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Abstract- Politics, in its broadest sense, is the activity through which people make, preserve and amend the general rules under which they live. As such, politics is inextricably linked to the phenomena of conflict and cooperation. On the one hand, the existence of rival opinions, different wants, competing needs or opposing interests guarantees disagreement about the rules under which people live. This makes the quality or otherwise of the process that transforms into achieving this common good i.e governance, worthy of constant empirical content versus goals analysis. This is a worthy endeavour especially in developing Democracies where it has been quite challenging for political office holders who shoulder the responsibility of ensuring a clear demarcation between politics and the art of Governance. Lots of reasons have been adduced for this trend, ranking highest is the over-politicization of every facet of governance which inadvertently has impacted negatively on the delivery of the proverbial democratic dividend in the area of National security. This paper primarily seeks to critically examine Governance issues which more often than not have being a cog in the wheel of delivering one of the most cogent prerequisite of any government the world over which is National Security, and suggest ways to exorcise this seeming inability to articulate and implement a security infrastructure that can be readily deployed for self preservation of the state and maintenance of fundamental human rights of the citizenry in Nigeria. It is argued that the unfortunate spate of Kidnappings, communal clashes, Bombings and Terrorist attacks which has led to callous bloodletting and lack of respect for the sanctity of human lives currently bedevilling the Nigerian state are direct consequences of the near collapse of the machinery of governance and not necessarily externalities. The implication of which has far reaching consequences in electorally competitive spheres like Nigeria.
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I. INTRODUCTION
The outbreak and execution of the Second World War signalled the end of handling the twin issues of Governance and National Security with levity. The cost implication of this is enormous to the extent that institutions of state can no longer afford a gravitation towards anarchy on an account of lack of will to ensure that these twin issues are put in proper perspective. It is not out of place to posit that National security, a concept loosely referred to as the requirement to maintain the survival of the state through the use of economic power, diplomacy, power projection and political power (Lippman: 1943 ) is a bye product of Governance. A government that is incapable of mustering its human and material resources to ensure a realisation of this basic requirement is definitely not qualified to be called one. The capacity or otherwise of institutions of Government the world over are often subjected to constant tests as regards its ability to deliver on the National Security front because of the seemingly difficult task of ensuring a conflict free society. This challenge is exacerbated more by the global wave of democratisation which preaches governance based on free consent of the ruled unlike in autocracies where the ruler simply equates himself to the state in which, all security issues are addressed through the prism of his whims and caprices.

The concept of National security contemporarily is hinged on the ability of government through its various agencies is impinged on a gamut of issues which is affected by non military or economic on the security of a nation and values espoused by the national society. Therefore, achieving National Security requires as a prerequisite, a robust Governance platform which can at once, engender economic security, energy security and environmental security which will put a nation at a vantage position to shelve off conventional foes such as other nation-states and non state actors, cartels, multinational corporations and nongovernmental organisations.

The Nigerian experience have been challenging, this is because of her inability especially at the dawn of democracy in 1999 to capitalise on the democratic ambience to nurture a National Security infrastructure that in the words of Orok Edem (2000) should ordinarily define her ability to successfully pursue her national interests which includes being able to protect the core values of the state and maintain same through victory in extreme situation of war. This brings to fore the quality of the process that harnesses these rudiments of day to day governmental actions which is often an interplay of sectors which eventually culminates in the quality of life of an average Nigerian. The Nigerian situation has been such that, the seeming laxity in the governmental triad has been
persistently capitalised upon by individuals or groups to make irredentist demands from the state. Meanwhile the thrust of this paper is an in-depth analysis of the various dimensions in which major governance issues in Nigeria affect National Security and suggest mechanisms to tame this ugly trend which has the capability of exacerbating the already fragile the component units that make up the Nigerian state. This is a direction the nation cannot afford to tread again considering the colossal damage inflicted by the inglorious civil war in 1966 which the nation is yet to recover from.

II. NATIONAL SECURITY: BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN THEORY AND PRACTICE

One of the greatest challenges to addressing the issue of National Security is the definitional gap which exists in an attempt to understanding the concept. This challenge is accentuated by the difference in the prisms through which what constitute National Security is examined or otherwise. This contest is not limited to the academia alone, public office holders whose responsibilities includes fashioning security measures that will guarantee life and limb are also not immune from the illusiveness of the concept which explains why National Security sometimes, do not enjoy the wholistic solution it deserves. However it must be emphasised the concept of National Security has not enjoyed uniform conceptual clarification amongst scholars. Therefore, it will not be advisable to be unnecessarily definition as the concept rightly belongs to the category of those that are essentially contested concepts (Galle: 1962 in Ojo: 2006: 78).

MacMillan dictionary defines the term National Security as the protection or the safety of a country’s secrets and citizens emphasizing the overall security of a nation and nation-states. Other scholars have attempted a definition from another view point. Prominently, Walter Lippmann (1943) sees National Security as a situation in which a nation does not have to sacrifice its legitimate interests to avoid war, and is able, if challenged to maintain them by war. Also from a situational point of view, Harold Lasswell (1951) conceives National Security as freedom from external coercion by a nation.

In the view of Arnold Wolfers (1952) National security is an objective endeavour which deals with how to guide against threats to acquired values of a state. It signifies to him, “an appropriate and aggressive blend of political resilience and matured human resources, economic structure and capacity, technological competence, industrial base and finally – military might”. This represent a tacit agreement with the notion that National Security is a bye product of quality governance.

In a bid to broaden the horizon of the concept of National security, Harold Brown ( 1983 ), included the concept of environmental security in the lexicon of National Security. This pre supposes the ability to preserve a nation’s physical and territorial integrity and deploy same for the maintenance of economic relations with the rest of the world on reasonable terms without external controls. The inclusion of environmental content in National Security discourse better explains the Nigerian situation in which environmental changes as a result of oil exploration are being harmonised for conflicts and intra state tensions where environmental degradation has led to dislocations in the immediate environment where the oil resource is prevalent.

Scholars have also adopted the Power theory to explain the concept of National Security, notable amongst them is Charles Maier (1990)who submitted that National security must be seen through the lens of power; it is best described as a capacity to control those domestic and foreign conditions that the public opinion of a given community believes necessary to enjoy own self determination or autonomy, prosperity and wellbeing. Closely related to this is Praphakaran Kaleri (2006:4)who also opined that National Security is the “measurability of the capability of a nation to overcome the multi- dimensional threats to the apparent well being of its people and its survival as a nation –state at any given time, by balancing all instruments of state policies through governance that can be indexed by computation, empirically or other wise and is extendable to global securities by variables external to it”. This copious comment is further reverberated in the writings of General Maxwell Taylor (1974) where he affirmed National Security to include current assets and national interests as well as the sources of strength upon which the future of a country depends. Some valuables according to him are tangible and earthy, others are spiritual or intellectual. They range widely from political assets such as bills of rights, political institutions, international friendships, to many economic assets which radiate worldwide from highly productive domestic economy supported by rich natural resources.

The reality from the various schools of thought examined above is that National Security requires a multi disciplinary approach to fester. The tendency is for political office holders who generally are regarded as “Proximate Policy Makers” (Olaniyi J.O: 2001) is to regard the above views as mere academic exercise. Such misconception is limited to some countries (including Nigeria) to myopically conceive National Security in a classical narrow sense of protection of lives and property alone. The classical belief that a beef up of the military, police and intelligence agencies is sufficient enough to guarantee national security seems to be deeply imbued in the psyche of those who make national security decisions. As a result, whenever incidents which disrupt public peace or threaten National Security occur, impulsively, security agencies are isolatedly lampooned for failure to maintain security. Development and other quantifiable indices show that National Security should be malebly tilted to contemporary developmental changes which call for the inputs of stake holders in the system in order to keep pace with the increase in the centripetal forces which often threatens the very essence of nation hood. The earlier this realisation, the better!

III. DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE AND NATIONAL SECURITY: THE NIGERIAN EXPERIENCE

It is quite heart warming that the skepticism and doubts casted on Nigeria’s transition to democratic government by scholars in 1999 became unfounded. After 29 years of military rule, Nigeria became a democratic state after several attempts. This ordinarily heightened expectation that democracy, with its natural in-built conflict management mechanism, coupled with the notion of separation of powers amongst the three arms of government offers the best alternative to military rule. Hopes were high that democracy would be sustained and consolidated. But alas, the military background of President Olusegun Obasanjo became a serious liability on the system
when the supposedly democratic government became a replica of dictatorship in its entire facet (Adebayo and Ojo: 2009:2).

Obasanjo two terms of four years each was brought to a close through an election that has been adjudged as one of the most flawed in the annals of Nigeria’s electoral politics. This view is corroborated by local and international observers of the elections. For instance President of the Catholic Bishop’s of Nigeria corroborated findings of the Domestic observers on the presidential and national assembly elections. According to him “The reports from our observers indicate that we have again failed in conducting free, fair and credible election. The reports from across the country show that the mandate of the people was abused, and brutalized: it is obviously evident that Nigerians could no longer afford to tolerate this level of vulgar disenfranchisement which is a blatant rape on their will” (The Punch Sept 6, 2007).

The greatest beneficiary of the flawed elections, late President Umar Musa Yar’adua alluded to the fact that, elections that brought him into office, fell short of minimum acceptable standards. Thus, an electoral reform panel was set up headed by Justice Muhammad Lawal Uwais (Rtd). Unfortunately, Yar’adua’s untimely demise on the 5th May 2010 prevented him from implementing the electoral reform. Circumstances surrounding the management of Yar’adua’s illness and the secrecy in which it was shrouded, particularly the way he was unceremoniously brought back to the country from abroad without the active participation of the then Vice President who was acting on his behalf and the deployment of a detachment of the military for that purpose generated heated debates that had negative implication for national security.

Events since 1999 have so far depicted a sombre outing particularly for the political office holders. Some events which for dint of luck would have jeopardised the corporate existence of Nigeria and National Security are worthy of mention. One of such is the Kidnapping of the Anambra state, Southeast Nigeria Governor, Chris Ngige, who was abducted and purportedly said to have resigned his position as Governor (Guardian July 11, 2004) readily comes to mind. This action which was a reflection of a strain in the relationship between the political gladiators in Anambra state who, obviously, have not internalized the democratic ethos of a procedural impeachment in tune with the 1999 constitution which clearly states in chapter (iv), part II, Section 188 that: “Whenever a notion of any allegation in writing, signed by not less than One third of the members of House of Assembly of the state; stating thatThe holder of such an office is guilty of gross misconduct in the performance of the functions, detailed particulars of which must be specified, the speaker of the House of assembly, shall, within seven days of the receipt of the notice Cause a copy of the notice to be served on the holder of such an office and onEach member of the House of Assembly, and shall also cause a statement made In reply to the allegation by the holder of the office to be served on each member of the House of assembly.....” (Federal Government of Nigeria, 1999 as amended)

This constitutional requirement for impeachment of an incumbent Governor obviously did not matter to Ngige’s abductors. The aftermath of the abduction was a rather hasty withdrawal of the centrally controlled police protection by the executive arm without any such directive by the judiciary, leaving Ngige to resort to “self help” of employing unconventional private body guards for protection. This shows a clear debasement of the rule of law as normalcy could have been returned promptly if the Peoples Democratic Party controlled central government had the upholding of the rule of law as a cardinal objective of state and the attendant potency for crises when not uphold. This singular act of dereliction of duty by the Obasanjo led government at the centre, lends credence to whatever interpretation given by political analysts locally and internationally on why the Federal Government chose to look the other way while impunity flourished in Anambra State (Salawu: 2012a).

Closely related to the above failure of governance nurtured on credible electoral processes which have the capacity of jeopardising National Security is the inability of the political class to explore to the fullest certain in-built conflict resolution mechanisms availed in the constitution. Every democratic society has mechanisms that checkmate its leaders from becoming autocratic. This is in consonance with the words of Lord Acton that “Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely” (Acton in Freeman M.D.A:1994). Nigeria, like most democratic societies, has one of such mechanisms and this is known as “impeachment”. Unfortunately, this mechanism almost tore apart the fabric of Nigeria’s burgeoning democracy between the years 2005-2007, when the process of impeachment was flagrantly abused. Critical questions that readily come to mind here are; where did the country get it wrong? Was it that Nigeria did not get it right from her colonial masters or from the country she copied the 1999 Constitution? Was it that the country’s political class innately develops the penchant to disregard constitutional provisions? Or else how do we explain the spate of impeachments ravaging state houses of assembly between the years 2005-2007 when five states governors were impeached by their respective Houses of Assembly. The only unifying factor in these impeachments was that none could be said to have followed due process. They were all removed without having regard to constitutional provisions.

The 1999 Constitution however provides for a detailed and elaborate procedure to be followed before an executive can be impeached in sections 143 and 188 (1999 constitution as amended). This procedure is sequential and must be duly followed. It is a chain of events which must not be broken at any stage. Sadly, this procedure has been grossly violated by the State Houses of Assembly where Governors were removed between 2005 and 2007. For example, in Ekiti State the former Governor Ayodele Fayose was removed without exploring due procedures; this eventually led to the declaration of a state of emergency by the then President Olusegun Obasanjo. In Oyo State, Governor Rasheed Ladoja was impeached by 18 members of the House of Assembly at D’Rovans Hotel, Ring Road, Ibadan instead of the constitutionally approved place of sitting of the House. This was not withstanding the fact that the members were not up to the constitutional mandated two-thirds of the House. Governor Joshua Dariye of Plateau State had his own share of the illegality perpetrated during this period. He was removed by eight out of the twenty-four members of the Plateau State House of Assembly (Solomon: 2011).

The implication of the scenarios above is the near collapse of the machinery of governance which ordinarily should be the bastion on which National Security is built and the attendant
loss of confidence by the heterogeneous followership in the ability of the state to provide the much needed “public good” which justifies subordination of citizens to laws of the state.

In a bid to assure the quest for “quick-wins” comes with the tendency to exacerbate issues in ethnic plurality of the Nigerian state for the realisation of certain ends which ordinarily should have been long delivered at the dawn of Democracy in 1999. The recourse to self help by all the regions of the country is manifest in the various deadly agitations and strife for resource control in the Niger-Delta by Movement for the emancipation of the Niger Delta (MEND), ethno religious clashes, boundary disputes in almost all the six geopolitical Zones of the country, kidnappings in the south east corridor of the country and outright terrorism which is being championed by the dreaded Jama’atu Ahsus-Sunnah Lidda’Awai Wal Jihad popularly known as Boko Haram, an Islamic sect that has wrecked havoc of unimaginable proportion across northern Nigeria through violent attacks on churches, Mosques, Media houses and even the United Nation office in Abuja. The humongous criminal network made up of several cells and units have rendered Nigeria and her security agencies helpless in taming this monster. This clearly shows the lack of capacity in the instrumentality of government to guarantee fundamental human right of its citizen no matter where they dwell within the polity.

The context of violations of the fundamental rights of Nigerian as a result of a break down in the security aparatchik is better illustrated by the 2012 annual Human rights report published by the centre for constitutionalism and Development which paints a dismal outlook of the situation in Northern Nigeria. Borno state ranked highest amongst the 36 states of the federation and the Federal capital territory, Abuja in terms of violation apart from Lagos state (Nigeria’s commercial and economic nerve centre) which for different reasons ranked higher with a total of 107 violation which when compared to the 84 cases in 2011 represents an astronomical increase (Odion Akhaine and Chiza:2012: XI). According to the report, the same scenario is replicated in the data gathered from all other Northern states of Kano, Kaduna, Bauchi, Gombe, Taraba, Yobe, Adamawa, Zamfara, Katsina, Niger and Nassarawa. The main reason for this increase is mainly a resultant effect of the Boko Haram insurgency. The same report shows Abia State for instance in the south east to have assumed the notoriety of a grooming ground for kidnappings and related activities, extra judicial killings, violation of children and women rights etc. All of these accounted for the 23 cases captured in the 2012 report. The Middle belt statistics shows a preponderance of assault on right to life which accounted for a 75% increase over the corresponding figures in 2011. This whopping increase is linked to the incessant ethnic clashes between the Fulanis and Plateau state indigenes.

The impact of economic hardship occasioned by the inability of government to responsibly react to the yearnings of the poverty stricken populace cannot be extricated from the reasons why crime have become so “attractive” in Nigeria. Within a projected 176million population in 2015 (the year bench marked for the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Ogunleye (2010:296) observed that; the persistent decrease in the per capita income to about $300, below the sub Saharan average of $450 approximately over 90million of the 150million Nigerians live in abject poverty! Nasir (2002) quoted in Ogunleye (2010) paints a more alarming picture of the poverty level in Nigeria; he stated that; 1.5 billion people globally live below poverty line of less than one dollar per day. Out of this number, 250 million constituting 17% of world’s total population are Africans and almost one third of this population figure coming from Nigeria alone!

A governance structure driven by vision ought to decipher the import of this unhealthy statistics and the capability for it being harmonized for crime and erosion of National Security. It is a blur appreciation of these economic issues by the political class in governance that has left Nigeria with the sordid paradox of being in the first league of petroleum endowed nations of the world, ranking 6th in the global oil map and 10th in the global gas map, which also places her on the topmost rungs of the petroleum ladder in Africa (Business Day, 18/07/2011) while inversely parading sleazy economic indicators enunciated earlier. Closely related to this is the inability of government to clearly come up with a clear cut strategy to balance the need to implement foreign- western inspired economic policies with well articulated and glowing cushioning measures for the teeming populace. This weakness such has often pitched government against the citizenry.

A case in point was the Bretton Woods Institution’s foisting of the withdrawal of subsidy from petroleum products policy which was hurriedly implemented by the Federal Government on New Year Day, January 1st, 2012. This is a classical example of ambush governance which cared less for National Security implications. Pump price of petrol was jerked up over night and compliance was meant to be immediate! Serious resistance to the policy was mounted by civil society organizations under the aegis of the Nigerian Labour congress (NLC), Trade Union Congress (TUC) and the Joint Action Forum (JAF). The Protests of January 2012 in Nigeria and government’s eventual shift of grounds by reversing pump price to Ninety seven Naira from one hundred and forty one Naira can be attributed according to (Salawu: 2012b) partly to the enormity of pressure mounted on government through the social media, Facebook, twitter et al and more importantly, the effect of the various social media anchored on the internet for the sustenance of the protests against this policy for more than a week. A development which is unprecedented in the annals of civil right protests in Nigeria.

The social Media was a wakeup call for political leadership at all levels to respond albeit reluctantly before the situation escalates further while also pre-empting the events especially in the western part of the country from snow-balling into what has now been dubbed “Arab spring” where New Media singularly became a rallying point for mass mobilization (social capital.wordpress.com). It is disheartening however, that the Nigerian government would allow such threat to National security to have gathered momentum for a whole week without solution and eventually resorted to the inglorious authoritarian tactics of deploying all security agencies namely the regular police, mobile police, civil defence corps, anti-terrorism squads, state security officials and soldiers armed with weapons to quell the protests leading to deaths, injuries and incarcerations in Kwara, Kaduna, Edo, Abuja, Lagos and Kano (Odion -Akhaine and Chiza: 2012: XII ). This is a clear manifestation of insensitivity of governance in acknowledging rights to peaceful assembly, free speech and freedom of Association are inalienable rights in a democracy.

The charged security atmosphere which the January 2012 protests posed was needless and totally unnecessary if the
government had properly conceptualized the policy, especially in the area of subsidy figures which was put at 1.7 trillion naira but was later contradicted by the National Assembly after a more rigorous scrutiny. National security will be jeopardised and political office holders also will find it very difficult to appeal to the sense of nationalism of the citizenry, if the process of power acquisition and maintenance lacks the basic standards that are universally acceptable, if there exists a lacuna between policy design and implementation and above all, poverty and economic indices do not improve. This is what the scenario above portends for Nigeria.

At the heart of the challenges of governance and national security lies the issue of corruption whose ravaging effects have not been quite easy to tame in Nigeria. Scholars have had to trace this hydra headed monster to Nigeria’s colonial origin and experience. Omotola J.S (2006: 217) submits that; “by all standards, colonialism in Nigeria was built on corruption. Because of the colonialists’ corrupt disposition to exploit the state for their exclusive benefit, they liquidated social structures against corruption associated with pre-colonial Africa and replaced them and/or transformed them to suit their own purposes”. It is this unfortunate trajectory that paved the way for the unbridled quest for accumulation of state resources for personal rationale by those who have been privileged to manage the polity from independence to date.

Reversing this ugly trend have been quite challenging as successive governments in Nigeria have celebrated allegations of looting public treasury without much convictions to act as deterrent. Before now, it was easy for Nigerians to accuse the military governments and their cronies of fraudulently and forcefully arrogating state resources to themselves, but events since 1999 has vitiated these claims. The return of democracy in 1999, despite structural ercations for fighting corruption has not been able to seethe the wild levels of corruption. Rather, it has assumed the dimension of a scourge infesting all arms of government. It has been more or less a case of motion without movement! Matters are made worse by the inability of the judiciary which is supposed to be the trendsetter of laws of the land. The perpetuators of corruption unfortunately are the greatest beneficiary of this lack of capacity on the part of the judiciary, for reasons that at times bother on the technicalities of adjudication. This inverse relationship is borne out of deliberate frivolous applications for injunctions by lawyers and the granting of same by some judges. This has impeded the pace at which corrupt public officers and their cronies are being brought to book through the courts.

Osinbajo (2011: 52) itemized a list of celebrated cases against corrupt public officials which are yet to be concluded. These include:

Former speaker of the House of representative, Dimeji Bankole and his erstwhile Deputy, Usman Naftada, former Governors of Ogun, Oyo, Nasarawa, Gombe, Delta, Plateau, Taraba, Sokoto, Jigawa and Ekiti States are all pending at various stages in Nigerian courts. This tardiness is not limited to allegedly corrupt government officials. Private sector players, especially in the Banking sector who were found to have abused public trust required of their offices also have not been made to account for their indiscretions at the required pace owing largely to some infirmities in the judiciary. Except in the case of the former Managing Director of Oceanic Bank, Cecilia Ibru who willingly pleaded guilty and has since been sentenced (Saharareporters.com). Her other colleagues like the Former Managing Directors of Intercontinental Bank, Afri Bank, Union Bank and FinBank are walking free despite the weighty allegation of theft running into Billions of Naira against them, courtesy of injunctions granted by the courts. These obviously, has a negative salutary effect on the image of Nigeria in its drive for Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and budgetary allocation for good Governance which National Security cannot be extricated from.

The negative slide in the economy will unfortunately continue if the judiciary remains incapacitated in dispensing justice with every urgency required where both operators of the public and private sectors of the economy have easy leeway to evade justice whenever legal infractions occur. The situation differs in other climes where same allegations receive prompt trials and adjudication for the same offences being unnecessarily dragged in Nigeria. The celebrated conviction of James Ibori, the former Governor of Delta State, south-south Nigeria, in a United Kingdom court for same charges of stealing over 250m pounds (Vanguard,18th April,2012) while Governing Delta state, for which, he had jumped bail in Nigeria after a protracted trial, is nothing but an embarrassment on the rule of law and judicial independence in Nigeria. The Ibori saga, pertinently, exposes the frailties in justice delivery especially in cases where the accused has introduced some level of sophistry in the process of committing the crime. This must have been the reason behind the discharge and acquittal earlier granted Ibori by Justice Marcel Awokulehin of the Federal High Court , Asaba on the 17th of December, 2009 (Thisday: 18th December,2009). The implication of this are:

1. Total loss of confidence in the machinery of governance.
2. Unnecessary heating up of the polity with serious implication for National Security.
3. Increase in the number of hopeless and disenchanted citizens who will be ready tools for ‘Fifth columnists’ who are bent on creating pandemonium as a means of getting back to government.

IV. ADDRESSING “THE DOWN RISKS” THROUGH GOVERNANCE

Nigeria’s consistent feature as one of potentially failed states rankings, especially in the last four consecutive years call for serious concern. It ranked 14th in the years 2012, 2011, 2010 and 15th in 2009 (Foreign Policy.com/failed states) This ratings obviously tallies with United States National Intelligence Council 2012 report which places Nigeria, Niger, Chad, Somalia ,Burundi, Pakistan, Malawi, Haiti ,Yemen, Mali, Ethiopia, DR Congo, Bangladesh, Afghanistan, Kenya amongst the list of countries exhibiting traits of failure (elombah.com/ Index/ failed states ). Although these ratings have come under severe attacks from countries that have been so listed, but the issues and indices adopted for analysis by the National Intelligence Council clearly revolves around Governance or lack of it, and National security. The index shows a downward slide in the areas of demographic pressures, Human capital flight, delegitimization, factionalized elites, human rights, security apparatus, economic decline, uneven development etc.

In the words of Sargent L.T (2009: 42) a state is said to have failed where, the process of nation building have not worked and/or states that cannot maintain law and order within their boundaries. Nigeria’s continuous existence however
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depends on how well it seeks to remedy these indices that are currently negatively skewed against it. This calls to question the role of governance in assuring the basics of a state. The laissez-faire posturing of government, especially at the centre which seems to give the impression that all is well in terms of Governance and National Security does not tally with the reality of unbridled lust for human lives by terrorist groups which unfortunately is not making Nigeria a destination of choice for foreign nationals who have constantly "red alerted" their nationals on the need for restrictions in terms of movement to certain areas of the country or outrightly barred them from visiting (Tribune, 24/12/2012).

Professor Ben Nwabueze, a constitutional Lawyer and leader of the "Patriots", a group of select elder statesmen in Nigeria whose comments on the state of affairs in the nation cannot be wagered, in a perceptive interview summed up the threats to national security and state failure in Nigeria in the following words:

"The other way that I have described it is that we are on the verge of becoming a failed state. I did not say that Nigeria is a failed state but that Nigeria is on the way to becoming a failed state. If you look at all the indices of a failed state, there are 200 states in the whole world considered. Somalia is number one while Nigeria is number 12 in the latest rating of failed states. The indices are there, the indices were not manufactured by me. What is the purpose of a state? It is to provide for the security of the people and this is in Section 14 of our constitution. The security of the people is the purpose of government; that is what you find there. Any state that is not performing that function effectively or maximally is on the way to becoming a failed state. If you are not performing the primary function of a state you are on the way to becoming a failed state, which is what we have in Somalia. Do we have that security? With kidnapping every day, armed robbers, Boko Haram bombing churches, offices, homes everywhere and you are never sure of your life. The purpose of government is not only physical security but also economic security. When you look at Chapter 2 of the constitution, you ask yourself, do the successive governments of this country ever look at the chapter? They don’t look at it because if they look at it they should be worried; they should be concerned. Nothing there is given to the people by way of democracy dividends. Any state that is not doing this for its people is on the way, if it has not already become a failed state." (Daily Independent/2013/03).

It is an anathema that indices of security of lives and property are not given the right attention by the governing elites in Nigeria. The continual politicization of solutions or policy options to tackle this problem lives the country on the precipice! Chief Bisi Akande, the National Chairman of the opposition party - Action Congress of Nigeria in a no holds barred interview with the Punch Newspaper gives a picture of the need for a more concerted effort across all political divides in the direction of achieving National security through a more responsive Governance architecture which is currently defective. He alluded thus:

"Majority of Nigerians believe that poverty within the country gave rise to Boko Haram while so many people believe it’s due to the jostle for Peoples Democratic Party presidential ticket in the countdown to the 2015 general elections. Government may want to negotiate; it may not want to negotiate. Should you want to negotiate, who are you going to negotiate with? If not, why are you not going to negotiate? Government’s primary duty is to ensure peace and tranquillity. Unfortunately, it is these key issues of governance that Boko Haram is attacking. It’s on record that most people have read politics of the PDP into Boko Haram insurgence. The President himself said Boko Haram is everywhere, including his government. The shielding of Boko Haram members by senators and people in power gave credence to the President’s submission. Do not forget that a police commissioner had once deliberately allowed a suspected Boko Haram member run away from police cell. You will remember also that the late National Security Adviser, Gen. Patrick Azazi, had at a public function attributed national insecurity to the politics of the PDP. If all of these have been the case, it could be submitted that the Boko Haram problem is like a ball in the court of PDP. Should it decide to negotiate, then, the presidency’s interest may be negatively affected. Second term ambition could be the underpinning of Boko Haram. Negotiation may mean shifting ground to accommodate lack of second term for the present occupant of the presidency, but which is most desired by a lot of other interested personalities and groups who may want a continuation of the present corrupt order. Already, the strategising for the above is already on and some people are already losing out in the power game. The dialogue option may not be workable for obvious reasons. It may be that the presidency may not be in tune with Boko Haram’s sponsors within the fold of the PDP and when a falcon cannot hear the falconer, then anarchy, like we have in Nigeria, is let on the loose. Therefore, the matter of negotiation with Boko Haram will be a matter of expediency as may be dictated by the interest of the President; does he want to hustle for second term and continue to lose more Nigerians to daily killings and bombings or does he want to adhere to the constitution he swore to protect Nigerians? He has a choice to make in all these’" (The punch January 27, 2013)

Avoiding all of these unpleasant predictions on the fate of the Nigerian state is most desirable. Geo- political circumstance of Nigeria, in addition to other factors like her huge population, large hydro-carbon deposit, peace keeping role in ECOWAS, seat in the United Nations security council and the strength of her financial market all put together makes her the most import region whose disintegration would have far reaching negative effect on the entire continent. This makes an exploration of all possible routes to ensuring the security of the country and the nurturing of governance that is in tune with democratic ethos a worthy endeavour. This will go a long way in assuaging the fears expressed locally and internationally that Nigeria should not go the way of Pakistan in the next 25 years. This warning was rehashed by United States Assistant Under Secretary of State, Jonnie Carsons at a forum on the ‘challenges facing Nigeria and suggested ways of tackling them’, warned that “Nigeria had the possibility of becoming the next Pakistan in 25 years.”

Pakistan according to Carsons is generally described as the hotbed of religious crisis and a poor terrorist nation. It’s history has been characterized by political instability and conflicts. It is home to terrorist organizations such as Lashkar-e-Toiba and Jaish-e-Mohammed; one of the most active militant Islamist terrorist organizations in South Asia. (www.epo.gov/.chrg-112shrg77372.htm)
V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This study has been able to establish the link between governance and the concept of National Security. Without mincing words, it has shown vividly, the need for those saddled with the responsibility of governance to properly contextualize National Security as one of the most important deliverables which when not met, poses great risk for the continuous existence of any nation. Nigeria, therefore as a matter of urgency must quicken efforts at workable solutions including the much touted amnesty to the Boko Haram sect which will definitely provide a platform for dialogue. Other machinations that will abate the present state of affairs where the sanctity of human lives and property can no more be guaranteed as a result of the Boko Haram and other security challenges must be vigorously pursued.

While taking cognizance of the progress made in the area of electoral reforms as exemplified by the progress made in the 2011 general elections which is intended to enhance legitimacy of Democratic Governance. Other measures through appropriate governance machinery must necessarily positively respond to improve the economic wellbeing of the citizenry, balance development across the federation, increase per capita income from the present paltry $1 per day, guarantee Human rights and provide access to grievance management and speedy dispensation of justice especially in corruption related matters, will go a long way to enhancing Good governance and national security and will simmer frightening postulations of a failed state toga hanging over Nigeria’s future.
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