

Security Perspective from the Intellectual Angle

Should scholars and scholarship not see issues from the point of view of knowledge? Should scholars not be the mirror of the society? Should scholars suffer the band wagon effect? Should scholars and scholarship not lead the way in pointing out the flaws of society? How do scholars and scholarship see security in Nigeria? Is there a security scholarship and scholars in Nigeria? Is the security scholarship in tandem with Nigeria's history, experience and reality? Or is it an imitation of the history, experience and reality of other society?

Scholars and scholarship should see issues from the perspective of their search and research knowledge. Scholars should be the mirror of their society as they devote their scholarship to re-examination of their society. Scholars, on the basis of their research, should not be part of the band wagon. They should lead the way in identifying the flaws of society and proffering solution. They should educate and disseminate knowledge that would enlighten and liberate society. Scholars and scholarship understand security like the rest of Nigerians socialised into the military's view of security. There is no security scholarship and scholars in Nigeria. Since there is no scholarship and scholars of security in Nigeria, what security scholarship and scholars in existence is not in tandem with the history, experience and reality of Nigerians. The security scholarship in existence imitates the security type hued from the history, experience and reality of other society particularly European and American society.

In the two previous submissions on military and political classes' view of security, I argued that most if not all Nigerians learned security from the military who ruled the country for most of its independence until 1999. I noted that the security type introduced by the military was the type that derived from their role of defence in the security umbrella. In addition, I noted that the military, like most Nigerians, was not knowledgeable about security because it did not learn security in any school. I suggested that the first time most members of the military and law enforcement heard or learned about security was either when they were socialised in the course of military rule or on the job as part of their work description.

The type of security they learned was the defence-inclined type that clearly spelt out their role as the protector of the state. For instance, the role of the armed forces and the police, the two captured in the constitution of Nigeria, was spelt out in section 217 subsection 2 a, b, c, d and section 215 subsection 3. I argued that to this extent they were biased in favour of the state. I also argued that security of the type that the military promoted and instituted when it was the governing elite was not in tandem with Nigeria's history, experience and reality. It was in tandem with the history, experience and reality of the West whose primary security worries was to protect themselves against attacks from outside and in recent time from naturalised citizens within their borders.

This was the environment that most Nigerians learned security including the intellectual class. Like the military and the political class, most Nigerian intellectuals who talk and do security did not learn security from any course of study in the school. The few who thought they learned security in the university and parade themselves as experts were those who did postgraduate studies (mostly non academic MSc) in strategic studies and not security studies as this was not available until the Nasarawa State University, Keffi established the postgraduate programme (MSc and PhD in security and strategic studies). Most that claimed expertise in security self tutored or had engagements with the established security tradition.

Most of those that claimed knowledge of security from a course of study were first and foremost biased towards the type of security the military initiated them into – the defence-inclined type (it was the first place they learned security), had no first degree in security and studied postgraduate programme in strategic studies which was biased towards the military's defence focus. These were the people who parade themselves as security experts on radio and in different forum. Nigerian universities have no courses of study in security from the undergraduate through to the postgraduate levels. If there are, they are mostly in the private universities. The public universities may be in the process of establishing the programme especially because of the currency of security among Nigerians.

Of all the disciplines in the university, political science would claim ownership of security. This is essentially because security of the popular type and the one common in Nigeria is concern with the science of power. In this regard, political scientists share so many things in common with the military and political class. These three are interested in getting, keeping and using power. The military uses power i.e. its control of the means of violence to protect the state and in the Nigerian case to intimidate the political class and subvert constitutional order.

The politicians offered themselves to the people to be empowered through election so as to use the power to provide security for the benefit of the people. In the case of the political class, we noted, in the last post, they lacked the experience of security of the all embracing type having been sidelined for decades from political power by the military. Consequently, they were socialised into the military's type of security and in the process learned to value its narrow focus on regime protection following their travails in the hands of Nigerian military. This lesson, we argued, was put into effect from 2007 until 2015. In this period there was trade-off between the military and political class on the matter of security. In return for staying out of politics, the military was allowed to access resource and manage security their way. The fight against terrorism-insurgency was evidence of this.

The political scientist studies power and its uses. Therefore the issues of security which is associated with power should be of interest, theoretically, to the political scientist. Nigerian political scientists have offered their expertise to various military administrations particularly

the administration of General Ibrahim Babangida. No military administration in the history of Nigeria has deployed the services of scholars as the Babangida regime did. Many of these scholars were political scientists and they were behind his numerous experiments and innovations towards crafting new political culture for Nigeria in his eight years hold on power. It was a fertile ground for the theorists to experiment with their ideas on political re-engineering.

However, the Nigerian brand of political scientists comes with their limitations. One area of this limitation was their knowledge of security. They have not studied security independent of the few courses or exposures they had in the course of their undergraduate and graduate studies. They have persisted to view security from its International Relation perspective without recognising the place and role of Nigeria in international relation. They have not studied let alone notice anything wrong with the Nigerian security practice. They have not notice that security has become the pre-eminent foolproof justification available for officials particularly in the course of the civil rule for most conducts in the public domain.

They have not notice that this justification is in relation to the view that security is fundamental and thus a first charge and that if the issue is classified as security, no resource is too much to be use to attain security. They have not notice that official Nigeria has its own preference for security type and that even in the preferred security type the huge resources so expended did not bring security. They have not bothered to examine the ideological connotation of "security is everybody's business" (because it has never been or more appropriately having succeeded in socialising Nigerians into the view of security, they were glad to argue security is everybody's business to justify their perfidy), the financial recklessness associated with "security vote" (a particular Nigerian invention, a securitisation process per excellence and the justification for countless expenditure without accounting) and the propensity of official Nigeria to avoid accountability of public resources using security.

They have not bothered to inquire if the security theory and practice in Nigeria addresses the country's security worries. They have not bothered to ask if there is a definition of security, the substance of national security on parade everyday and if there is a security policy in existence as opposed to security strategy. More importantly, they have not bothered to ask if there is a connection between the security policy (if there is one) and other policies in Nigeria. The crisis in the north east did not generate the type of interest that should question the security type in practice in Nigeria. Neither did the expenditure on security draw their attention to begin to ask question. They have not notice that the security type in practice imitates the reality of other societies. In particular, they have not notice that this reality assumed that Nigeria has an active international affair that calls for this type of security. They have not thought it wise to begin to research into the security type in Nigeria in order to determine its suitability or otherwise for the country. Considering the importance of security

in official conduct and in the lives of Nigerians, they have not thought it necessary to begin a course of study at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels that will deepen the focus on security to unmask what it is not.

The limitation of the political scientists extended to scholars from other fields of study particularly in the humanities. Most scholars were fascinated with security because of its currency and not because as scholars they owed the society the responsibility to unmask the ideological use of security to make life insecure for Nigerians. There are thousand of articles, hundreds of books and numerous seminars, workshops and talks that have used security's currency. There are phrases such as "security" and "national security" without contributing to securing the lives of Nigerians and Nigeria.

They have exploited security in different ways in their scholarship such as in conference flyers, seminars, workshops, papers, articles in journals and books. One would find reference such as "education and security", "education and national security", "history and national security", "languages and national security", "science education and national security", science and national security", "security and national development", "urbanisation and national security", "science, technology and national security", "policing and national security", ICT and national security", "accounting practice and national security" etc. When examined closely, these titles had few lines or nothing to say in their inclusion of security and national security. Indeed even if they had it was from a security and national security definitions that are not indigenous to Nigeria. Nigerian scholarship and scholars of security, if there are, are not conscious of self let alone producing knowledge of the type that can be utilised in Nigeria.

They had few local and international literatures to support the claim to the use of security and national security. Indeed as I have argued there are no body of local knowledge on security derived from Nigeria's history, experience and reality to tap into. For their sources, they tapped into available statements, speeches and papers credited to official Nigeria which encapsulated the views official Nigeria on security and national security. Like the political scientists, these scholars did not think there is anything wrong with security to begin to build a Nigerian security that derived from its history, experience and reality.

Intellectuals owe society a responsibility. This is to research and disseminate the result of their research as it affects their society and as it will benefit their society. Nigerian intellectuals have not lived up to this expectation in the case of security studies. Although it is not a subject of study in the universities until recently and only in a few private universities, in their exposition they have not been critical enough to examine security's place of origin and influence and the manner of its origin and use in Nigeria. Nigeria intellectuals whether in the universities or in the media have not educated themselves enough to be in the position to educate and liberate Nigerians from the use of security of the type introduced by the military

to advance their interest. This security type has been appropriated by the political class to consolidate their hold on power.

Nigerian intellectuals have not studied security with the history of Nigeria in perspective; they have not studied security with the experience of Nigeria and Nigerians to guide them and; above all they have not studied security with the accumulated and daily reality of Nigerians as determinant of this security. To this extent they have been complicit in the domination of Nigerians through their dissemination of ahistorical security knowledge to their students and public. They have served as the intellectual wing for deepening of knowledge of security that makes life insecure for Nigerians.