

Towards an Explanation of the Origin of "National Security"

This exercise is necessary because of the importance of "national security" in the discourse of "security" among officials – military, law enforcement, politicians, scholars and ordinary people in Nigeria. By the way the concept of "security" from where "national" (I would assume that adding "national" was a process of securitization) was added to make "national security" is as disagreeable in its definition, content, context, and instrument as is national security.

Security, from an intellectual perspective, is new in Nigeria. There is no scholarship, scholars and body of accumulated knowledge on security in existence in Nigeria. To this extent the use and usage of security and allied matters including national security should have history albeit a Nigerian history. We have dealt with security in different forums.¹ Although national security has been addressed as well, this discourse is the first one devoted to investigating its origin and situating it within the Nigerian parlance.

National security is a term that resonates in the United States of America. The USA, I dare say, is the home of national security to the extent that it is a familiar term in policy, scholarship, and media and among ordinary Americans. As a term, I would want to suggest that the origin of national security in the United States can be traced to the passing by the Congress of the National Security Act in 1947.² Until this legislation, the term "national security" and its usage was not popular.

¹ Visit (adoyionoja.org) for some of my perspectives on security; see also Adoyi Onoja, "Regime Type and the Established Notion of Security in Nigeria: Towards a Human Centred Security for Nigerians", In Olayemi Akinwumi, Mammam Musa Adamu, Patrick Ukase, *Nigeria at 50: The Challenges of Nation Building*, Zaria: Historical Society of Nigeria, 2012, pp. 83-108 _____ "Security Education in the Nigerian Context and the Need for Reconceptualisation", *Humanity: Jos Journal of General Studies* Vol. 7, No.1 August 2014, pp. 68-84 ; _____ "50 Years After: Rethinking Security/National Security Discourse and Practice's Past Reinventing Its Future", *Bingham Journal of Social and Management Studies* Volume 3 No. 1 , July 2014, pp. 564-579; _____ "In Search of the Causes of Insecurity in Nigeria: A Note on Administrations and their Agendas", *Journal of Conflictology*, Volume 5, Issue 1(2014), pp. 33-42, <http://journals.uoc.edu/index.php/journal-of-conflictology/article/view/vol5iss1-onoja/vol5iss1-onoya-en>; _____ "Situating Old and New Security in Nigeria: Reflecting the Theory and Practice of Security", *Journal of International Politics and Development Studies*, Volume 9, Nos. 1&2, January-December, 2013, pp.149-171; "Security in Nigeria Depends on Human Welfare, not State-Centric Bureaucratism": *Open Security* May 2012 <http://www.opendemocracy.net/opensecurity/adoyi-onoja/security-in-nigeria-depends-on-human-welfare-not-state-centric-bureaucratism>; "Defining and Situating Insecurity in the Nigerian Context: A Glimpse at Everyday Insecurities", In P.U. Omeje and U. Okonkwo, *New Perspective on West African History: A Festschrift in Honour Prof S.C. Ukpabi*, Enugu: Madonna University Press, 2013, pp. 437-47; Adoyi Onoja, "What is wrong with solution to insecurity in Nigeria", <http://www.dailytrust.com.ng/sunday/index.php/comment-debate/5977-what-is-wrong-with-solutions-to-insecurity-in-nigeria> accessed 29/03/15; _____ "Groups' Resort to Arms in Negotiating Space in Nigeria: The Central Nigeria Exception?", C.S. Orngu, T. Wuam, E.T Ikpanor (eds.) *Ethnic Minority Agitations and Political Development in Nigeria* Volume 1, Abuja: Donafrique Publishers, 2015, pp. 24-58

² See National Security Act, 1947,

<http://global.oup.com/us/companion.websites/9780195385168/resources/chapter10/nsa/nsa.pdf> accessed 25:05:17

While agreeing with Kim R. Holmes³ that national security began with the recognition of the nation-state in the Peace of Westphalia of 1648 which established the idea that the nation-state had sovereign control not only of domestic affairs but also of external security, the use of the term "national security" began with the passage of the Act of 1947.

"The National Security Act", the legislation creating the term "national security" opened with the statement "to promote national security" by creating several institutions. Among these were National Security Council, Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Resources Board. These three institutions were referred to under Title I as "coordination for national security". In other words, they were the coordinating institutions of national security. Other institutional support for national security captured under Title II were The National Military Establishment which included Secretary of Defense, Military Assistants to the Secretary, Civilian personnel, Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, Department of the Air Force, United States Air Force, Effective date of transfers, War Council, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Staff, Munitions Board and Research and Development Board.²

When one examines the "coordination for national security" particularly the functions of the three institutions, it was expressly conveyed in their readiness to defend America against external aggression. For instance, the National Security Council was chaired by the President and its primary function was to "advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security".

The Council also "assess and appraise the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power, in the interest of national security; for the purpose of making recommendations to the President..." Members of the Council included the President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, Chairman of the Munitions Board, Chairman of the Research and Development Board etc.

This composition was a de facto war council. The impression it leaves was that of a national security conception defined as the protection of America against all types of external aggression. The National Security Act was passed just two years after the Second World War.

³ Kim R. Holmes, "What is National Security?" <http://index.heritage.org/military/2015/important-essays-analysis/national-security/> accessed 20:04:17

America's performance in that war created a new world order where America was the leader. It was an order created by the virtue of fighting and winning a war. War was therefore recognised as important in the coming international relations and politics. It was a world order that would be marked by issues of the type that could threaten the survival of the American system. The Act was to protect America and its allies in this new world. This is the definition of national security.

The Central Intelligence Agency was created "for the purpose of coordinating the intelligence activities of the several Government departments and agencies in the interest of national security...under the direction of the National Security Council..." Other functions of the Agency included "to advise the National Security Council in matters concerning such intelligence activities of the Government departments and agencies as relate to national security; to correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security, and provide for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government using where appropriate existing agencies and facilities..." The CIA coordinates all external intelligence affecting the US national security further conveying and consolidating the view that national security originated from America's interests and roles around the world.

The third institution under Title I is the National Security Resources Board. The first two functions of the Board clearly indicated the focus of national security. It is to prepare America to defend itself in the event of war. Accordingly, "it shall be the function of the Board to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization, including— (1) policies concerning industrial and civilian mobilization in order to assure the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the event of war; (2) programs for the effective use in time of war of the Nation's natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy in time of war, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions...;3

The rest of the content of the National Security Act of 1947 detailed the roles of the institutions it created in fortifying national security which was the defense of America and American interests against external aggression. The American establishments and people have come to define national security in terms of the thriving of its interests and the coordination of its domestic resources to maintain, advance and protect these interests against aggressions of external origins.

National security was not static as has been proven by the dynamism since its evolution. While the core contents of national security in America remained unchanged, national security has been responsive to emerging challenges from within America and in the course of America's interface with different parts of the world.

One of the challenges that modified the focus of national security from its exogenous tradition to include endogenous issues was the event of 1996 in Oklahoma. One of America's own, James Timothy McVeigh had turned against his government and detonated a truck full of explosives killing over 160 persons at a Federal facility in the city of Oklahoma. McVeigh was protesting against government intrusion into private spaces. This action was new to national security. The second challenge to national security came in the wake of the end of the Cold War, the 9/11 attacks and the launch of the War on Terror. Americans of Muslim descent had either attack the homeland or provided material assistance to aid the attacks from outside. The creation of the Department of Homeland Security was a response to this new and emerging dimension of national security threat.

The Kim Holmes Perspective

Kim Holmes's essay on national security provided parameters in terms of definition, content, context and instrument. Holmes began with what he described as the basic concepts embodied in America's national security. The first was power which included military strength, force and national defence. The second was the international system of security. According to Holmes, "understanding the major schools of thought on international security that have arisen since the end of World War II will also help to explain the international context in which American national security was expected to operate". These thoughts included collective defence, collective security, global security and international law. The third was the non military ideas of national security. In Holmes's opinion, for most the 20th century, national security had been focused on military strength but as a concept, it expanded over time beyond what armed forces could do (or not do as the case may be).

In 1947, the United States created the National Security Council to "advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security...." Thus "in the wake of total war, and at the dawn of the nuclear age, it was well understood that the days of defining national security solely in terms of armies fighting it out in set-piece battles were things of the past."⁴

⁴ Holmes, "What is National Security?"

According to Holmes, since then, national security has come to mean different things to different people. Today, there are all kinds of “national securities.” They include economic security; energy security; environmental security; and even health, women’s, and food security. It was Holmes’s view that the proliferation of definitions has not always been for the good. In some instances, for example, it was merely a rebranding of domestic agendas to shift resources away from the Pentagon. In other cases, it was adjusting to the complexities of a changing international environment. For instance, the 9/11 attack gave birth to the Department of Homeland Security and Homeland security was described as a set of domestic security functions that includes airport and port security, border security, transportation security, immigration enforcement, and other related matters.⁵

Holmes proceeded to provide what national security was not in the United States. Holmes line of reasoning was that if one set out to do everything, one would end up, doing few things. Thus “America’s definitions of national security should be guided not only by a sensible understanding of what is truly vital to the nation’s security, but also by what the nation can practically expect the government to do and not to do.” To avoid failure, it was “thus critical to identify what national security was not.” The best way to do this was to establish clear criteria for what exactly constitutes a threat to national security.

Holmes posited this in form of questions and answers. Is it, for example, truly a threat to the American people and the American nation as a whole? Can it be tolerated, or must it be eliminated? If the latter, does the nation have the proper means to defeat, contain, or influence the threat? If not, can it obtain those means within a reasonable time frame to make a difference and at an affordable cost?

Is the threat external or internal? If internal, is it from foreign, unlawful, and unconstitutional sources and thus reasonably understood as hostile and a risk to peoples’ freedoms, or is it merely an act of lawful dissent or protest by Americans? The last thing the nation’s leaders should do is to mistake political dissent as a threat to homeland security; although surveillance and intelligence-gathering capabilities are necessary to combat terrorism, it is imperative that America’s leaders keep a bright line between watching terrorists and monitoring the political views of Americans.

Are the threats man-made or natural in origin? Natural disasters like hurricanes can be very dangerous, but even if one assumes they are caused by climate change (which is disputable),

⁵ See Ibid

are they threats to the nation? Are “threats” from the weather, disease, or lack of food due to manipulations by states or terrorist groups or natural in origin, to be dealt with accordingly?

Finally, a crucial question: To what extent is the insecurity of other peoples related to our own? Does U.S. national security come into play only when the safety and security of allies who share America’s values and interests are endangered? Or is America committed generally not only to the safety and security of all peoples around the globe, but also to their health, human rights, and general well-being?

Holmes argued that policymakers need a sharper focus as to what was and was not national security. It cannot be all things to all people; if it were, it would be meaningless. The definition of national security must be limited not only to decide what the government should be expected to do, but also, just as important, to decide what it should not do. Arguing on budget restraints, he posited while it was proper to task the U.S. government with protecting a spectrum of national security interests—from the financial and economic system to access to natural resources—“the lion’s share of the government’s interest and thus budgetary resources should be dedicated to safeguarding the country and its interests from foreign aggression.”

Holmes thus contended that national security was the safekeeping of the nation as a whole. Its highest order of business was the protection of the nation and its people from attack and other external dangers by maintaining armed forces and guarding state secrets. Since the attacks of September 11, 2001, the defense of the homeland from terrorist and other attacks, broadly understood as homeland security, has risen as a major national security concern.

Arguing further, he noted that because national security entailed both national defense and the protection of a series of geopolitical, economic, and other interests, it affected not only defense policy, but foreign and other policies as well. Foreign and defense policies should be seen as mutually reinforcing, not as zero-sum trade-offs in budgetary fights. While hard choices will indeed have to be made in national security spending, they should be decided by realities, not by fatuous comparisons or incoherent and tendentious concepts, he concluded.

Holmes essay also provided a guide to the “how” to attain national security or national security strategy. He criticised the official National Security Strategy which he described as “having bad reputation” as “they were often seen more as public relations exercises than as reliable guides for strategic planning”. The “how” or the NSS was a “bare outline” indicating that the “US should have goals that are clear, achievable, and mutually reinforcing”.

The National Security Strategy goals which Holmes suggested were listed in descending order of importance included:

Preserve the safety of the American homeland and protect the integrity of the nation's domestic institutions and systems vital to that purpose. This goal requires strong Active, Guard, and Reserve forces as well as effective intelligence, law enforcement, counter-terrorism, cybersecurity, and immigration policies to protect the homeland and secure America's borders.

Maintain a global balance of power in favor of America's security and interests and those of its friends and allies. This requires an armed force capable of successfully completing all of the military missions assigned to it and fulfilling U.S. commitments to defend the security of America's allies and friends.

Guarantee the freedom of the seas, upon which both the U.S. and world commerce and economic viability depend. This in particular requires a strong U.S. Navy and Marine Corps and overseas bases capable of supporting the projection of American power around the world.

Exert U.S. influence as much as possible overseas through the entire spectrum of instruments of power, including diplomacy, foreign aid, selective intelligence sharing, public diplomacy, and human rights and humanitarian programs. This requires integrating U.S. diplomacy and foreign aid and humanitarian programs more closely to achieve the purposes of the national strategy.

Dedicate America to maintaining as much as possible a global economy based on economic freedom (sometimes called democratic capitalism), including free trade and the openness of energy markets and international financial systems based on the rule of law.

Focus U.S. energy security policy on developing domestic resources and keeping the international energy market as free as possible from harmful political manipulation.

Ensure that America's dedication to values and their promotion overseas reflects not only its own history of liberty, but also the universal principles of freedom—thus defining human rights as freedom of expression, the right of democratic self-government, economic freedom, equality before the law, and freedom from persecution and oppression. Values should guide and inform the nation's strategy, not direct or control it. Geopolitical compromises will have to be made from time to time, and America should not see itself as the world's policeman enforcing certain values. However, it is important to recognize that this nation's

commitments to universal values like freedom and democracy are reasons why foreign nations and peoples support America.

These "order of importance" did not mask the kernel of US national security. It is to "Preserve the safety of the American homeland and protect the integrity of the nation's domestic institutions and systems vital to that purpose." The "how" to attaining this "requires strong Active, Guard, and Reserve forces as well as effective intelligence, law enforcement, counter-terrorism, cyber security, and immigration policies to protect the homeland and secure America's borders. This method was what gave America its power, influence and respect all over the world.

The Nigerian Context of "National Security"

Using the American experience, what is the Nigerian claim to using national security? What is the historical context for the emergence of security and national security? What are the definition, content, context and instrument of national security? In the absence of scholarship, scholars and thus repository of knowledge on security and national security, what was the basis for this constructs? Should some of Holmes observation not serve as guide to the Nigerian situation?

Ask Nigerians when the term national security became everyday word in Nigeria and one would likely get response like national security was not in use in the 1960s, 1970s and the early part of the 1980s. Perhaps, it began in the mid 1980s and progressively grew in the 1990s and became a household term from 2000. It began with the Second Republic government creating the Office of the Special Adviser on National Security. Nigerians will also say that national security and indeed security was popularised by the military while in government. Discerning Nigerians would also say that the transition that sent the military back to barracks from 1999 and the transition within transition that began in 2007 came with the realisation that getting the now thoroughly politicised military to hands off politics completely would have to come with a tradeoff albeit a blind tradeoff.

At one end of the tradeoff, the politicians would hands off security. Indeed the security type and knowledge the politicians and most Nigerians had was the type initiated by the military when they were the rulers of Nigeria. At the other end of the tradeoff, the military would stay away from politics. This was how security and national security was recalibrated in the body polity. The orchestrated crises in the polity would increase and consolidate the currencies of security and national security within the context of the security education that

Nigerians imbibed during military rule. Perhaps, in there, one can find the origin of national security in Nigeria.

Barring the existence of any document or policy statement on national security such as we found in the United States to extrapolate and inform on national security, the conventional wisdom is to situate any document as they exist in esoteric terms. They included "top secret", "reserved", "classified" and "restricted". These are terms associated with the military and thus describing the state of security and national security. Security and national security document are only available to those who have been initiated. Security is available in documents in the vaults of the Office of the National Security Adviser, military establishments and in the essays written and circulated within these esoteric groups. Only the military and to some extent the political class know security, national security and perhaps national security policy, if one exist. The rest of Nigerians including the intellectual class merely extrapolate on the statements and pronouncements of these people or engage in a wild goose chase. And yet so much has been done, is being done and will be done in the name of security and national security for Nigerians.

Take the National Security Act of 1947 in the United States from where we traced the origin, content, context and instrument of national security. This document was in the public domain for people to know what national security was about in America. Do we have an equivalent document available to all Nigerians and not a select few, from which we can extrapolate on the content of national security in Nigeria? As was usual and common with Nigeria imitating experiences from other societies, there can be found a document on the Internet called the National Security Agencies Act.

The National Security Agencies Act was an attempt to give a democratic touch to the military regime's decree number 19 of 1986 that disbanded the Nigerian Security Organisation (NSO). The NSO was replaced with three agencies including the Defence Intelligence Agency (DIA), National Intelligence Agency (NIA) and the State Security Services (SSS). These three agencies, in the words of the Act, was each charged "with the conduct of the relevant aspect of the national security and other related matters." What is national security the document did not define? What is the relevant aspect of national security?

Priority was given to the DIA perhaps in tandem with the perception of national security by the military responsible for security and the promulgation of the decree. Even the democratic touch given to the decree did not tamper with the order of arrangement of the agencies with

the DIA, NIA and SSS in this order. It might be an inadvertent admission by the democratic legislature of its lack knowledge on the matter, intimidation or of the threat the military poses to them.

What is the perception of threat and thus insecurity for a democratic government? What is security and what constitutes national security for a democratic government? What is security and national security for a democratic government? The democratic regime, in regularising decree number 19 into an act, had no input of its own on security and national security. While ordinary Americans knew national security and what constituted threat through documents, scholarships, media discourses and sensitisation, Nigerians, in the absence of these mediums, were left to discern the meaning of national security as the military constructed this and in the work of these agencies.

What were the works of these agencies since their creation in 1986? What intelligence of a military nature had the DIA gathered since 1986? What was the work of the NIA in the general maintenance of Nigeria's security abroad? Who threatened Nigeria from outside and why? Few persons or countries threatened Nigeria from outside and at best nobody. However, in the esoteric language that characterise the practice, all information was "classified" and Nigerians will never know. Were there threats from within? There were plenty threat from dissatisfied and disgruntled Nigerians. Nigerians are not happy with their standard and quality of living. Should this justify the colossal amount given to these agencies in the name of security and national security?

The Act also provided for the creation of the National Defence Council and the National Security Council. What was the rationale for putting defence before security when decree 19 was promulgated in 1986? I would like to assume it was a deliberate move by the military. The military's professional role is defence and not security. Security is political. As I have argued repeatedly, security is a wider field encompassing all things including defence. The military's knowledge of security is limited hence their conscious or subconscious desire to remained within their professional competence of defence.

Was retaining defence above security by the democratic legislature borne of their ignorance in matters of security? Do they understand their roles as political leaders in providing security to Nigerians? Did remaining outside government for as long as they did because of military intervention made them forget their security role in governance? Or were they addressing their narrow concern of regime security which, having learnt lesson from the military, falls within defence, in their preference for elevating the NDC above the NSC? In any case, what

would the National Security Council composed and dominated by people with defence mindset contribute to resolving Nigeria's problem?

While in the American version of the Act, scholarships and media discourses we were able to discern the focus of national security and the instruments, we have no idea of national security, the context for its birth, the content and least of all the instrument for its attainment. While official Nigeria talks less about the existence of national security document(s) of any kind, we have been inundated about the existence of a national security strategy document. In other words, there is in existence the instrument for the attainment of national security. I have repeatedly asked if it was possible to have strategy without policy and the response of my audience has been silence to say the least.

National security policy should be the preeminent document on security. National security strategy should be the outline of the instrument for the attainment of national security. The national security policy's only rival in importance is the constitution of the country. Just as the constitution provides for other laws, the national security policy should provide security objectives for every other policy in existence. To say that all national policies including defence, if there was one, do not have security objective derive from the national security policy speaks to the deep systemic problem with institutions in Nigeria.

Only recently, retired Lt Gen Abdulrahman Bello Danbazzau demonstrated that there was no security, national security and national security policy in Nigeria. In a lecture titled "education and national security", Danbazzau's paper was yet another proof that other national policies have no security objective derived from a national security policy. Danbazzau was the guest lecturer at the 5th combined convocation of the Nasarawa State University, Keffi. As important as the theme for discussion was, the speaker had assumed a lot of things. One of this was that his audience knew what security and national security was. Another was that with this knowledge they will be able to draw the connection between education and national security.

The conceptualisation of national security as "territorial security, the protection of the state, its boundaries, people, institutions and values from external attack" did not come from any extant document on the subject beyond the reference to "traditionally". Which and whose tradition was he talking about? Was it the tradition of imitating external realities? What institutions and values was he referring to? Do nationalities in Nigeria subscribe to a Nigerian institutions and values? Is there a Nigerian security institutions and values? Attack from

which “external” source? Has Nigeria ever faced the type of attack that is traditional to the places where we have persisted in imitating security reality in theory and practice?

There was no reference to education policy drawing its security objective, if there was, from the national security policy, if there was one. In one instance, he offered “how does education impact on national security one may ask?” In answer to this question, he opined that “education is the vehicle through which development is driven and national security can only be achieved if there is human security”. Instead, the Speaker dwelt on the function of the ministry of interior which he presided over as minister, the challenges in internal security and the attempt to connect this to education.

Dr. Danbazzau’s paper was important to me as I was keen to learn about security, national security and national security policy and the nexus between education and national security. It was also important to the students of security and strategic studies programme present in the hall. In the first place the minister did not show up to present the paper himself. Thus the prospect of fielding question was out of the point. In the second place, the paper avoided defining security and national security. In the third place there were references to internal security, human security etc. In the fourth place, the paper did not say if the national policy on education has security content and if it had whether the content was derived from the national security policy.

The choice of Danbazzau as the speaker and the choice of the topic either given by the University or chosen by the speaker himself did not mask the face of security in Nigeria. The face of security is that only military people serving or retired know security and the security type they know is closely associated with their profession. It is the knowledge that most Nigerians are familiar with. I may be alone in expressing my disappointment with the presentation. It might not be so with the rest of the audience on that occasion. One thing I carried away with me from the presentation was that Nigeria has no security conception anchored on its history, experience and reality. Nigeria has no national security policy and that policies in Nigeria have no security content derived from a security policy. My conviction in this is absolute. I remained to be challenged on this.

Danbazzau’s presentation was the second in the series involving the University, security and military people. As part of the commemoration of the birthday of Professor Muhammad Akaro Mainoma, the Vice Chancellor, the Security and Strategic Studies Unit of the Institute of Governance and Development Studies, organised its first guest lecture series to celebrate the occasion. The lecturer was retired Lt. Colonel Kayode Aare, former deputy/acting

national security adviser and director general of the Department of State Service. The title of the paper was "security paradigms and the Nigeria Challenge".⁶ For the students and resource persons of the Security and Strategic Studies programme battling many challenges as a result of the newness of security in the curriculum, the presence of what could arguably be described as one man who has seen it all on security in the Nigeria context in their midst should be taken seriously in terms of ironing out issues.

Again and for me, the presentation was a disappointment. There was no sense of anything new on security and there was no paradigm or paradigms as implied in the topic. The lecture was reminiscences of the lecturer. In the question and answer session, he was asked if there was a security policy in Nigeria. Colonel Aare's answer was intriguing to say the least. It was his opinion that there was a national security policy in so far as there were institutional representations of security such as the ONSA, DIA, NIA, DSS etc. According to Colonel Aare, the policies were in bits and pieces and that what it would take to have them in one document was for someone to put them together. This was the extent of the Colonel's knowledge about policy in general and national security policy in particular.

Considering the perspective from America, what sense of security informs national security in Nigeria? Where did this leave Nigeria in terms of a made in Nigeria security, national security and policy? A made in Nigeria security, national security and national security policy would take into consideration Nigeria's history, experience and reality (HER). It is a sine qua non to the making of security in Nigeria.

⁶ Colonel (Dr) Kayode Aare, "Security Paradigms and the Nigerian Challenge", Guest Lecture Series, Institute of Governance and Development Studies, Nasarawa State University, Keffi, Postgraduate Hall, 08th October 2016