

Presenting Models of Security Constructed off Some Countries' History, Experience and Reality (HER)

It is my firm conviction that Nigeria has no security philosophy. For the government and most Nigerians, security is simply the role of the Military, Intelligence and Law Enforcement (MILE).¹ Nigeria and Nigerians have never given SECURITY more than a practice-inclined meaning – practice associated with the work of the MILE. Nigeria and Nigerians have not bothered to look into other meanings security hold vis-à-vis comparing their practice notion of security with those of other countries.

Security is more than just the role of MILE. A careful examination of S E C U R I T Y from the etymology S E C U R E demonstrates the word contains more than Nigerians have credited it. To butt, S E C U R E and S E C U R I T Y is the de facto reason behind every human endeavour on earth. The Nigerian human endeavours cannot be an exception. The Nigerian human endeavours cannot be defined and confined to the endeavour represented by the Military, Intelligence and Law Enforcement (MILE) only.

Nigeria and Nigerians have never deemed it necessary to infuse philosophy into security beyond this practice-inclined meaning. Thus security lacks foundations in legislation and in policy. The lack and/or inability to infuse philosophy into security represent a chip off the block of a Nigeria without a Nigerian idea.² If, as I argued, Nigeria was a British security idea from its official inception in 1849 to 1960, what is Nigeria to Nigerians since the departure of Britain in 1960 to date? Is Nigeria a security idea for Nigerians? If it is, what is this security? Do most Nigerians feel secured and included in Nigeria?

The enabling laws creating the MILE from which the practice-inclined meaning of security derives describe their role as “defence”, “law enforcement” and “public order”. In a bid to drive home the need to look at security beyond its present meaning amidst security’s failure and failing, I present here models of security from different countries. The models buttress the thesis of “security based on History, Experience and Reality (HER)”.³

The theory’s central thesis is that security should be constructed from a country’s history, experience and reality (HER). In other word, security should be imbued with philosophy or nature, meaning and purpose borne out of the HER of a country. For now, security in Nigeria lacks philosophy, legislation and policy platforms. The failure and failing of security

¹ See <http://adoyionoja.org> for the article on “the acronym MILE or AFILE in the discourse of security in Nigeria”

² See the “Idea of the State” in Chapter 2 of Barry Buzan’s *Peoples, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security in the Post Cold War Era*, Wheatshelf, New York, 1991

³ For this thesis, see the article “security based on history, experience and reality (HER) in the sub-link “stripping” on <http://adoyionoja.org>

should have been enough to warn off the authority that security goes beyond the narrow role of the MILE that it has come to assume in Nigeria. This is seemingly not the case. This thesis is supported by the theory of constructivism that avers that security is socially constructed. If security is social concept and can be constructed, then security should be geared towards addressing the roots causes of the social problem in the society. Is this the case in Nigeria?

The models include the United States of America, Europe, Iran, Israel, Pakistan and North Korea. In presenting the models, I shall briefly state the followings: one, the state of security and security knowledge in Nigeria; two, the role of military, intelligence and law enforcement as the driver of this security in Nigeria; three, the reasons that this MILE-inclined security has failed, is failing and will continue to fail unless; four, Nigeria build its security essentially and particularly post 1999 on the basis of Nigeria's history, experience and reality; five, draw my conclusion by examining the models stemming from these countries history, experience and reality.

As I argued elsewhere security became the buzzword in the mid 1980s following the failure of governance to address the failing economic-inspired social, political, cultural and structural problem of Nigeria. As a result of this, the manifestations of citizens' angst with the disequilibrium between demand and supply – manifestations such as protests, demonstrations and rising crimes – became the sources of the insecurity to which the authority committed security to addressing.

Security is therefore the containment of the threat posed by the citizens to the state represented by the government in power and to other citizens with whom they are in a loggerhead. This security is threat-inclined and NOT vulnerability-inclined. Thus security is the deployment of police, soldiers, airmen and sailors or all armed agencies or that which I described as Military, Intelligence and Law Enforcement (MILE) to creating the enabling environment first for the state or its representatives and second other Nigerians. This is the type of security knowledge prevalent among most Nigerians – security as that which is associated with the work of the MILE. It is a knowledge Nigerians have not subjected to investigation and interrogation even in the light of the spectacular failure of this type of security to address that which is described as insecurity.

The military in particular helped create this security knowledge in Nigeria. They accomplished this in two respects. In the first instance and as the governing elite for the better part of Nigeria's independence from 1966 to 1999 with a brief representative rule interlude in 1979 to

1983, the military was the government. They were responsible for the crisis that created what they described as insecurity. They gave birth to security in Nigeria. From a governance perspective their handling of the complex definition of security was simplified in tandem with their professional role within the security complex. In the second place and within the context of classical security theory, the military is the bulwark of security and the Nigerian military took up this task when in their judgement they concluded that the country was faced with dire insecurity endangering the state. As government and professionals, the latter role was used to reinforce the former role and in the context of the former role, security with the MILE in the lead became etched in the consciousness of most Nigerians.

The MILE-inclined security failed. The MILE inclined security is failing. The MILE inclined security will continue to fail. The reason for this is not farfetched. Security of this type did not address the root cause or causes of the manifestations that are the enabling laws sanctioned job description of the military, intelligence and law enforcement. In other words, insecurity of the type the MILE is deployed to address is beyond their purview. Indeed at the point in the evolution of Nigeria when the MILE became involved in governance, its involvement was the height of insecurity in Nigeria.

With the commencement of representative rule in 1999, the operators have failed to examine the failure of the security model in place under the military – a security model from where they learnt security. They have been incapable or unwilling to unlearn security. They have since contrived to evolve a version of security that factored in the political and military class corporate interests in the unfolding representative rule in place. They have remained insensitive to the failing security system inherited from the military and operated by the MILE in order to begin to operate the type of security that eluded most Nigerians and to begin to build a new security of the type the governance role representative rule demand. They have refused to build security based on Nigeria's History, Experience and Reality (HER).

Nigeria particularly under civil rule must build its security based on history, experience and reality. Nigeria must understand its history – where and how it came to be; its experience from 1960 to date – how it has ruled its people and the challenges it has encountered and; its reality – poverty in the midst of plenty, structural imbalance creating injustice and thus dissatisfaction, disgruntlement and rebellion occasioned by its experience of governance since 1960 and the position of its people – in order to begin to construct a philosophy for its security. Security of the HER represents the sum total of the aspirations of its peoples represented in the missing idea of Nigeria and the pursuit of this aspiration in its governance at all levels. It is the call for a new Nigeria where security represents the commitment of the

state (the sum total of the will of Nigerians) and government (its occasional representative) to work for the interest of most Nigerians. This new security philosophy prioritising the economic welfare of most if not all Nigerians will be anchored on legislation. The policy or the take and/or the how of individual government to attaining the different objectives of this security in the different facets of Nigerians' lives will be anchored on the security legislation. Each policy of government will be required as a matter of law to have a security objective taken from the security legislation for implementation in its area of focus.

I had argued in one of the post on <http://adoyionoja.org> that in the event that this ideal security is attained, the Office of the National Security Adviser (ONSA) will transform into the agency ensuring compliance and maintenance of standard across government ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs) at the federal, states and local council levels. I proposed that a different institution that will handle the type of responsibility that the present ONSA handles – responsibility that is essentially defence oriented encapsulating the work of the MILE – would be created and called the Office of the National Defence Adviser (ONDA). The ONDA will take over the role of the present ONSA as the political appointee of the President that will liaise with the military, intelligence and law enforcement.

Indeed if security of the type I proposed comes into being and work, the role of the MILE in the complex called security would be so insignificant to require a separate agency of this nature. The current office of the Chief of Defence Staff (CDS) would be adequate to handle this matter. If the CDS is thought to be too professional an office and a civilian go-between is required, then the ONDA would be created. In any case the CDS is a political office since whatever criteria is used to select the occupant of the office pale into insignificance as the occupant is the appointee of the President and does everything within his power to protect the interest of his principal. This consideration goes for all of the services chiefs.

The models drives home the point that the circumstances or H.E.R of each country is the driving force for the type of security it constructed. I will consider these countries briefly beginning with Europe and America in this order. These two countries have done more to build security practically and theoretically in the course of the evolution of human being. I begin with Europe because without Europe there will not have been the United States of America. In fact it was the dissatisfaction of European with their economic, political and social condition – the crux of the complex called security – that gave birth to movement that created the USA.

Empires in Europe have struggled over resources of political, economic, cultural, strategic and religious types for centuries. These were the sources of the division of Europe. These empires included the Celtic, Viking, Spanish, Portuguese, French, Byzantine, Russian, Third Reich, Holy Roman, British and the complex called Habsburg, Austrian and Austro-Hungarian. These empires have contested for power and have brokered alliances in a system of balance of power that dominated European politics.

The Treaty of Westphalia of 1648 that ended the Eighty Years wars between Spain and the Dutch and the German phase Thirty Years also established the basis of the modern state system worldwide. However, the Treaty did not end the quarrels or divisions of Europeans or erase the enabling environment that made war frequent. The heights of the quarrels were the First and Second World War of the last century. In both instances, the United States of America had to enter into the affair in order to resolve the problem.

The situation convinced Europe and European countries that security lies in the might of its military in the defence of the country or ally and in forging alliances in order to be able to win wars and prevail in international relation and diplomacy.

Beginning with the end of the Second World War, European countries particularly France and Germany laid the foundation for their security systems. The European Union became the flagship of the security systems that would keep the peace alongside the Atlantic variety called the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) which included the United States of America. The EU security system seek first to create an economic bloc that would regulate the competing trading and tariff systems and political framework that seek the amicable resolution of common issues affecting European.

The NATO on the other hand unite all members of the ideological bloc that subscribe to free market and democracy ideology in the course of the Cold War that divided Europe and the world immediately after the end of the war in 1945. The European security model seeks to assure the welfare of Europeans first and secondly look out for potential source of conflict among Europeans. The security system attempts, since the end of the Cold War, to blunt the sharp edges of the numerous fault lines in European society. Among the fault lines are the Russian interests and Central European ethnic, religious and nationalities questions.

The post Cold War Europe is replete with East and Central European countries opting to join the two perspectives of security represented by the European Union (EU) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO). For long, these countries have been pawns in the

power play of bigger powers including Britain, France, Germany and Russia. They are desirous of joining these organisations to secure their material and physical insecurities.

A combination of economic, religious and political reasons led Europeans to establish the United States of America. There were other migrants that followed voluntarily from different parts of the world and others that were brought in involuntarily. The migration-for-economic-opportunity type has since defined and remained the constant rational for most migrants to America.

The attainment of the *America Dream*⁴ – the ethos of the pioneers and others who followed – and sanctioned by the five founding ideals and the charter of freedom became the security platforms of the United States. America committed itself to expanding and making accessible this America Dream through the expansion of opportunity for its citizens. The expansion of opportunity began first in the conquest of territories around its backyard, second in staying out of European and world troubles and third with the exhaustion of the first option and the intervention in the second the extension of the reach of the American state using its military, intelligence and law enforcement might anywhere and everywhere on the globe.

America's performance in the First World War but especially in the Second World War and its subsequent intervention such as the Marshall Plan in Europe and other developments with the beginning of the Cold War forced America to define security as the ability of the state to triumph over its enemies abroad. Security is the military ability of the state deployed to achieving the multiple objectives of the United States in international affairs. In 1947, the United States Congress codified this security when it passed the National Security Act.

This Act created the concept of National Security in America. The concept of National Security like most things America has gone global. National Security is used in numerous countries even if it connotes an entirely different security type and environment from those of its founding country, the United States. While national security cannot be divorced from foreign relation as the two go hand in hand in America, it is doubtful if most countries that subscribe to the use of national security do not use it essentially for domestic purpose. One such country is Nigeria where national security is invoked for domestic purpose only.

Iran is a country in the Middle East. The Middle East is a confluence of several fault lines. The Iranian state is a descendant of the Persian civilisation and represented one end of these fault

⁴ For additional perspective on the philosophy of American security, see the sub link "stripping" for "A Little New Light on the Dark and Darkening Matter Called Security in Nigeria: a Perspective on the Founding of the United States of America's Security and Lessons for Nigeria" on <http://adoyionjoa.org>

lines. Unlike most of the states of the Middle East that are Arab, Sunni and recent creation, Iran traced its descent thousands of years to the Persian Empire and is Shia. Prior to the creation of the theocratic state following the 1979 revolution, Iran or the leadership was ensconced in the American led western power orbit. The revolution changed all that as Iran retraced its steps and reconnected with its ancient heritage by holding the banner of Shia Islam. This condition became the basis for the construction of its security.

With the revolution in 1979, the relationship between Iran and its neighbours near and far changed. Iran is at loggerhead with most countries supportive of the enterprise of the United States in the Middle East and the entire Moslem world. The principal countries with which Iran is at loggerhead are Israel and Saudi Arabia. Iran's foreign policy is committed to exporting its ideology, Shia Islam and support Shia or Shia ruling class anywhere in the Moslem world. Iran and Saudi Arabia are behind the crisis in Yemen, Lebanon and to some extent the blockade of Qatar. Both Saudi Arabia and Iran support their claim to protecting Sunni and Shia anywhere and everywhere around the globe.

As America's eyes and ears in the Middle East, Israel is not on friendly relation with Iran. Israel is America's staunchest ally and Iran's enemy in the area. Israel is the Middle East's only democracy and by far the strongest military power in the region since it was created in 1948. Israel has fought several wars with different countries or coalition of countries in the area most of which it won. Security of the type that resonates in the area is that which protect and advance the power of the state on the international turf.

Iran's security orientation thus stemmed from its consideration to survive in the Middle East international stage. Security for Iran is the perception of self as a civilisation, leading Shia state, hostile relation with Saudi Arabia/allies, United States of America and Israel. Iran feels vulnerable and threatened from the presence and activities of these countries. Iran sees its security in the creation of like-minded ideologies in the countries around and in the acquisition of nuclear weapon in order to protect itself, its allies, get a voice and serve for the Shia population that which the possession of nuclear weapon by Pakistan serve for the Sunni population.

Israel was created in 1948 as a homeland for Jews. The manner of its creation left enduring bitter taste for the displaced Palestinian population and their neighbours. Thus from its inception in 1948, Israel began as a security state. Israel was vulnerable and thus threatened by its hostile neighbours. Israel has fought several wars with its neighbour aimed at destroying

the state. Israel is therefore pushed by circumstances to become the strongest military power in the area.

Israel is the United States of America's ally in the Middle East. The United States like Israel is disliked by most countries of the Middle East for its own enterprise and its support of the state of Israel. America therefore extends its security shield to the state of Israel. Security for the state of Israel is its capacity and ability to survive as a state amidst its hostile neighbours that are committed to its destruction.

Pakistan was originally part of the Indian sub continent before it was carved out in 1947. Pakistan represented the predominantly Moslem section of India. The hostility between the largely Hindu part of India and Moslem Eastern part has remained a defining point in the construction of the security of Pakistan. In 1971 as part of the unresolved hostility between India and Pakistan, the former supported the birth of another state from Pakistan – the state of Bangladesh.

Pakistan is not only unsure of its neighbour India. Pakistan feels threatened by India's economic development, disputed borders and Kashmir. These collectively become the basis of the construction of Pakistani security directed principally against India. Both Pakistan and India are the two undeclared nuclear states and both took advantage of the policy that sought to allow countries access to nuclear facility in the hope it will engender peace.

The Pakistani military especially the Inter-Service Intelligence (ISI) is central to the security orientation of the country. During the Cold War, Pakistan became a frontline state for America's involvement in Afghanistan against the defunct Soviet Union. Following the end of the Cold War and the launch of the war on terror, Pakistan retains this role for the Americans. Thus the relation with India and the frontline position has built for the military an immensely significant stake not only in the security type of Pakistan but also in the politics. The Pakistani military is central to the success or failure of governments in Pakistan.

North Korea is the other half of South Korea. The division of Korea was the product of the Cold War. During the Cold War, North Korea enjoyed security guarantee from the Soviet Union and from the Peoples Republic of China. This Soviet aspect of this security guarantee ended with the Cold War. North Korea is left to survive on its own as the last remaining communist state in the world. Thus for North Korea, security is survival as a state against the machination of pretty much the entire world. North Korea is vulnerable as the only communist state with few friends and thus feeling threatened from especially the United

States. This explains the desire of the regime in Pyongyang to acquire the nuke. The possession of nuclear weapon is the bulwark of the regime's security and thus its survival.

The thaw in relation between Pyongyang and Washington resulting in the first meeting in Singapore and the scheduled second meeting in Vietnam would not have been possible had North Korea not achieve its desire to become a nuclear state. With its ability to defend its sovereignty in the bag, North Korea is in an excellent position because it possesses the lever to threaten the United States of America directly or indirectly. North Korea's capacity to deliver its warhead into the United States was confirmed by the series of successful missile test it carried out prior to the first meeting in Singapore. North Korea can threaten Japan, South Korea and U.S troops in these countries. These countries are ally of the United States and covered by the U.S security shield.

In all these instances, some deductions can be drawn. One, the theatre of this security is the international stage. Two, all countries involved have genuine vulnerability and thus worries about their neighbours and the direction of threat they confront. Three, in choosing to fortify their military with conventional and nuclear weapons, it is to underscore the threat to the state from external sources. Four, the developing countries among the models confront internal challenges bordering on their inability to provide basic needs and grow opportunity for its population – issues that undermine their security. In spite of this, they have chosen to prioritise the external threat and thus divert resources from the internal to funding and containing the threat. The United States and Europe do not confront this essentially developing countries' challenge. For the U.S and Europe, part of its insecurity arises from its enterprise around the world directed at enhancing and maintaining high standard of living back home.

Where is Nigeria in these security models? Nigeria's theatre of security is internal. Nigeria's so-called security is not externally driven. Nigeria is not threatened by its neighbours. Nigeria's investment in its MILE driven security is not because of its neighbours. Nigeria is fortifying itself to deal with the dissatisfaction and disgruntlement of its citizens. Thus Nigeria's security is about protecting the state i.e. the political and military class against the dissatisfaction of its people.

The primary reason for the rhetoric on security in Nigeria is the inability of government and governance to provide basic needs and grow sustainable opportunity for most Nigerians. This is what security is about. The American Dream describes this security succinctly. As is common knowledge, the colossal investment on "security" in the country goes into the

pockets – the pockets being crux of that that is insecurity and thus security for most Nigerians – of the political and military elite. The political and military elite chose to create conflict in order to line their pockets and secure their lives in the name of providing security for most Nigerians.

As I noted, Nigeria's singular setback is the absence a Nigerian idea. The presence of this idea will unite all of Nigeria's nationalities because they believe in the idea. The *idea* will drive Nigeria's *institutions* that will in turn govern the *physical base*. This idea is similar to the *American Dream*⁵ that unites all the nationalities making up the United States of America. The absence of this idea is because Nigeria is yet to comprehend its History, Experience and Reality (HER). The birth of this idea is the foundation for the construction of Nigeria's security.

⁵ For more on this, read the article "A Little New Light on the Dark and Darkening Matter Called Security in Nigeria: a Perspective on the Founding of the United States of America's Security and Lessons for Nigeria" on <http://adoyionoja.org>