberately harmed their citizens, or lacked the capability to provide security as can be seen in many under-developed countries.

Such a view, as expressed by Mutimer (2019), is very much discernable in Nigeria where the masses of citizens do not feel protected by their country but are rather at the receiving end of the activities of law enforcement agents in the name of enforcing security. The #Endsars protests of 2021 (Jones, 2021, Mungadi et al., 2021) were a reaction of young Nigerians to the ill treatment they were subjected by elements of the Nigeria Police Force. According to Onoja (2018), the security type imbibed by the political class excluded the rest of Nigerians as the defence-inclined security merely sought to defend the interest of the political class and their associates against the interest of Nigerians.

It is noted that traditional and critical approaches in security studies differ mostly in the treatment of the state and the international arena. The former approach sees the world from a state-centric perspective while the latter argues that states are a means and not the ends of security policy, and hence should be decentred

in scholarly studies as well as in policy practice (Booth, 1991). Nigeria, as a developing country, is still struggling with state formation as loyalties of her inhabitants are more to nations that were put together by the British colonialists to form the country. A renowned Nigerian nationalist, Awolowo, (1967) stated that Nigeria is a 'mere geographical expression'. The Nigerian state in its present state cannot in any way be equated with states in the advanced countries of Europe and America, where citizens take extreme pride in their states because of the immense benefits they gain from belonging. At best, the Nigerian state merely exists because of the Westphalian doctrine that brought about the sovereignty of states for the purpose of international interactions. In that regard the Nigerian state should be a means towards enhancing the well-being and welfare of citizens and this should be prioritized in all government policies and programs.

Mutimer (2019) further opines that questioning the referent object of security leads to questioning the over-riding focus on the threat, use and control of military force. Large, powerful and stable states such as the USA, the UK, or Canada may be only seriously threatened by war. However, people, can be threatened in all sorts of ways. This is particularly so in developing countries grappling with issues of underdevelopment which are, as a result, beset with internal challenges rather than external threats. Military force is therefore a better tool for defence in developed countries which are threatened by external wars.

To Booth (1997) security is a derived concept in which one's perspective should be derived from one's political outlook and philosophical world view. He opines that the failure to recognize this view and the consequent practices shaped by some universal conceptions of security have made the world less secure (Bilgin, 2018). Bilgin (2018) cited Cox (1981) as referring to Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937) who distinguished between 'critical theory' and 'problem-solving theory'. According to him, whereas critical theory examines an order and asks how that order came about, problem-solving theory is satisfied with fixing glitches in the prevailing system. Given the unending internal strives and challenges in Nigeria, it should be clear that a critical theory approach will be far beneficial in the efforts to unravel the causes of these strives rather than being fixated on the funding and deployment of so-called 'security' agencies (the military, intelligence and law enforcement agencies).

According to Horkheimer (1982), traditional theory makes ideas very real and presents them as unchanging facts of life. Such immutability of ideas is rejected by critical theory. Institutions are social creations which have to change in accordance with changing experiences and realities. The assumption of immutability for institutions and ideas that gave rise to them may be suitable for advanced countries but surely cannot be so for developing countries which are still struggling to build their institutions.

According to Krause and Williams (1997) Critical Security Studies seeks to accomplish three things. First is to question the referent in security which traditional theory takes as the state. States are important but people can be either secure or insecure other than through states and military power; second it will strive to show that security is more than military security as there are many other issues which impact on referents other than the state which are not amenable to military solution;and third it will deviate from the way security was being studied, especially as the objectivity claimed by traditional approaches to security is considered untenable. The researcher completely agrees and aligns this paper on the critical security paradigms. The referent for security in Nigeria should be the people whose security and welfare should be the primary purpose of government (Section 14(2). The military, intelligence and law enforcement agencies are to be seen as part of the tools for delivering security.

Ayoob (1997) opines that the state inferred in traditional security studies should be the state of the advanced, industrial North. To him the security issues of most of the countries of the world are quite similar to those which confronted most of Western European states during the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries. In other words, most less developed countries are still grappling with concerns which some Western European states experienced in the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries. Therefore the critical security theory should be a preferred option for these developing countries. It is Booth (2007) who opined that by deepening and broadening security, the approach of critical theory to security will be to examine in a comprehensive manner the questions of reality, research methodology and practice.

This paper is aligned to the critical security theory rather than the realist theory. The two key arguments of the realist school, the state as the referent and anarchical international order, may be applicable to advanced countries of the West and America. Nigeria like most developing countries is yet to become a state in the mold of those of advanced countries. Additionally, Nigeria faces very little threat from across its borders given its location and population.

Methodology

This study uses the exploratory research design to examine the meaning of the concept ‘security’ and those who have the responsibility to provide it in Nigeria. The study examines various views on ‘security’ and whose responsibility it is to provide it. It relies solely on secondary publications that are publicly available. Though most of the publications were euro-centric because of the paucity of scholarly works on what should be security in Nigeria.

Discussion of Findings

The idea of security as threat to cherished values might be the case in a developed country where the necessities and opportunities for self-actualization already exist but certainly will hardly be so in an under-developed country that is still beset by basic economic, political, social and cultural challenges and grappling with building a state. If a society is to ensure alleviation of threats to cherished values of every citizen, the boundaries of such values will be problematic. For instance, the idea of same sex marriage has become a cherished value to some individuals in a country such as the United States of America, where the Supreme Court ruled in 2005 that states could not ban same-sex marriage and in 2015, equally ruled that gay marriage was legal (Cornell Law School, 2018). Meanwhile, whilst there are some Nigerians who believe in same sex relationship, there is an extant law that criminalizes it (LawNigeria, 2020).

In the view of Ayoob (1995), security should be seen in relation to internal and external vulnerabilities which are likely to threaten, weaken or bring down a state or governing regimes. The emphasis on this definition appears to be on the state, its institutions and regimes. The people, to whom sovereignty belong are not prioritized. Most regimes, especially the military type, tend to prioritize the survival of their regime above the welfare of the citizens who are the reason the state exists in the first instance.

A country can have well trained and equipped armed forces, police force, custom men and secret agents but still be challenged with security problems which arise from poor governance, neglected masses whose lots are ignorance, hunger and unemployment (Abolurin, 2011) as can be seen in most developing countries. This view seems to amplify that the military, intelligence and law enforcement (MILE) agencies are trees in the forest going by the metaphors of security as forest and defence as one of the many trees in the forest (Onoja, 2022). If the trees related to the MILE only are being nourished while the other trees are neglected, the forest (security metaphor) will obviously be unkempt and unable to uphold the attributes of a forest.

The military, intelligence and law enforcement agencies are the face of security projected to the developing countries by the advanced countries when the real hidden driver is the economic well-being of their peoples. Nigeria should be mindful that countries in their evolution to statehood do not necessarily go through the same experiences or have the same history. The economic and political challenges which currently beset developing countries are similar to those faced by Western European countries in the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries before they achieved their on-going political and economic stability. Their current security practices should therefore not be copied hook, line and sinker in a developing country, such as Nigeria.

It is in the interest of every country to determine what security means to her, which agency or agencies of government should be held accountable for delivering the security to her people and what strategies are to be adopted from time to time.

According to 14(2)(b) of the 1999 Constitution (as amended), responsibility for 'security and welfare' of the people of Nigeria is the primary purpose of government. This provision suggests that providing security and welfare to the people of Nigeria is the responsibility of the three tiers of government, that is, the federal, state and local governments. However, the focus on the military, intelligence and law enforcement agencies as providers of security requires a fundamental shift as challenges of insecurity instead of abating have been increasing. In this regard, a home grown definition of security, reflecting the history, experience and realities of Nigeria and Nigerians should be the welfare and well-being of the people to whom the various tiers of government should be held accountable for the deployment of resources to achieve a harmonious economic development.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The study concludes that the definition and meaning of security should be country specific. Nigeria, as a developing country, should define what security is and how this security should be achieved based on its own peculiar experiences, histories and realities. Most commentators, including government officials, politicians and generality of people think that security means the work of the military, intelligence and law enforcement (MILE) agencies. This notion is a carry-over from the military which was in political leadership for many years during which it acculturated the people to think security in terms of force which is the domain of the military, intelligence and law enforcement agencies. It is this notion of security that forms the basis to believe that only the federal government has the responsibility to provide for the 'security' of Nigerians. Moreover, the control of the entire MILE is on the Exclusive List of the 1999 Constitution (as amended). However, the MILE have their clear duties fully enunciated in the Constitution and these duties were not classified as "security".

State governors generally claim that as chief security officers of their states, they have no control over the law enforcement agencies. Meanwhile, as chief security officers their primary responsibility, in a redefined conception of security as the well-being and welfare of the people, shall be the provision of policies to engender economic prosperity. Equally, the third tier of government, the local governments, should have a similar responsibility to those in their jurisdictions.

The study therefore recommends that there is a need to amend the 1999 Constitution to clearly delineate that 'security' means the welfare and well-being of citizens and that the three tiers of government are to be

held accountable for its achievement through their various economic and social policies. The military, intelligence and law enforcement agents are to be seen as part of the tools available to be deployed to this end rather than their duties being "security" and being seen as sole providers of security.

References

Abolurin, A. (2011). Para-Military Agencies and the Promotion of Good Governance for National Security in Nigeria In *Nigeria's National Security: Issues and Challenges,* Ibadan: John Archers Publishers.

Arms Control Association. (2021). Timeline of Syrian Chemical Weapons Activity, 2012-2022. Armscontrol.org/factsheets/Timeline-of-Syrian-Chemical-Weapons-Activity. Accessed February 28, 2023.

Awolowo, O. (1967). *The Path to Nigerian Freedom*. London: Faber

Ayoob, M. (1995). *The World Security Predicament: State Making, Regional Conflict, and the International System*, Boulderm CO: Lynne Rienner.

Baldwin, D. A. (1997). The Concept of Security. *Review of International Studies* https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/review-of-international-studies/article/concept-of-security/

Ball, J. (2019). What is Security? Everything.https://globalsecurityreview.com/What-is-security-everything. Accessed January 18, 2022

Bilgin, P. (2018). Critical Theory. In P. D. Williams and M. McDonald (Eds.), *Security Studies: An Introduction (3rd ed)*. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group

Booth, K. (1991). Security and Emancipation.*Review of International Studies*, 17(4)

Booth, K. (1997). Security and Self: Reflections of a Fallen Realist. In K. Krause and M.C. Williams (eds.), *Critical Security Studies*: *Concepts and Cases.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Brooks, D. J. (2009). What is Security: Definition through knowledge Categorization. S*ecurity Journal***,** Palgrave Macmillan 0955–1622

Buzan, B. (1991). *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*, 2nd Ed. Boulder CO.Cornell Law School (2018). Obergefell v. Hodges. https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/obergefell_v._hodges. Accessed August 20, 2021.

Cox, R. W. (1981). Social Forces, States, and World Orders, *Millennium*, 10(2)

Craighead, G. (2003). *High-Rise Security and Fire Life Safety*. Woburn, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann .

Davidson, M. A. (2005). A matter of degrees. *Security Management, 49*(12), 72 – 99.

Ekeh, P. P. (1975). Colonialism and the Two Publics in Africa: A Theoretical Statement. *Comparative Studies in Society and History, 17*(1)

Fashola, B. (2022). Whom am I Voting for? Keynote lecture delivered on the occasion of Of the 6th Annual BRFGABFEST.https://theeagleonline.com.ng/2023-what-am-i-voting-for-by-babatunde-raji-fashola/ Accessed July 1, 2022.

Greve, B. (2008). What is Welfare? *Central European Journal of Public Policy*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/2659160. Accessed July 20, 2022).

Horkheimer, M. (1982).Traditional and Critical Theory. *In Critical Theory: Selected Essays*. Translated by M.J. O'Connell and others. New York: Continuum.

Jones, M. (2021). Nigeria's #EndSars Protests: What Happened Next. *BBC News*, Lagos. bbc.com. Accessed April 16, 2023.

Krause, K., & Williams, M. C. (1997). From Strategy to Security: Foundations of Critical Security Studies. In K. Krause and M.C. Williams (eds.), *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lawan, A. (2023). Proceedings of the Nigerian Senate of Wednesday, 29th March, 2023.

Law Nigeria. (2020). *Same Sex (Marriage) Prohibition Act, 2014*. https://laws.lawnigeria.com/2020/01/10/same-sex-marriage-prohibition-act-2014/ Accessed January 13, 2022

Manunta, G. (1999). What is security? *Security Journal 12*(3), 57-66.

Mungadi, D. D., Kana A. A., Yusuf, A. U., Owa, F. T., Abubakar, I. A., & Onibiyo, E. R, (2021). Endsars cyber warfare protest and critical national asset and infrastructures in Nigeria. *Infokara Research Journal, 10*(3), 194-208.

Mutimer, D. (2019). Critical Security Studies: A Schismatic History. In A. Colins (ed.), *Contemporary Security Studies,* 5th Ed

Obiezu, T. (2023). Electoral Body says Nigeria Ready for Polls Despite Security Concerns.*VOA*. Voanews.com/a/electoral-body-says-nigeria-ready-for-polls-despite-security-concerns/6976362.html. Accessed February 28, 2023).

Ochoche, S (1997). Electoral violence and National Security in Nigeria. *African Peace Review, 1*(1).

Onoja, A. (2017). A Security Theory based on Nigeria's History, Experience and Reality (HER).http://www.adoyionoja.org.ng/stripping.html. Accessed March 3, 2022).

Onoja, A. (2018). *What is Security: Perspectives of Nigerians* (Monograph 1) Jos: Eiwa Press

Onoja, A. (2020). *Security: A policy Note for Nigeria* (Monograph 5). Jos: Eiwa Press.

Onoja, A. (2022). *The 1999 Constitution and the Fifteen (15) References to "Security"* (Monograph 7). Jos: Eiwa Press

Perilocity. (2004). Beyond Internet security to risk management. http://www.perilocity.com/2004/08/mcnamara_on_sec.html. Accessed January 18, 2022.

Post, R. .S., & Kingsbury, A. A. (1991). *Security Administration: An Introduction to the Protection Services* . Boston, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann

Smoke, R. (1975). National Security Affairs. In Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson W. Posby (eds.). *Handbook of Political Science,* Vol. 8: International Politics, Reading, MA.

Voegtlin, C. (2016). What does it mean to be responsible? Addressing the missing responsibility dimension in ethical leadership research. https://www.researchgate .net/publication/309756 6_What_does_it_mean_to_be_responsible_Addressing_the_missing_responsibility_dimension_in_ethical_leadership. Accessed March 4, 2023).

Williams, P. D., & McDonald, M. (2018). *Security Studies: An Introduction* (3rd Ed.). New York: Routledge

Winter, D. G. (1992) Responsibility. In: Smith CP (Ed) *Motivation and Personality: Handbook of Thematic Content Analysis.*Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 500-511.

Winter, D. G., & Barenbaum, N. B. (1985). Responsibility and The Power Motive In Women And Men. *Journal of Personality,* 53, 335-355.

Wolfers, A. (1962). *Discord and Collaboration: Essays on International Politics.* Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Yakubu, U. I., & Mohammed, S. (2016). The Concept of Security and the Emerging Theoretical Perspectives. Paper presented at the Faculty of Social Sciences, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. International Conference on the Theme "Corruption, Security and National Development.

Young, I. M. (2003). Political Responsibility and Structural Injustice. *The Lindley Lecture the UniversityofKansas*.https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/bitstream/handle/1808/12416/politicalresponsibilityandstructuralinjustice-2003.pdf?sequence=1. Accessed April 28, 2023).