

National Security and Good Governance in Nigeria: Interrogating the Nexus

Asanebi, Daupamowei Henry*

Department of History and International Studies
Federal University, Otuoke, Bayelsa State, Nigeria

Otoo, Rufus Dume-Yam

Centre for the Study of Leadership and Complex Military Operations
Nigerian Defence Academy, Kaduna
Hansome1159@gmail.com; 08068555773

Abstract

National security is a by-product of good governance. In societies where national security is breached the leadership or government of such society is usually characterized by corruption, self-centredness and lack of political will to entrench the tenets of good governance such as accountability, transparency and others. Political participation and responsiveness to the needs of the people, efficiency in public administration and development oriented budgeting add more value to governance. In Nigeria, national security has been breached severally, as political leaders have not been able to deliver the dividend of democracy that will ensure job creation, poverty alleviation and the protection of life and property of its citizenry. Hence Nigeria's national security had been challenged by various groups such as the Boko Haram insurgents in the North-east, militants in the oil rich Niger Delta or by the increase in herders and farmers clash over grazing land. This entirely have in one way or the other impede on Nigeria's National Security. Using available narratives and analytical approaches the paper argued that the relationship between national security and governance is indivisible, hence bad governance would possibly spell doom on any nation's national security. The paper concluded that good governance through good leadership is so important to sustained economic development, prosperity and enhanced national security. Nigerian elites have to make good governance the cornerstone of development as the Nigerian project needs rapid change in her national security and governance

Keywords: Good Governance; Insecurity; Leadership; National security.

Sécurité nationale et bonne gouvernance au Nigéria: interroger le Nexus

Abstrait

La sécurité nationale est un sous-produit de la bonne gouvernance. Dans les sociétés où la sécurité nationale est violée, les dirigeants ou les gouvernements de cette société sont généralement caractérisés par la corruption, l'égoïsme et le manque de volonté politique d'enraciner les principes de la bonne gouvernance tels que la responsabilité, la transparence et autres. La participation politique et la réactivité aux besoins de la population, l'efficacité de l'administration publique et la budgétisation axée sur le développement ajoutent de la valeur à la gouvernance. Au Nigéria, la sécurité nationale a été gravement atteinte, les dirigeants

* Address for correspondence: Asanebi, Daupamowei Henry, Department of History and International Studies
Federal University, Otuoke, Bayelsa State, Nigeria. E-Mail: daupa4real@gmail.com; Phone: 08135026310

politiques n'ayant pas été en mesure d'offrir le dividende de la démocratie qui garantira la création d'emplois, la réduction de la pauvreté et la protection de la vie et des biens de ses citoyens. Par conséquent, la sécurité nationale du Nigéria avait été mise en cause par divers groupes tels que les insurgés Boko Haram dans le nord-est, les militants du delta du Niger, riches en pétrole, ou encore par l'augmentation du nombre de pasteurs et des conflits entre agriculteurs sur les pâturages. Cela entrave d'une manière ou d'une autre la sécurité nationale du Nigéria. Utilisant des récits et des approches analytiques disponibles, le document a fait valoir que la relation entre la sécurité nationale et la gouvernance était indivisible. Par conséquent, une mauvaise gouvernance ferait peut-être craindre pour la sécurité nationale de tout pays. Le document conclut que la bonne gouvernance grâce à un bon leadership est si importante pour un développement économique durable, prospérité et sécurité nationale renforcée. Les élites nigérianes doivent faire de la bonne gouvernance la pierre angulaire du développement, le projet nigérian ayant besoin de changements rapides en matière de sécurité et de gouvernance nationales.

Mots-clés: bonne gouvernance; Insécurité; Direction; La sécurité nationale.

Introduction

Since the return to democratic governance in Nigeria in 1999, an era Samuel Huntington (1991) called the “third wave of democratization”, the nature of governance in the country has been the subject of intense debate by scholars of all divides. Admittedly, the rising concern about governance in Nigeria cannot be explained outside the country's historical experience, a history that has laid the “solid” foundation for the current wave of ethno-religious and political-economic crisis in the land. This state of affairs raises serious concerns about the question of good governance in Nigeria where the politics of deprivation and mismanagement of resources appears to be stalling over the principles of accountability, transparency and responsibility. This has thrown up security challenges in the poverty-ridden society. In his analysis, Odock (2006) assert good governance is “a system of government based on good leadership, respect for the rule of law and due process, the accountability of the political leadership to the electorate as well as transparency in the operations of government.” Transparency for Odock argued that it has to do with the leadership carrying out government business in an open, easy to understand and explicit manner, such that the rules made by government, the policies implemented by the government and the results of government activities are easy to verify by the ordinary citizens. Accountability as a component of good governance refers to the fact that those who occupy positions of leadership in the government must give account or subject themselves to the will and desire of the society and the people they lead. Unfortunately, this is lacking in the public domain in Nigeria. The questions now are: what is the explanation for bad governance in Nigeria? How can these governance deficits be corrected?

An attempt to answer these questions is what this paper has set out to achieve. The thesis of this paper is that good governance is the key instrument that oils a sustained peaceful, secured and over all development of society (National Security). In other words, the survival of the society is dependent on how its leadership and people are committed to the ideals of good governance where the atmosphere of peace, equal rights, justice, rule of law and freedom of choice prevails.

Conceptual Clarification

Good Governance

The concept of good governance is as old as civilization itself. History reveals that empires decline; states broke up, regimes collapse due to bad governance. This implies clearly that good governance is the key ability of a government to maintain control over a state. Terrible consequences of bad governance can be seen in recent history of civil unrest, terrorism and other intra-state conflicts. Governance therefore is an obligation not a choice for any elected and true representative government. Good governance should dispassionately result in decision making that is fruitful and beneficiary for the citizenry of the state and through which they feel secure and participative as if they themselves would have made those decisions (Musarrat et al 2013). Good governance is not restricted to free and fair elections, respect for human rights and the other features of democracy. It also entails efficiency and effectiveness in fulfilling the functions of the state. Thus, Good governance as an extension of governance concept means governance that is efficient, participative, transparent and accountable. There are three main dimensions of governance; economic, political and administrative governance (Abdellatif, 2003). Good governance is not limited to the delivery of financial services but it surely influences other sectors of society equally that results in a culture that promotes and encourages transparency and discourages corruption.

In recent times good governance occupies a central stage in the development discourse and is also considered as the crucial element to be incorporated in the development strategy. Apart from the universal acceptance of its importance, differences prevail in respect of theoretical formulations, policy prescriptions and conceptualization of the subject itself. It has become a truism to say that good governance is essential for successful development. According to the UNDP (1997) good governance is among other things, participatory, transparent and accountable, effective and equitable, and it promotes the rule of law in totality. It ensures that political, social and economic priorities are based on broad consensus in society and that the voices of the poorest and the most vulnerable are heard in the decision-making process over the allocation of developmental resources. Goran and Dele (2000) argued that “governance was never allowed to become a conceptual strait-jacket but was expected to function rather as a loose framework within which each researcher could creatively explore political issues of significance. The problem that we encounter, therefore, is not the limitations stemming from the imposition of a confining concept, but rather the opposite: The challenge of making sense of the wide range of interpretations of governance that the authors bring to the agenda. In essence good governance is the state of being governed by all the tenets of democracy which include transparency, equity, fairness, provision of basic amenities for survival of a state citizen, such as water, security, food, job, school among others.

National Security

In order to examine concept of National Security, it is pertinent to state that the term security is a contested concept. Scholars have differed on whether national security is all about freedom from threats to core values and the state having the protection of the military or should focus on the individual and several considerations of the international system. Traditionally, security can be defined as the protection of the territorial integrity, stability, and vital interests of states through the use of political, legal, or coercive instruments at the state or international level (Stan, 2004). With the emergence of non-state actors in the 1990s the definition of national security was broadened to include non-military threats that lead to violent conflict and affects the security of individuals, communities, and states. Such threats range from insurgency, terrorism, civil wars and resource conflicts to transnational crime and population movements. According to the International Peace Academy, the term security therefore refers to the search to avoid, prevent, reduce, or resolve violent conflicts — whether the threat

originates from other states, non-state actors, or structural socio-economic conditions (IPA, 2004).

Security is conceived as a holistic phenomenon that is not restricted to military matters but broadened to incorporate political, social, economic and environmental issues. The concept of security is not confined to states but extends to different levels of society to include people, regions and the global community. Threats to security are not limited to military challenges to state sovereignty and territorial integrity; they include poverty, oppression, social injustice and ecological degradation (IPA, 2004). The objectives of security policy therefore go beyond achieving an absence of war to encompass the attainment of democracy, sustainable economic development, social justice and protection of the environment. The state's responsibility for ensuring the security of its citizens does not lie exclusively or even predominantly with the police, military and intelligence services. It is shared by many government departments and ultimately resides with Parliament (Nathan, 1998). While the term national security have no general acceptable definition, in spite of the varieties of definitions provided by the various scholars on the concept, still remains ambiguous having originated from simpler definition which originally focused on freedom from military, threat and political coercion. National security has been described as the concern of government about the stability and safety of a state. The purpose of national security is the protection of state, values and its people. For Bello (2018), national security was initially or traditionally perceived as referring to the protection of territorial integrity of a state and the protection of its citizens from external threat with specific focus on protection against military attack. Thus, national security is the protection of citizens, national sovereignty, democratic rights, freedom, values, strategic asserts, resources and the wellbeing as well as prosperity of the state and its citizens (NSNSAA, 2015). Emmanuel (2017, p. 72) asserted that the government and its legislature should protect the state and its citizens against all kinds of national crisis through a variety of power projection, such as political, diplomatic, economic, military power amongst others. Some of the measures to be taken to ensure national security include:

Using diplomacy to rally allies and isolate threats, Mobilizing economic power to enhance or compel cooperation, Maintaining effective control of the armed force, Implementing civil defense and emergency readiness measure, including anti-terrorism legislation, Ensuring the resilience and redundancy of cultural infrastructure using intelligence service to detect and defeat or avoid threat and espionage and to protect classified information, and using counter intelligence service or secret police to protect the nation from internal attacks.

National security is concerned chiefly with defending the sovereignty, territory and political independence of the state. According to Grand Strategy for National Security of Nigeria, national security can be defined as the "aggregation of the security interests of all individuals, communities, ethnic groups, political entities and institutions that inhabits the territory of Nigeria. The goal of national security is not only focused on ensuring stability of the State and the security of the nation. But ultimately national security is the safety and well-being of its people, institutions, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the state. The elements of national security are socio-political stability, territorial integrity, economic solidarity, cultural cohesiveness, moral-spiritual consensus, peace and harmony, ecological balance etc (Aziza, 2011). National security is a state of being governed by all the tenets of democracy. It can also be seen as the safety of a territorial sovereignty as managed by the government and ruling elites of a state.

National Security and Good Governance: The Nexus

Good governance and national security are separate concepts, yet they have a relationship. To be precise, it is governance that provokes and defines the nature of security. In effect, when there is governance failure the security framework deteriorates as this has been the case in Nigeria. To ensure effective security system, there must be some necessary link between the elements of good governance by the leadership (Quino, 2010). These elements include rule of law, accountability and transparency in the management of resources, political stability, provision of basic needs and services as well as absence of corruption. The role of the good leadership is particularly important in the governance project. The primacy of good leadership in the governance project rests on the ability of the leader to see beyond the perceptual vista of the people, appreciate their needs, and inspire and motivate them to cherish and desire these needs as goals that should be achieved (George-Genyi, 2013). Indeed, good governance as a means of ensuring peace, security and sustainable development rests on the leadership. This is dependent on the ability and capacity of a leader to allocate scarce resources, determine policy choices and outcomes that affect the direction and nature of development in the society.

Nigeria's historic overview of governance presents various pitfalls as a result of bad governance in different political eras. Wherever there was any favourable economic condition, it was a direct result of reforms that were initiated to trigger an investment friendly environment. However, lack of political stability resulted in either premature termination of planned reforms or change of priorities to the extent that the net effective result was compromised (Chikendu, 1987). This however, implies that reforms lie at the core of Nigeria's economic turnaround and once this is initiated it needs continuation. Having said that, we must never forget that re-alignment, efficiency and delivering audits of reforms are of critical importance to ensure that such reforms are delivering the needed benefits to the people for whose interest these reforms are being formulated and introduced. Achievement of growth is one thing and to sustain this growth requires a committed approach because the ultimate goal of good governance is sustainable economic growth that delivers social and economic goods to the citizenry (Musarrat et al, 2013). Resultantly, it can be argued that the concept of good governance relates to the quality of the relationship between government and its citizens because of whom it exists and to whom it is bound to serve and protect.

Furthermore, the key characteristics of good governance comprises of political participation, rule of law, transparency, responsiveness, equity, effectiveness, efficiency and accountability that is supported by a strategic vision. It is important to note that all these core characteristics are interrelated and do not work as stand-alone entities. These features are all mutually reinforcing. It is becoming increasingly important to build competences through good governance education for the political elites, representative leaders and members of democratic institutions such as the executive, the legislature and the judiciary. The failure of good governance is compounded by the fact that irrespective of the fact that from what class politicians emerge, they do not have any such training to serve at the highest positions of leadership and executives. For good governance to strive there must be accountability, thus, Accountability as a component of good governance refers to the fact that those who occupy positions of leadership in the government must give account or subject themselves to the will and desire of the society and people they lead. Objectively and unfortunately, this is lacking in the public domain in Nigeria.

Governance typically emphasizes leadership which suggests the way political leaders meaning the apparatus of the state, use or misuse power, to promote social and economic development or to engage in those agendas that largely undermine the realization of the good things of life for the people. Good governance is in tandem with democratic governance which is largely characterized by high valued principles such as rule of law, accountability, participation, transparency, human and civil rights. These governance qualities have the capacity to provide the development process of a country. Speaking in Nairobi, Kenya, in

August 2006, U.S.A. former Senator Barack Obama (Immediate past President of the USA), pointed out that for all the progress that has been made, the African continent generally has not yet created a government that is transparent and accountable, one that serves its people and is free from corruption which undermines the governance process. As cited in Goerge-Genyi (2013, p.23) indeed Obama noted that:

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

Central to the concept of good governance are accountability, which denotes the effectiveness with which the governed can exercise influence over their governors. Thus, legitimacy is concerned with the right of the state to exercise power over its citizens, and the extent to which those powers are perceived to be rightly exercised, while transparency is founded on the exercise of mechanisms for ensuring public access to decision making.

Where the above factors are strictly observed there is good governance. But where they are subject to violation, there is bad governance. Good governance therefore becomes an affirmative observation of accountability, legitimacy and transparency in administrative management at whatever level(s) whether in the private or public sector. Nevertheless, some factors have been identified as being responsible for crisis of governance in Africa, or simply put, bad governance. These factors includes; corruption, self-interest and loss of political legitimacy owing to weak or undemocratic leadership. These three factors, identified as the bane for the crisis of governance in Nigeria and by extension Africa, have permeated the leadership fabrics to the level of institutionalization or near-institutionalization thereby making it very difficult for leaders to be extricated from the web of this glued administrative nemesis.

As a corollary, National Security is a cherished value associated with the physical safety of individuals, groups, or the nation-states, together with a similar safety of their most cherished values. It denotes freedom from threats, anxiety or danger. Therefore, security in an objective sense can be measured by the absence of threat, anxiety or danger. More importantly, security has a subjective sense, which can be measured by the absence of fear that threat, anxiety or danger will materialize. No matter how much safety there is in objective terms, unless there is confidence that such safety exists or will exist, there is no security. Even when no safety exists in objective terms but there is confidence that it exists, then there is likely to be security, at least in the short term. Though, Nnoli argue that this might be false security. Lasswell and Kaplan, as cited in Nnoli, described security as “high value expectancy”. This definition stresses both the subjective and speculative character of security via the usage of the term ‘expectancy’.

Furthermore, security is not a standalone concept and especially it cannot be separated from governance. It is important to note that governance is not limited to development rather it encompasses all the sectors of human society that ensure quality of life for a human being. Traditionally, security has been considered as physical means of protecting sovereignty of a state but in Westphalia model, security is constructed parallel to the protection of social order Edeh, (2014). The link between national security and good governance is vital since good governance helps prevent conflict and therefore it ensures peace, development and prosperity. This link was more clearly explained by Kant two centuries ago when he said, “People who feel secure and free, governed by the rule of law and not of men, are much less likely to go to war with each other - either within or across borders – than those who don’t” (Nnoli, 2006). It is self-explanatory that, if government is responsive to the requirements of its people and is

properly and justly utilizing available resources for the benefit of its population. By so doing the government will further strengthen its bond with the people which will lead to strong internal structure that will help promote and sustain a national security policy based on the unanimity support of the masses (Nnoli, 2006). On the contrary, bad governance causes an upsurge in internal security threats that leads to instability which certainly affects national security of a country negatively.

It is an open secret that improvements in good governance are directly linked to security and stability; as such erosion of democratic vitality can be the logical outcome of complexity and sizing problem of democratic institutions on ground (Nnoli, 2006). If the governance strategy is tilted towards consolidation of political structures, the establishment of legitimate democratic institutions, power-sharing and promotion of human rights in such a free and dynamic environment that is friendly for development and corruption free, then peace and prosperity will prevail.

Impact of Bad Governance on Nigeria's National Security

Since the inception of democratic governance in 1999, the federal government of Nigeria has done little, if not nothing, to improve on human rights and protection of its citizen's life and property as one of their cardinal responsibilities. Instead the government turns at some point threatening the wellbeing and corporate existence of their citizens as part of their mandate and statutory responsibility as contained in the constitution. Adele (2011) argued, that bad governance since Nigeria's transition to civilian rule has created enormous challenges for national security and socio-political development, as demonstrated by diverse conflicts, upheavals and anti-state/government agitations in the Niger-Delta and South-East, the menace of the Boko Haram in Northern Nigeria and the rising wave of farmers and herdsmen clashes. The roots to violence and insecurity tend to be complex, sometimes people resort to violence when they are oppressed, discriminated against, socially isolated or economically deprived etc.

Some researchers hold that poverty and inequality trigger violence (Musarrat et al, 2013). According to Awake, about 90% (percent) of all violence-related deaths have occurred in the worlds less prosperous nations; and the poorer neighborhoods of cities are often high-crime areas (AFC,1999). For Akande and Okuwa (2009) youths unemployment and poverty are playing a major role in African conflict experiences and Nigeria is no exception. The prevailing clumsy socio-economic environment is enticing youths to turn to social crime and violence as a means of livelihood. Emerging literature points to the fact that the collapse of social institutions and the failure of the economic system to generate sufficient means of livelihood for people is an explanation for youths' increasing involvement in conflicts and social crime perpetrated across Africa. In Nigeria, national security is threatened when unemployed youths are involved in violent conflicts such as ethno-religious conflicts, insurgency, terrorism and elections related conflicts.

For instance, the conflict situation in the Niger Delta is spearheaded by youths, all of whom were unemployed and poor. At the very least, there is a correlation between economic hardships (occasioned by poverty and unemployment). Hence, those accused of taking part in the orgy of violence or violent disorder are mostly youths. In all, it is discerning that unemployment pre-dispose people to poverty and the two problems co-jointly influence national security by creating insecurity situations. Therefore, the rising wave of crimes is as a result of poverty and unemployment (JW, 2012). The federal government amnesty for militants in the Niger Delta failed to address the root causes of the violence, but rather prolonging the violence if the program fails eventually in the future. Additionally the Nigeria government demonstrate lack of political will to reform the police, who were again implicated in numerous extra judicial killings of persons in custody, torture of criminal suspects, and wide spread corruption. Violent conflicts, whether social, political or environmental have seriously

contributed to the crisis situation in terms of loss of human and material capital. Nigeria in the last decade especially has experienced the breach of peace from the six geopolitical zones:

- a. North-Eastern States of Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe.
- b. In the North-West States of Kaduna, Katsina, Kano, Kebbi, Sokoto, Jigawa and Zamfara have been hard hit with conflicts.
- c. The North-Central States of Benue, Kogi, Kwara, Nasarawa, Niger and Plateau state including the FCT which is not a state however have experienced the breach of peace.
- d. The South-Western States of Lagos, Ekiti, Oyo, Osun, Ondo and Ogun too have at one time or the other during this period witnessed conflicts.
- e. In the South-South States of Akwa-Ibom, Cross River, Edo, Delta, Rivers and Bayelsa, the experience has not been any different.
- f. The South-Eastern States of Anambra, Imo, Ebonyi, and Abia have equally had their own share of violent conflicts.

Consequently, the multi-ethnic nature of Nigeria and the failure of the governing apparatus to evolve a true nation and a corresponding national identity, ethnic religious and other primordial elements have assumed points of relevance in Nigeria. Mijah, (2009) further argued that the eventual transformation of identities along primordial lines and the entrenchment of negative identity politics by the elites have made ethnic and religious identities the basis of inclusion or exclusion in the distribution of resources and power in Nigeria (Akanke & Okuwa, 2009). Thus, dominant ethnic groups systematically exclude minority ethnic groups from national and even regional or state processes and opportunities for individual and collective development are unevenly distributed. As a protection of communal and group resources, ethnic nationalities have defined citizenship along the lines of indignity. This has created the problem of indigeneship and settlers. Consequently, indigenes derive more benefits, opportunities and resources than the settlers in most states in Nigeria. In other words, this indigeneship/Settlership phenomenon has become the standard for inclusion or exclusion in the distribution of available resources and opportunities within the states. (Akwara et al, 2013). It must be pointed out succinctly that the entrenchment of this negative identity politics in Nigeria's political circle is part of the wider causality of insecurity in the country. Suffice it to say that, the structural imbalance in the ethnic, religious and regional composition of Nigeria and the manipulation of such identities logically explains the various ethno-religious and even communal conflicts in the country such as Zangon-Kataf in Kaduna, Ife-Modakeke, Jukun/Tiv, Jos Crisis, Boko Haram insurgency, Kano riot, Borno Maitatsine, among others.

Though the challenge for economic development was that, there have been several ethno religious conflicts in the history of Nigeria, but since the inception of democratic governance in 1999 these problems appeared to be escalating at an intolerable scale. Ethnic crisis and the foregoing challenges individually and collectively create insecurity and breach of peace that are likely to, or indeed affect legitimate social and economic activities in the country. Negative though but these challenges have also posed serious threats and send wrong signals to the international community that Nigeria is not a safe place to do business. The leadership and other stakeholders should provide good governance and followership to reflect and improve on the policy and institutional means of dealing with security concerns arising in the country (Ibrahim, 2002).

All these violent conflicts impeded on Nigeria's national security and contributed to the state of underdevelopment currently experienced in Nigeria. There has been loss of lives, livelihoods, destruction of infrastructure and natural resources, employment opportunities which coincides directly with a weakened social safety net and a decline in the capacity of the state to provide services such as health, education and indeed security for the people. In a sentence, the peace and security and indeed wellbeing of the people of Nigeria has been seriously compromised. For instance, bloody sectarian clashes claimed hundreds of lives in

late 2008 and 2009, while the government failed to investigate, much less hold accountable, members of the security forces implicated in numerous incidents of extra judicial killings, torture, and extortion (Mijah, 2009).

The emergence of Boko Haram insurgency in 2009 in Nigeria and the continued insurgence activities by the sect has not only paralyzed the already bastardized economy but threatens our corporate national security and existence. Like other insurgences in Nigeria, the Boko Haram has been attributed to poverty, which is also a product of bad governance (IPCR, 2003). Nigeria has the wherewithal necessary to command and even become a world power but the contrapuntal maladministration over the years had succeeded at rendering this dream illusory.

Consequently, Boko Haram is reinforcing the economic comatose of Northern Nigeria and therefore impoverishing the people the more and making life unbearable for both the indigenes and non-indigenes who perpetually live in fear thereby re-echoing the insecurity situation and forcing many out of the region (Ibrahim, 2013). Drawing from the national security theorizing, insecurity subjective exists when there is a threat of attack. Nonetheless, Boko Haram insurgency speaks volume on the economic backwardness of Nigeria while projecting serious cataclysmic consequences in the future should the insurgency even end now.

Aside the Boko Haram insurgency, another issue currently begging for attention is the herdsmen/farmers clashes and this had amplified insecurity among the Nigerian populace. A salient indicator that the conflict between pastoralists and farmers was going to become a major threat to national security manifested in Plateau State. There is no doubt that the causes of the Plateau crisis which resulted in the declaration of State of Emergency in the 2004 by the then President Olusegun Obasanjo cannot be reduced to herder- farmer conflicts alone. However, the conflict is an enduring feature of the Plateau crises, which has resulted in the “near-mutual genocide” of both groups and the displacement of more than 20,000 people to contiguous states (HRW, 2010).

Generally, conflicts between pastoralists and farmers have become endemic in several states in the North East, North West and North Central Zones of Nigeria. It is also spreading coastward with incidents recorded in Oyo and Enugu states. The North Central states, especially Plateau, Benue, Nasarawa and Taraba as well as Kaduna States are flash points due to the incessant conflicts. So far, farmers and pastoralist’s clashes have been recorded in 12 states including fringes of the FCT which indicates the pervasiveness of the threat and the violent dimension it could assume in the period ahead. The situation has begun to attract international concern as indicated by the recent visit to Nasarawa State by the US ambassador to Nigeria who expressed concern over the loss of lives and property resulting from the crises. The concern is surely not misplaced as in the first quarters of 2014, a total of 359 violent clashes were recorded with about 1,033 Nigerians killed in the North Central zone (Edeh & Ugwueze, 2014).

It has also been observed that, beginning from 2011, the frequency of clashes, threshold of violence and sophistication of weapons inventory of the belligerents, has increased exponentially. This has led to corresponding increase in number of lives lost and property destroyed. The conflict has also assumed an ethnic and religious dimension with ethnic groups in the North Central Zones importing weapons from Cameroon to balance the fire power equation between them and the pastoralists who are mostly Fulani. In the first quarter of 2014, two vehicles were intercepted in Yobe and Bauchi State respectively with 15 rifles each hidden in their compartments. The weapons were imported from Cameroon and destined for Benue State (Abbass, 2014).

It is also important to mention the seasonal trend of the crises as it has been established that more than 60% of the reported cases of conflicts between pastoralists and farmers occur during the dry season. However this trend may change in the period ahead as the herdsmen

seem to be domesticating in the North Central zone, especially along the banks of River Benue which could give the conflict an all year round outlook. This is not an isolated trend as such conflicts usually concentrate around resource endowed locations like fertile flood plains, river valleys and water points which brings up the issues of right to ownership and access.

Conclusion

The paper has in the light of objective research revealed that good governance is responsible for good national security. Despite the two concept are separated, yet they are closely related as governance provoke the security situation of a state. Thus, for any meaningful development to take place, leaders of a state must ensure peace, and security on their territorial land. The key characteristics of good governance are political participation, rule of law, transparency, equity, accountability, responsiveness and efficiency that is supported by a strategic vision. In essence both concepts are related as national security is a byproduct of good governance, as such need for growth, peace, development and prosperity of a state.

Conclusively, national security is non-existential or could be occasionally bridged in the midst of bad governance. The importance of good governance to national security cannot be over flogged. Succinctly put good governance and national security are indivisible, and the development of the capacity for good governance is the primary way to eliminate insecurity which is usually a by-product of bad governance or leadership. If good governance through good leadership is so important for sustained economic development and prosperity and enhanced national security, then Nigerians have no choice but to make good governance the cornerstone of development as the Nigeria project needs rapid change in her national security and governance.

References

- Abbas, M. I. (2014). *No retreat, no surrender: Conflict for survival between Fulani pastoralists and farmers in Northern Nigeria*. Zaria: Ahmadu Bello University.
- Abdellatif, A. M. (2003). Good governance and its relationship to democracy and economic development. *Global Forum III on fighting corruption and safeguarding integrity*. Seoul, 20-30.
- Adele, B. J. (2011). Boko Haram and democracy in Nigeria's fourth republic. *Journal of Constitutional Development*, 11 (4), 60.
- Edeh, H. C & Ugwueze, M. I (2014). Good governance, national security and economic development in Nigeria: A political diagnosis of Boko Haram insurgency. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Science*, 5 (17), 32.
- African Studies Centre, Nigeria (1999). *Odi massacre statements*. Being the Text of a Press Conference, Theme: Genocide in Oil, by Leaders of Human Rights and Civil Society Groups who visited Odi Town in Bayelsa State. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania University.
- Akande, S. O. & Okuwa, O. B. (2009). Empowering Nigerian youths for the 21st Century. *Occasional Paper No.3*, 9-15. Ibadan: NISER
- Akwara, A. F. (2013). Unemployment and poverty: Implication for national security and good governance in Nigeria. *International Journal of Public Administration & Management Research (IJPAMR)*, 2 (1), 4.
- Azizi, O. A. (2011). National security and defence, In C. O. Bassey & C. Q. Dokubo (Eds.). *Defence policy of Nigeria: Capability and context*, p. 92. Bloomington: Author House.
- Bello, F. (2018). Public policy implication on national security. <http://www.nigeria.org/journals/fatima.bello>. Accessed on the 5th of August, 2018.
- B. S. Quin, B. S. (2011). National security policy 2011-2016. *Annex Memorandum No. 6*. 21.

- Bislev, S. (2004). Globalization, state, transformation and public security. *International Political Science Review*, 25 (3), 282.
- Chikendu, P. U (1987). Political leadership and nation building in Nigeria, In S. O. Olugbemi (Eds.). *Alternative political future for Nigeria*, Lagos: NAPSA.
- Goerge-Genyi, M. E. (2013). Good governance: Antidote for peace and security in Nigeria. *Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 2 (2), 57-61.
- Goran, H. & Dele, O. (Ed.)(2000). *African perspective on governance*. Washington DC: African World Press.
- Human Rights Watch. (2010). *World report, Nigeria 2010*. Washington DC, 47: Kenneth, R.
- Huntington, S. (1991). *The third wave: Democratization in the twentieth century*, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press
- Ibrahim, J. (2002). *Consolidation of democracy and minority rights in Nigeria: Sharia and the 1999 Constitution*. Paper for Politics of Development Group (PODSU), Department of Political Science, University of Stockholm Book on Rights of Groups and Differentiated Citizenship.
- Ibrahim, A. A. (2013). Issues in security, good governance and its challenges to economic growth and development. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(16), 223- 231.
- Institute for Peace and Conflict Resolution (IPCR)(2003). *Strategic conflict assessment report*. Abuja: Lyons, S. and Reiner mann, D.
- Jehovah's Witness (2012). Will violence ever end? *Awake*, Benin City: Watch Tower Society.
- Kant, I. (1999). Practical philosophy, In M. Gregor (Eds.)Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mijah, B. E. (2009). Democracy, internal security and the challenges of policing in Nigeria. In O. Mbachu & C.M. Eze (Eds.). *Democracy and National Security: Issues, Challenges and Prospects*. Kaduna: Medusa Academic Publisher.
- Moritz, M. (2010). Understanding herder-farmers' conflict in West Africa: Outline of a procession approach. *Human Organization*, 69 (6), 8.
- Musarrat, R. Afzal, R. & M. S. Azhar. (2013). National security and good governance: Dynamics and challenges. *Journal of Public Administration and Good Governance*. 3 (1), pp. 179-182.
- Nathan, L. (1998). Good governance, security and disarmament in Africa. *African Journal of Political Science*. 3 (2), 70.
- Nigeria stability, In National Security Agencies Act (2018). Available: <http://www.nsip-nigeria.org/2005/06/08/impact>.
- Nnoli, O. (2006). *National security in Africa: A radical new perspective*. Enugu: Snaap Press Ltd.
- Odock, C. N. (2006). *Democracy and good governance*. Lagos: National Open University of Nigeria
- Stan, F. (2004). The security-development nexus: Conflict peace and development in the 21st century. New York: International Peace Academy.
- Solagberu, A.R. (2011). Management of farmer- herdsman conflicts in North-Central Nigeria: Implications for collaboration between agricultural extension service and other stakeholders. *Journal of International Agricultural Education and Extension*, 18 (1), 60-72.
- United Nations Development Programme, (1997). *Governance for sustainable human development: A policy paper*. New York: UNDP