NATIONAL SECURITY: AN ASSESSMENT OF CONCEPTS, STRUCTURES, AND PLANS

Ochoga Edwin Ochoga[1] & M.O. Mazdli[2]

Abstract

The essence of national security is to have peace. Thus, peace is considered the opposite of war or conflict. This study admonishes state leadership to take into consideration structural forms of violence such as poverty, exclusion oppression, humiliation and other types of socio-psychological pressures, which though not manifested in physical violence threaten the well-being and security of people. Therefore, it would be wrong to classify a country experiencing pervasive violence as peaceful or secure. It would also be wrong to say that there is peace and security in a country where ordinary people are daily brutalized by the rich and powerful. Thus, it is possible not to have peace even though there is no war. Be that as it may, the essence of national security structure and strategy is having a secure country. This is the leviathan of Nigeria and all other Westphalia states. Thus, the task of this paper is to engage with the concept of national security, structures, and plans, and to assess Nigerian security strategy before and under President Buhari.

Keywords: Democracy, National Security, Peace, Strategy, Violence

Introduction

Within the context of this paper, national security refers to the capacity of a State to pursue the realization of the fundamental needs and vital interests of man and society and to protect them from threats which may be economic, social, environmental, political, military or epidemiological. In other wise, one of the greatest challenges of

[1] Ochoga Edwin Ochoga is with the Department of Political Science, Federal University Lokoja, ochoga.ochoga@fulokoja.edu.ng

[2] Wing Commander M.O. Mazdli is with Dalet Battalon, Nigeria Defence Academy, Afaka-Kaduna

contemporary States is how to ensure peace and security. According to Francis, (2005: p.22) 'security is accepted to be about the 'condition or feeling of safety from fear, anxiety, danger, poverty and oppression, the defence, protection and preservation of core values and absence of threats to these values.' This conceptualization implies that the essence of national security is to ensure the safety and overt happiness of the nation, and its people and the preservation of lives from attacks.

Specifically, Imobighe (1990: p.87) avers that 'security has to do with freedom from danger or from threats to a nation's ability to protect and develop itself, promote its cherished values and legitimate interest.' This scholar's conceptualization of national security is socio-economic and psychological. Hence the absence of fear, anxiety, danger and poverty signifies a secure nation. However, Francis's (2005) perspective of national security did not take into consideration intangible strategic defence interests. Thus, this paper sees this as a contextual lacuna.

As a result, Imobighe (1990: p.7) took a step further and contends that 'national security in the contemporary international system is concerned with the individuals and groups, not just states alone. When individuals are not secured, then the state is not safe.' Based on this submission, the spread of unhealthy ideology could pose a security threat to nations. For instance, the emergence of the Communist States during the Cold War and the religious ideological disposition of the Boko Haram sect are good examples. Such a security threat could emanate from within or outside the State.

Therefore Kaka (2018, p: 6) asserts that 'a contemporary notion of national security also includes non-military dimensions such as social, economic and political factors. Even climate change, migration, ethnoreligious and poverty factors also constitute issues that can affect peace and security.' Kaka's (2018) perspective counteracts the traditional notion of national security, which believes that only states can pose a security threat to states. However, the scholar failed to explain further how the emergence of Violent Non-States Actors (VNSAs) has changed national security, of which national security strategic doctrine did not focus on the prism of the State alone. The end of the Cold War came with the birth of fresh perspectives on national

security. The period 1980-2000 w regard. Tsuwa and Ochoga (2016, p: 24) argue that:

> The records of carnage, brutality, pogroms, and even genocide associated with incessant civil war and other forms of violent conflicts informed the strategic change of national security in the post-Cold War period. As a result, some states like Liberia, Sierra Leone and Somalia collapsed, while many others, like the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Rwanda, and Angola, nearly collapsed.

Indeed, this paper agrees with the above submission because the causes of insecurity in most states are near to lack of justice, inadequate basic needs, and degradation of the environment. And the rise in identity crisis which became pronounced as one African country after another embarked on the construction of majoritarian democratic political arrangements. In as much as Tsuwa and Ochoga (2016) promoted the usefulness of the 'people-centred national security doctrine, they failed to explain the reasons for the change in the nation's security thrust. The article buttressed the angle to neither the security concern of the people nor the major sources of threat to the individual, group or national security. And this is a gap in the literature. To fill this gap, African States have to re-conceptualize security to address the concerns of the citizens. This concern is what the UNDP Human Development Report (2018) called the human security thrust. Based on this report, nations are to devote decisive interest to human security. This takes us to Ichho (2015) who advocated the change in national security strategy from nuclear security to human security. In this perspective, Nagasaki (2015: p76) contends that:

> for a long time, security was narrowly interpreted as security of territory from external aggression as protection of national interest in foreign policy or as global security from the threat of a nuclear holocaust. I have related it more to nation-states than to people. Forgotten, it is the legitimate concern of ordinary people

> who seek security in their daily lives. For many of them, security symbolizes protection from the threat of disease, hunger, unemployment, crime, social conflict, political repression and environmental hazards.

With this illustration, defence and security strategists rethought that the enemies of the States are not only external but also from within. The UNDP (2018) report is tailored towards this perspective when it advocated that national security strategy should also focus on internal physical and structural violence. This study agrees with the UNDP (2018) report because security constitutes safety from the threats of hunger, disease repression, and protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily lives, whether in homes, offices or communities.

Francis (2005: p.4) 'avers that this kind of security has four characteristics which include, universalism, interdependence, ease of management through early prevention and people-centeredness.' Moreso, this notion of national security implies that security has universally recognized values and every sphere of a society should be integrated and collaborated to achieve a common goal which is a secure nation. While Francis's (2005) perspective about national security focuses on both military and non-military approaches, he did not shine his searchlight to elaborate on how the inter-dependence strategy can work in democratic States. Thus, the study sees this premise as a gap in the literature.

However, the multinational approach and doctrine of national security are geared towards the potential of good governance. With the culture of good governance, every organ, tier and agency of government even the private sector and civil society would work to eliminate poverty, unemployment, injustice, illiteracy, inequality, corruption and other factors that could precipice crime and conflict capable of causing security challenges in a country. Based on this line of thought, national security is increasingly understood to be about development, justice, and fairness. Most of the threats to security in Africa are caused largely by the absence of development, justice and

fairness. Most of the threats to peace and security also emanate from real or imagined injustice, operation and exploitation. Therefore, at the national and global levels, there is now a strong link between development and security and the need for what is increasingly known as securitization of peace, which is the perception of security as peace in its broadest ramifications that this study has tried to present above.

The essence of national security is to have peace. Thus, peace is considered the opposite of war or conflict. However, though conceptualizing peace in this way is attractive, as argued by Ibeanu (2005: p.33) 'it is inadequate for understanding peace…because peace exists independent of war which is one manifestation of violence which is physical and indirect'. This study agrees with the perspective of Ibeanu (2005) because he admonished State leadership to take into consideration structural forms of violence such as poverty, exclusion oppression, humiliation and other types of socio-psychological pressures, which though are not manifested in physical violence yet threaten the well-being and security of people (Ibeanu, 2005). Therefore, it would be wrong to classify a country experiencing pervasive violence as peaceful or secure. It would also be wrong to say that there is peace and security in a country where ordinary people are daily brutalized by the rich and powerful. Thus, it is possible not to have peace even though there is no war. Be that as it may, the essence of national security structure and strategy is having a secure country. This is the leviathan of Nigeria and all other Westphalia states. Thus, the task of this paper is to engage with the concept of national security, structures, and plans, and to assess Nigerian security strategy before and under President Buhari.

Contending Views on National Security

The notion of national security is crucial to the thrust and understanding of the theme of this volume. Thus, it requires to be interrogated. Taking from Ibeanu's (2005) views, this paper dares to say that, in contemporary security studies, several factors impact peace. One of them is justice, which is recognized as a critical factor in achieving peace in societies. Where there is no justice, peace cannot

thrive and society is not secured. An added ingredient to the achievement of justice is the creation of a structure for society that allows individuals to achieve their aims. This notion takes us to the structural-functional perspective of national security. The structural-functionalists view society from the prism of the structure and organization angle in which citizens struggle to meet their needs. Thus, structure means a set of interrelated roles necessary for performing a specific function (Ibeanu, 2005). For example, border security agencies in Nigeria should do their job well to enhance the country as a secure nation, schools should be available for education, farms to produce food, industries to produce needed goods, parliament to govern, courts to adjudicate and armed forces to maintain internal security and so on.

This type of structure allows the society to achieve its objectives. Where the structure works well, societies are in harmony, stable and at peace. If not, society is fragile and at war with itself and, therefore, insecure. Proponents of this school of thought advocate and admonish nations to fashion their national security strategy in the structural and functional premise (Imobighe 1990; Francis 2015 and Alli 2008). However, structural functionalists are too optimistic about using non-military structures and institutes to strengthen national security without regard that some categories of humans have a natural urge for aggression, crime and conflict. In consequence, this is a gap which managers of national security infrastructures have to take into consideration. Also deduced from the above argument, both military and non-military approaches are required in such circumstances, as society is at peace when the structure and the institutions are put in place to perform their functions well. If border security agencies and the Nigeria Immigration Service, in particular, perform their functions well, insecurity threats arising from illegal immigration and other trans-border crimes will be reduced, then, peace and security will be assured. If not, Nigeria, for instance, would become weak and, therefore, insecure.

Another dimension to national peace and security is offered by the radical perspective. The Marxist political economy school evaluates society from the viewpoint of how it organizes production and how it

distributes the wealth created by labour. Some argue in class societies, the dominant groups do less work, yet most of the wealth of the society (Ayoob, 1991). This kind of situation creates tension in societies, leading to class struggle and class war, which again appear in different forms, from open revolution to covert forms. It often takes place in an environment of poverty, fear, anxiety and oppression, manifesting as social disobedience, insurgency, anti-establishment behaviour, terrorism and other crimes. The dominant groups, of course, respond with the means of cohesion in their possession, by deploying structural violence which undermines national peace, security, and socio-political and economic progress (Alli, 2008). The conclusion from the dialectic-materialist perspective is that national peace and security is not possible in a society divided into materially antagonistic groups or class.

Ironically, security is linked to peace. The end product of security is peace. And as such, peace has been conceptualized as a political condition that makes justice possible. Peace entails institutionalization of political structures and when this happens, the political system becomes stable. Where institutionalization is weak, what we will have, according to Ibeanu (2005: p.7) is "primacy of politics. This phrase implies that in an environment where politics has primacy, every individual or group deploys its endowments to pursue and enforce its interest." This is why political struggle within the dominant class, according to Ake (1989: p.74):

> is intense and normless. With the premium on power exceptionally high, the class constantly endangers itself by engaging in a ceaseless struggle in which all seek power without limitation as to means and exercise whatever power they have without restraint except that arising from self-interest.

This paper agrees with Ake (1989), Ayoob (1991) and Alli (2008) on the premise that to create peace and ensure security, politics must be mediated by stable structures. In such a society, the government approximates the interest of the wider population, and uses and applies force minimally, while citizens become more rational. However, the

dialectical-materialist perspective to national security is pessimistic towards national security hence the history of every hitherto existing is a history of class and class struggle (Avineri, 1969). The proponents of this school of thought advocated for classless societies as a panacea for tranquillity and security in any society. However, they can be criticized because it is only the Marxist utopia communist and communal societies that are hypothetically classless. Just as slavery society negated communalism, capitalism (through colonialism in the Nigerian context) negated feudalism. Now, Nigerian society has transcended to a global society known as globalization. Since the central thesis of the dialectical materialists' perspective to national security is premised on classless society as a recipe for national peace and security, then according to the proponents, national security is nothing but an illusion in the global society which is characterized by the existence of classes. Therefore, this apotheosis remains a source of criticism in peace and security studies and this study upholds it.

Contemporary security studies are being dominated by internal conflicts and crimes as emerging trends of Nigerian national security (McNamara1968; Ochoche 1997). It has argued that in these circumstances; it is wrong to continue to view national security from external enemies of the State (Ochoga 2022). The internal enemies of the people also pose threats to national peace and security. Thus, this point of departure takes us to examine the old and new perspectives on national peace and security. The focus of the old perspective on national security is rooted in the security challenges, particularly since the end of the Second World War have combined to suggest the need for rethinking security. Importantly, most of the threats to peace and security since the late 1940s have increasingly been from within States rather than from without. Intra-state wars outnumbered inter-state and overt military intervention (Ayoob 1996; Alli, 2008; and Uba, 2017). This shows that more attention should be devoted to the causes of these internal threats and conflicts within States that undermine peace and security.

However, in the complex era of globalization, all these security issues have both internal and external dimensions because they are also

perpetrated across national boundaries. In addressing national peace and security, global cooperation is required thus, the necessity for a new appreciation of interdependence and the concept of collective security, which the ECOWAS is already promoting through its reform agenda. As we can see, the world community has shifted its attention to addressing these issues within a framework that can enhance national security through institutionalization.

A good example is the implementation of the ECOWAS Protocol on Free Movement. As Ochoche (1997, p.8) suggests, 'to understand security, one must evaluate the prevailing threat situation.' However, this paper agrees with the view of this scholar because the values and interests of a nation are perceptions. Threat situations are dynamic and, in most cases, are politically determined. Therefore, security is much viewed at the individual, the group, the social, the national and the global levels, they are all linked. However, Ochoche's (1997) perspective on national security is considered to be reactionary rather than pre-emptive. Meanwhile, Stone (2010, p: 4) filled this gap and argued that a rewarding and impact-yielding national security strategy should be pre-emptive rather than reactionary. Pre-emptive approaches are products of preparedness.' While Stone's (2010) viewpoint takes a step higher than that of Ochoche (1997), the point of contention here is that the level of preparedness of national security infrastructure determines the nature and character of a nation's security management.

The setting for international security is, of course, the international environment which is dominated by States all of which, from the perspective of the realist theory compete for power. Power has been conceptualised as the ability of an actor in the international system to influence the behaviour of other actors and consequently the course of international events. Considering the complexities of the ECOWAS Protocol on Free Movement, the ability of Nigeria to implement it without corresponding effects on Nigeria's national security would add value to its power among members of the community. This is based on the argument of the realist school which believes that pursuing power drives global politics and the relations among the principal actors in the international system. In post post-Second World War period, this realist

perspective on security informed the notion of peace and security leading to the dictum that if you want peace and security, prepare for war (Alli, 2008).

Understandably, national security came to be identified with the possession of strong-armed forces, built on a high concentration of manpower, powerful institutions and weapons, the destructive and the better. This was the conventional security doctrine. Alli (2008: p.19) further argues that:

> The major platform of his doctrine was a powerful military, and it was a critical requirement of national security for protecting national sovereignty, national independence and national interest. A strong security force was also needed to project national power in the pursuit of access to globally available resources.

This view is the central thesis of the old perspective on national peace and security. However, the new perspective on national peace and security has its major concern for development. How to use national resources to cause sustainable development is the primacy of the new focus on peace and security studies. This viewpoint is further collaborated by McNamara (1968) that there are new realities that suggest the necessity to review the whole concept of security. McNamara (1968: p.149) further argued:

> that in the contemporary era, security means much more than the security of the nation-state. Security is not military hardware, though it may include it; Security is not military forces, though it may involve it; is not a traditional military activity, though it may encompass it. Security is a development and without development, there can be no security.

Inferring from McNamara's submission, apart from military capability, other elements of power as economic capability, and quality of governance are all critical in the assessment of national security. Thus, the security problem of Nigeria is no longer the conventional type

which can be solved by just the acquisition of arms and military build-up. In some instances, despite the militarization, insecurity persists and has deepened. It is thus more complex and emanates from several non-traditional and non-conventional sources. In Nigeria for instance, illegal migration and trans-border crimes are likely factors contributing to the country's insecurity problem. Therefore, Nigeria's strategic security approach at the moment ought to be anchored on how the migration-related issues that can undermine Nigeria's national security can be addressed. Increasingly, the threats to the Nigerian State are largely from within. Overcoming the new security challenges requires not only relying on military approaches; but a combination of military, political, economic and socio-cultural responses.

Contemporary Nigeria's security environment is characterized by a series of violent groups. What is notable about them, besides the human devastation accompanying each incident, is the analytical challenge they pose to the traditional approach to national security. None of the threats posed by these groups is an obvious example of either interstate conflict or civil war; each of these groups is linked in weird spaces together in ways that defy national security logic; these cases call into question some of the basic spatial assumptions that undergird much of the scholarly literature in security studies. They direct our attention towards other spaces of security, which are geographical human security. Harvey (2009: p.12) asserts that:

The emerging security issues in Nigeria present an opportunity to reframe how we think about security. The very name of the emergence of different violent groups in Nigeria spurs us to move beyond the nation-state as the sole focus of security practices and discourses, suggesting possibilities for theorizing alternative topographies of security. Harvey's (2009) view suggests that the security trend in Nigeria opens up the global security connection with its domestic constituent parts and it calls for interrogate and analysis, and by doing so urges security expertise to raise questions about where security practices and discourses are in Nigeria. The rethink of security studies in Nigeria is to allow us to juxtapose actors and connect processes that operate in very different physical (or virtual) locales.

Based on the above submission, the present security situation in Nigeria requires a spatial turn. Security scholars must not miss the words of Waltz (1986: p. 329) who argues that 'national security threat can be resolved when a lot of big and important things are taken seriously with the spatial dimensions of security. Despite a great deal of Harvey's (2009) viewpoint on contemporary national security, the field of security studies has yet to fully embrace the notion of security as a socio-spatial practice. It is based on this premise that this study locates a gap in the literature.

This is because foremost, it does not mean that we should throw out the State, State interest or State practices, all of which are very much still at the core of global security concern and needs to be analysed. It does, however, mean that we should not fetishize and reify the nation as the only space in which security practices and discourses are formed and take place. It means identifying and theorizing non-national spaces of security and analysing how these interact with State practices and with each other. It means paying attention to how the socio-spatial practices of security change over time and how they vary with the changing social meanings and constructions of space that accompany new technologies, rise in social connectivity, and increased time-space compression.

Similarly, Ragazzi (2014) argues that realists; liberal internationalists, globalists, cosmopolitans, feminists, trans-nationalists, relationists, network analysts, scholars of civil war, insurgency, or terrorism; and academics or practitioners interested in broadening and deepening notions of national security can all benefit in different ways from paying more attention to the geographical and socio-spatial dimensions of national security. According to him, realist approaches can gain from a spatial turn in security studies through a focus on the spatial dimensions of the exercise of State power, such as the emergence of global networks of military bases and their effects (Ragazzi, 2014: 24). This argument suggests that the dynamics and implications of advanced technological warfare have changed the course of national security.

This line of thought implies that national security managers should study non-state actors, transnational networks and contentious politics which can utilize a spatial approach to gain insight into how these actors, networks, and processes are shaped or even constituted by the resources and opportunities embedded in particular locales. Ragazzi believes that contemporary national security challenges have varied in dimension. Instead, its potential threat should invariably become a lens through which to engage with them. Ragazzi (2014) concludes that this solves national security threats. This implies that Ragazzi's article introduced the notion that there are national security threats. However, it did not explain how it institutionalizes a particular security context. Also, he did not suggest the means to advance the solution he contended. It is on this ground that this study argues that Ragazzi's article is illustrative but not exhaustive, and thus, it is ripe for further empirical interrogation.

An Assessment of Nigerian Security Strategy Before and Under President Buhari

National security comprises military and non-military approaches and/or strategies. That is why Okodolor (2004: p.211) avers that "threats to national security are not static, but dynamic, and just as the political, economic, military and social causes of threats change, so does the national security posture of a country change". This submission implies that when governance is bothered about human beings, national security is strategically guaranteed. No wonder, in 2007 Former President Olusegun Obasanjo contended that:

> the primary aim of national security shall be to strengthen the Federal Republic of Nigeria, to advance her interest and objectives to containing stability, control crime, eliminate corruption, enhance genuine development, progress and growth, and improve the welfare and well-being, and quality of the life of every citizen (Obasanjo,2007: p.3).

Based on the above submission, national security has two spectrums, namely; State security and human security. By this conceptualization, national security entails the preservation of the safety of Nigerians at home and abroad protecting the sovereignty of the country, and the integrity of its assets. Traditionally, the defence strategic posture of any country is both pre-emptive and reactionary when the potential is to understudy environmental threat analysis. However, the adoption of an effective defence strategic posture is premised on critical defence resources, diplomatic strength, scientific and technological capabilities, etc.

A Speculative Scenario Analysis comes to mind hence national defence is both immediate and futuristic. Presently, there is a shift in defence strategic thinking globally. But Nigeria's National Defence Policy (2006) so much relied on a military approach to national security rather than the combination of both military and non-military strategies. This is because Nigeria's National Defence Policy (2006: p.25) put it that: Nigeria as a nation shall sustain a sufficient defence capability and express her intentions according to the prevailing circumstances to ensure that potential aggressors are kept in no doubt of the willingness to use the Armed Forces and all weapons available.

The Nigeria National Defence policy also gives deterrence capabilities. Deterrence and force projections are the basic principles on which the national defence policy of Nigeria is premised. The thrust of the policy is militaristic in the sense that there is always a military solution to every defence and security threat to Nigeria. This is because the principle of deterrence is a core of the military doctrine of anticipating the likelihood of the enemy's attempt. Only relying on deterrence and other military approaches to national security are contemporarily exclusive in defence doctrine. National security must be viewed in national development (Tedheke, 1998; Lyman,2010; Fage, 1999). Based on the forging construction of Nigeria's national security, excluding national security and defence from the economic framework would amount to a half-baked national security strategy without rethinking national from multidimensional approaches. National security in the 21st century is more complex, challenging and dynamic

and defence strategic posture for national security in this era should also have value and advocate sectoral linkages.

Although, 2000 and 2014 Nigeria's national security strategy placed little or no emphasis on economic development as a grand strategy for national security (Nigeria Security Strategy,2000; Nigeria Security Strategy,2014). However, the impact of the economy and technology on national security is very profound (Mbachu, 2011). This is because, for a developed economy, sophisticated high-tech electronics, improvement in firepower and ranges of weaponry, had transformed national security unprecedentedly. Therefore, Research and Development (R&D) continues to show the way for future enterprise, be it military or non–military issues. As Powell (1992:8) asserts:

> the strength of the American economy has permitted the investment of considerable sums in research and development. This has produced an American technological superiority contributing substantially to America's deterrent capability during peacetime; this has advanced American combat efficiency in war.

This implies that in achieving guaranteed national security in contemporary times grand strategy is required. Another ill been identified against the 2000 and 2014 Nigeria national security strategy, while democratic norms are taking root, Nigeria's security outlook remains precarious without internalising democratic structures to deepen national security. As a result, the country continues to face oil-fuelled militancy in the Niger Delta, farmer-herder conflicts in the Middle Belt, trans-border banditry in the north-west, Boko Haram terrorism in the north-west and renewed agitation for secession in the south-east region of the country, respectively. Despite the review of the 2000 National Security Strategy in 2014, the nefarious operations of these violent non-state actors continue with an acute threat to Nigeria's national security.

In 2014, former President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan described Boko Haram as the greatest threat to Nigeria's national security. It is

against this backdrop that Nigeria developed the 2014 National Security Strategy (DailyTrust,12/4/2014). The review was aimed to guide the Nigerian State to organize and harmonize national security policies and efforts. The 2014 National Security Strategy seemed to have a little shift from the 2000 National Security Strategy, which appeared to be militarily strategic. While the 2000 National Security Strategy conceptualised national security as "the aggregation of the security, the 2014 National Security Strategy viewed the national security interest of all individuals, communities, ethnic groups, political entities and institutions in the territory of Nigeria. The thrust of the 2014 National Security Strategy anchored on sectarian security strategies; the national security architecture of Nigeria; implementing instruments of national security in Nigeria and monitoring and oversight mechanisms (National Security Strategy, 2014). These components are aggregated into elements of State power, including economic and social development, defence, foreign policy, law and order and information management. This thrust of the 2014 Nigeria National Security Strategy, guides the formulation of policies and conduct of operations. Nigeria's over-arching strategic vision is to create a peaceful, self-reliant, prosperous and strong nation. The underlying aim of the 2014 Nigeria National Security Strategy is to apply all elements of national power to ensure physical security, build individual and collective prosperity, cause national development and promote Nigeria's influence in regional, continental and global affairs. Also, the 2014 Nigeria National Security Strategy outlined two critical threat areas to address they are. The core national interests as defined in Nigeria's National Security Strategy are the security and welfare of its people; sovereignty, and defence of its territorial integrity; peace; democracy; economic growth; and social justice. Sub-regional security and economic cooperation are classified as strategic interests. Promotion of peace, security, development, democracy and international cooperation in Africa and the world are peripheral to Nigerian national interests (Nigeria National Security Strategy, 2014).

The second critical area is how to deal with the most potent threats to Nigerian national security which include global challenges;

terrorism; transnational organized crimes; crude oil theft or illegal bunkering; Nigeria's borders; climate change; communal and ethnoreligious conflicts; pastoralists and farmers conflicts; politics and federalism in Nigeria; governance; poverty; kidnapping, the proliferation of small arms and light weapons; the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; illegal migration; economic challenges; financial crimes; information technology and cybersecurity; natural, man-made and medical-related threats; environmental security (Nigeria National Security Strategy,2014). However, the threats enumerated above are not the only threats to Nigeria's national security. They are the most potent and are adjudged potential sources of disaffection, discontent and instability that could adversely affect the country in quest for national stability, unity and development.

The emergence of a series of threats to Nigerian national security prompted stakeholders in the security sector to call for the review of the 2014 National Security Strategy. It was reviewed in December 2019. The revised national security strategy focuses on human security, unlike the previous ones. The 2019 National Security Strategy focuses on sectorial linkages to strategically enhance the actualisation of the human thrust of the National Security Strategy. The sectorial strategies rely on sectorial collaboration for grand strategy.

This strategy is developed as a response to the identified threats to Nigeria's national interests. Some of these strategies are to be fully realized by implementing the National Defence Policy, the National Counter-Terrorism Strategy, and the National Policy on Public Safety and Security. All these policies emanated from the National Security Strategy, which focuses on the preservation of the safety of Nigerians at home and abroad and protecting the sovereignty of the country and the integrity of the assets. This is an area the 2019 National Security Strategy seems to be more dynamic and encompassing than that of the 2000 and 2014 National Security Strategy which did not incorporate the multi-dimensional operational documents in the security sector.

Conclusion

The paper has demonstrated how Nigeria's national security strategy was military in the past and how the amended Nigeria's national security strategy under President Buhari's administration brought human security to it which is in line with global best practices. Legally, the Nigerian constitution puts security in the Exclusive List which gives the Federal Government the exclusive jurisdiction to legislate on national security matters. The sub-national governments do not have the legal-rational authority to decide on security matters, as the federal government controls the national security architecture. Even with the emergence of the series of violent non-state actors which is threatening Nigeria's national security, the federal government still has the monopoly of power over national security. Although this is a constitutional matter, it is a concern against the effective implementation of the National Security Strategy.

References

Ademola, O. (2018). *A New Trend of Terrorism in Nigeria*. Lagos: Freeman Publishers.

Annan, K *(2010). Security, Modernity, and Ecology: The Dilemmas of Post-cold War Security.*

Aviner, S (1969). *The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx.* Cambridge: University Press.

Ayoo, M. (1991). The Security Problematic of the Third World. *World Politics,* (43).

Ake, C. (1989). The Present Crisis in Africa: Economic Crisis or Crisis of the State? in Ihonvbere J. (ed.), *The Political Economy of Crisis and Underdevelopment in Africa: Selected Works of Claude Ake*. Lagos: JAD Publishers.

Alli, O.W. (2008). New Perspective on International Peace and Security. *Journal of the African Centre for Strategic Research and Studies, 8(1).*

Francis D. J. (2005). Peace and Conflict Studies: An African Overview of Basic Conflicts. In Best S.G., (ed) *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa,* Ibadan: Spectrum

Giddens, A. (2006). An introduction to the Special Issues: Ontology Security in World Politics European *Journal of International Relations.* Retrieved from https: doio.org/10.177/135

Harvey, C. and P. Barnidge, P.R (2017). Human rights, free movement and the right to leave in international law. *International Journal of Refugee Law* 1(2)

Ibeanu, O. (2005). Conceptualization Peace. in Best S.G., (ed) *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa*. Ibadan: Spectrum.

Ichho, I (2005). Nagagaski Peace Declaration. *The Asia-Pacific Journal,* 3(11).

Imobighe, T.A. (1990). Doctrine for and Threats to Internal Security. in Ekoko, A.E and Vogt (eds), *Nigerian Defence Policy: Issues and Problem*. Lagos: Malthouse Press.

Kaka, M (nd). Sub-Saharan African Experiences with Regional Integration. Zubair, I. and Mohsin, S.K. (eds). *Trade Reform and Regional Integration in Africa.* Washington, D.C: International Monetary Fund.

McNamara R.S (1968). *The Essence of Security*. New York: Harper and Row.

Nnoli, O. (2006). *National Security in Africa: A Radical New Perspective.* Enugu: PACREP.

Ochoche S.A (1997). Changing Concepts of International Peace and Security. in Garuba, C (ed.) *International Peace and Security: The Nigerian Contribution.* Lagos: Gabumo Press.

RagaezzI, V. (2014). *The New State and Security.* Hyderabad: Superb Publishers.

Red Cross Society (2019). *Human and Conflict Index in West Africa.* www.redcrossinternational.org.com Retrieved:12/12/2019 .

Rogers, J.A (2011). Integration and Development. *Journal of Development Studies*.1 (2), pp112-124.

Rufa I, M.A, (2018). *Perspectives on Farmers-Herdsmen Conflict in Agatu*. Being a Paper Presented at the 61st Annual Conference of the Historical Society of Nigeria University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt, 9th -13th October.

Stone, V. (2010). *Africa and Migration: A Comparative Studies.* Oxford: Oxford University.

Tsuwa, J.T. and Ochoga, E.O (2016). Conflicts in Africa: A Search for Conflict Prevention Strategy. *The International Journal of Humanities and Social Studies, 4 (6).*

UDDP (2018). *Human Security*. http:www.hdr.indp.org/em/content/human-development – report.

Waltz, D (1986). International Relations and International System as abnormal form. The *American Journal of Political Review, 86(3)*