

On Weekly Correspondence and Takes from the First Two Inaugural Classes of 2020/2021 Session

In the first two classes I had with you, I collected email addresses to enable me communicate effectively with you. Communication is important. Communication, amongst others, clears issues as well as minimise misunderstanding and conflict.

Towards this end, I drew a class member's attention to that which would have been obvious in the message I sent to him after the last class had the class member read my note prior to acknowledging receipt of the note.

Therefore, when I write I expect that you should study whatever I write and in the spirit of scholarship respond accordingly. Studying is the major reason for enrolling in any programme. Getting certificate is the testament to the study you carried out. It is important for you to begin to equip yourself with knowledge from books, journals and whatever source or sources that carries knowledge using some of the tools I developed and shared with you.

The other reason for getting your email address is to enable me tackle issues that may arise in the class. It is possible that I did not address the issue properly in the class. It is also possible that I may have had time to think about the issue better than I did in the class. Thus as time permit, I will engage with you on this on a weekly basis. This is to deepen and widen knowledge and understanding.

I expect that you should be able to learn from me and I should also learn from you. Thus we have two-way traffic. To this end and for you and I to be able to do this, we must study, think, observe and compare whatever knowledge that comes our way in the class, private study and our interaction in whatever forum. The issue of Security should be central in this.

Of the interactions that came up in the course of the last two classes, the question of definition of security on the one hand and on the other hand the place of security as dependent or independent variable in the light of my perspective to the first of the four fundamental questions (4FQs) were prominent.

Of the first issue on definition of security, I raised this as part of the methodological issues bedevilling security and security studies in Nigeria. I argued that what was security which encompassed perspective or what I called country-specific construct was a question of philosophy, legislation and policy which was the responsibility of the STATE and GOVERNMENT of Nigeria.

Nigeria, particularly of the last twenty two years, is yet to construct its perspective on security to serve as platform for interaction on security. As such, there is no perspective or definition of security in Nigeria. However, there is a security narrative in existence in Nigeria. The "security" narrative in existence represented the MILE perspective on the one hand and on the other hand the poor imitation of the Globalised Western Security Philosophy (GWSP) of the United States and Europe.

This version of security failed, is failing and will continue to fail as has been evident in the last twenty-two years. New frameworks and new constructs of security have been long overdue in Nigeria. The provision of new frameworks and new constructs of security in tandem with these frameworks will usher in new ideas, institutions and persons (IIP).

On the issue of whether security, in the context of my response to the first question of what is security, should not be considered as dependent variable, it could fall as dependent and independent variable depending on how it is used. Again until the state and the government resolve the question of philosophy, legislation and policy on security, we cannot say this for certain.

However in the context of MY FRAMEWORK (see Monograph 4 and 5), I provided what I called the three routes to attaining security in my forth coming book *security: a brief encounter in Nigeria*. The first is **security route to security**; the second is **governance route to security** and; the third is **law and order route to security**.

This construct of the three routes to attaining security derived from the critique of the prevailing MILE security perspective which failed and is failing daily. In failing to try let alone succeed in the first two routes, we have come to rely on the third route or law and order route to security. Thus from the perspective of law and order, security is a dependent variable.

The first route advocates the construct of security and the pursuit of security in policies and programmes. In this instance, security is independent and dependent variable. For example, if security is wellbeing as the state's construct and it is pursued in policies and programmes, this made security independent variable in the first instance and dependent variable in the second instance in the policies and programmes that seek to attain wellbeing or security.

The second route advocates governance route to the attainment of security. By governance, I adopted the World Bank perspective as the "effective and efficient utilisation

of human and material resources for the benefit of people." If security is wellbeing, then the pursuit of governance in every spheres of human endeavour will produce wellbeing or security. This makes governance the independent variable and security the dependent variable.

The third route advocates law and order route to security. The ideal situation, from the three security route constructs, is to try the first two routes before falling back on the third route. In the case of Nigeria, we have not tried the first two routes prior to settling for the third route. Thus we have no way of knowing the utility and viability of the first two routes. In the case of the third route, law and order is the independent variable and security is the dependent variable.

In the order I presented in Monograph 5, the first typology of security route to security combined the property of independent and dependent variable. This is an exercise in theoretical construct in the absence of state provided framework on security in the context of representative rule.

It is too early to worry about the question of particular perspective of security. The nearest one will get to perspective on security is the numerous theories of security. This will become evident when you deepen and widen your studying, thinking, observing and comparing or STOCing as you attempt to ask and answer the four fundamental questions on security in Nigeria using the Anglo-Saxon resources.

The approach recommended for this class – see Monograph 4 – is to study, think, observe and compare (STOC) extant literature – see the reading list on the course outline – in order to arrive at the understanding of the 4FQs.

STOCing the works of Anglo-Saxon scholars with several decades experience of the theory and practice of security and security studies is one way forward. This can be complemented with the tools I provided in Monograph 4.

As I noted on page 19 of Monograph 4, constructing security and security studies in Nigeria will entailed threading the path threaded by the discipline of history in Africa in the late colonial and early post-colonial periods.