

Understanding Security, “Security” Challenges and the Role of Administrators in Nigeria’s Schools¹

By

Adoyi ONOJA²

Nasarawa State University, Keffi

onojaaf@nsuk.edu.ng

<http://www.adoyionoja.org.ng>

Preamble

I will begin this paper with a conversation that ensued between a passenger and a driver enroute to Keffi from Jos.³ By the way, I was in Jos when I was contacted by Dr. Amuga to find out my availability to write and present this paper. The conversation was about the state of governance amidst Nigeria’s unparalleled resources endowments. This was in view of the mindless and grotesque stealing of resources at all levels by those who can.

The basis of the conversation was the driver’s humane consideration of the plight of the passengers in reducing fare and/or negotiating fare amidst the immoral ills of the average Nigerian of profiting off difficult conditions in what is arguably the rendition of the deeply ingrained individual and collective *emi lokan*.⁴

The driver was of the view that no country was as rich as Nigeria but that the greed of the leadership will not allow the leaders govern for the benefit of the people. The passenger then noticed the new road from Akwanga to Keffi and commended the initiative while listing four significant areas he considered would make tremendous difference in the lives of most Nigerians if addressed by the governments. They were roads, schools, hospitals and

¹ Paper prepared for presentation at the 2024 annual conference of All Nigeria Confederation of Principals of Secondary Schools (ANCOPSS) slated for June, 2024. The original title was “educational development: the role of school administrators in the face of current security challenges in Nigerian schools”. This was modified with the permission of the ANCOPSS.

² Dr. Adoyi Onoja is of the Nasarawa State University, Keffi where he teaches in the Department of History and in the graduate programme on Security and Strategic Studies of the Institute of Governance and Development Studies. His research interests are security, history of security, comparative security, governance, law enforcement, media and Middle Belt of Nigeria. He edits a website <http://www.adoyionoja.org.ng> where most of his works can be accessed on the sub links stripping/buzzingintown/aoviews/adonostra

³ The trip was on 26th March 2024 inside a Volkswagen Sharon Bus. The conversation was in Hausa Language.

⁴ The concept of *Emi Lokan* which is *My Turn* in Yoruba was first publicly articulated and presented by Candidate Ahmed Bola Tinubu when he presented his case, in the lead-up to the 2023 nomination and elections, before his people. Whether the case was just, fair and legitimate in the circumstance was immaterial as it was a call for action in what Candidate Tinubu must have convinced himself and thus his people was an attempt to deny him his rightful right. As a concept, *Emi Lokan* is deeply engrained in the Nigerian mentality and persona for the sole reason that working and governing for the sake *Awa Lokan* or the majority has never been the Nigerian thing. In the absence of governance that benefits most Nigerians, Nigerians sit and wait their turn. A replica of this is what is happening in the current subsidy removal triggered food and commodities inflation. When prices go up in Nigeria, they never come down. Or so it seems.

electricity.⁵ The driver then added “tsoro”⁶ and according to him tackling this “tsoro” was the number one issue of governance without which the other issues would not matter.

There are so many unresolved questions associated with the wisdom – if it is one – that put “tsoro” before other issues of governance for resolution in order to address Nigeria’s challenges. This is because this is the official position that plays out every day in the affairs of the country.

What is “tsoro”? “Tsoro” is supposedly the Hausa equivalent for “security”. What is security? What is security should be conceived from two perspectives: the founding/universal perspective and the local perspective. Is “tsoro” thus the proper equivalent of security in the founding universal perspective? Is “tsoro” the equivalent of security in Hausa language? Is this “tsoro” the number one challenge of governance in Nigeria? What is the equivalent of “tsoro” or security, as the Hausa language would want their audience to believe, in each and everyone’s language, in this hall? This is assuming “tsoro” in Hausa do equate to “security” as conceived etymologically, historically and philosophically by those that invented the word security?⁷

Is “tsoro” the same as what in Nigeria is referred to as “security” challenges? Is there an equivalent of “tsoro” in each of Nigeria’s languages? If there is, what is it? Is it the same as what we in Nigeria call “security” challenges? Is there a Nigerian conceptual, policy and legislation perspective of or on security? Are all these the same as in the founding/universal perspective of security? If they are not, should Nigeria not embark on creating the equivalent of security, in its *etymologies*, *history* and *philosophy* and domesticating this security, in its existential classification, to guide policy and practice?

⁵ If properly designated in the context of the etymologies, history and philosophy of security, these – roads, electricity, schools and hospitals etc. – belong in the first hierarchies of security needs in the Nigerian context and “tsoro” or the prevailing conception of “security” – the work of the military, intelligence and law enforcement – comes last on the hierarchy. It is the absence or the inadequacies of hospitals, roads, schools, electricity, opportunity, etc. that push people into committing crimes and criminalities which formed the crux of the work of “tsoro”. Once these essentials of life and living are provided for most Nigerians, crimes and criminalities would be reduce to the barest minimum and “tsoro” or the MILE would have no work to do. Read Adoyi Onoja, *Hierarchy of SECURITY Needs (hSn)* (Monograph 9), Jos, Eiwa Press, 2022

⁶ “Tsoro” is purportedly the Hausa equivalent for security albeit “security” in the name and work of the military, intelligence and law enforcement. In one of my inaugural PhD classes on the course Seminar on National Security Policy, I was compelled to ask students to provide the equivalent of security and not “security” in their indigenous languages. Not one of the students could come up with the word for security in their languages. In the Latin and English languages amongst other European languages, the word for security is *securus*, *securitas* and *secure* and they mean free from care, something which secure, condition of being secure and feeling no apprehension. “Tsoro” which in Hausa mean fear is the verb for the work of the military, intelligence and law enforcement. There is certainly no Hausa or other indigenous language word that I know for now for security when viewed from the European etymologies, history and philosophy of security.

⁷ Security has Etymologies, History and Philosophy. See <http://www.adoyionoja.org.ng>

Of crucial importance, in line with the idea that informed the conception of “tsoro” as security, why do people commit crimes which “tsoro” (as noun (hukuman tsoro) and verb (aiki tsoro) for the effort to check crimes and criminalities) seek to ameliorate? There are two explanations for this. The first is deprivations of all forms. The second is what I would refer to as the political economy of “security”.⁸ The two are related. This is to the extent that deprivations which are the deliberate creation of the governance authorities is in order to unleash the conditions for the operation of “tsoro” and thus the political economy of “security” in Nigeria’s Fourth Republic.

This brings us to the part of the rephrased⁹ topic and the crux of the issue: “understanding security.” Unless we understand security, using its founding etymologies, history and philosophy, we cannot understand what we in Nigeria refer to “security”, “security challenges” and the role of administrators in Nigeria’s schools.

Introduction

The beginning of Nigeria’s journey to “security” challenges has remote and immediate causes. On the remote side are the accumulated injustices committed by successive governments against most Nigerians upon which Nigeria’s equally unjust foundations rest. These injustices lay buried in Nigeria’s colonial and post-colonial pasts. There are either no attempts or cosmetic attempts to remedy these injustices.

Of the numerous immediate causes, one dimension that plausibly informed this conference and theme were the activities in lead-up to and after the enthronement of Muhammadu Buhari GCFR as Nigeria’s President in 2015. The quadruple evil of terrorism, insurgency, banditry and kidnapping flowered¹⁰ and reached their nadir in the eight years of his rule and continued afterwards.

⁸ A political economy of “security” combines the defects in the statues particularly the 1999 Constitution, the Nigerian characters and institutions with the Nigerian ability to deploy their emi lokan to profit from it. The make-up of a political economy of “security” include the 1999 Constitution particularly the life and death powers of the president and governors, the absence of political parties (no ideology, absence of policy platform, as recruitment, training and nurturing grounds and the highest bidder gets the tickets), the cost of politics and elections (the unending quest for funds to deploy for this purpose) and the need to keep the military happy owing to the fear psychology of the civil political class about the military’s potential for destabilisation. See Adoyi Onoja, *A Political Economy of “Security” in Nigeria’s Fourth Republic* (Monograph 12), (forthcoming)

⁹ I was given a topic and I was also permitted to modify the topic to suit my disposition. The original topic was “educational development: the role of school administrators in the face of current security challenges in Nigerians’ schools”. I did take the liberty to modify the topic into what is before you now.

¹⁰ In the eight years of Muhammadu Buhari GCFR’s presidency, the official policy of the governments at all levels was to adopt a laissez-faire attitude to kidnapping and banditry whenever it occurred. Thus beyond the official condemnations, platitudes and promises that the so-called “security” forces would go after the kidnappers and bandits and rescue the victims – statements which ended after it was uttered – the governments take no responsibility whatsoever whenever it happened. The governments leave the victims’ families to bear the pains in all of its forms. It is a policy that has the hallmarks of the unspoken and the yet-to-be uttered emi lokan which is arguably deeply embedded in

Somewhere in my introduction I mentioned security, I put this security in quotation marks. The reason for this is not farfetched. For most Nigerians including majority of the participants, security has only one perspective albeit an undefined, uncharted and ungoverned perspective in Nigeria's laws and policies. Beyond the noun and verb associational and descriptive perspectives of security as designating the name and work of the executive agencies of the military, intelligence and law enforcement (MILE), most Nigerians have confined themselves to this narrow perspective and in the process lost the true meaning of security. This perspective suits what I called the political economy of "security"¹¹ because it legitimise the relationship of convenience¹² between Nigeria's political elite and the elite leadership of the military, intelligence and law enforcement (MILE) of the Fourth Republic.

As long as the quadruple evils of terrorism, insurgency, banditry and kidnapping continue, most Nigerians would not question the humongous money¹³ persistently and consistently assigned to "security" in the name of mitigating these challenges because as most Nigerians have been goaded into believing "'SECURITY' and welfare are the primary purpose of government".¹⁴ But which security is this? Why is the WELFARE aspect suppressed as opposed to the volarisation of the security aspect? In whose benefit is the "security" in this Section volarised? To whose benefit are the fund frequently voted for "security" and prioritised against other aspect of governance at all levels of governance? And rather than abetting, why is there no end in sight for the "security" challenges?

most Nigerians DNA. It is a policy that has continued in the present administration. With all of the policies churned out on terrorism, insurgencies etc. at the behest of the Office of the National Security Adviser in the last fifteen years, the policy that works is the do-nothing-policy as reflected in the practical conducts of the governments and its agencies in these matters.

¹¹ What I refer to as a political economy of "security" captured the beneficial aggregation of interests, understanding and relationship between the elite of politics and the elite of the military, intelligence and law enforcement. In order to safeguard democracy for the elite of politics and in order to compensate the military for the vast infrastructures and investments it made in governance and lost with the enthronement of civil rule in 1999, Nigeria's political elite entered into an informal understanding where they allow the military, intelligence and law enforcement exclusive control over the portfolio called "security" in return for safeguarding democracy. The MILE had lost power, fame and access to money with the return to democracy. To compensate the MILE, "security" allowed their elites access to fund and at the same time provide the elite of politics unlimited fund to mitigate the costly political system in place in the country. "Security" and dealing with "security" challenges is the number one item of governance at all levels. The "security" challenges are deliberately manufactured by the political elites in their poor and inadequate governance at all levels on the one hand and on the other hand in the branded type typified by the quadruple evil of terrorism, insurgency, banditry and kidnapping. The latter was the Buhari presidency's specialties.

¹² See footnote 6 for some of these conveniences

¹³ The audit firm Price Water House Cooper Nigeria (PwC Nigeria) provided a figure of N14.8 trillion spent on "security" in the last nine years – essentially the years of Muhammadu Buhari GCFR's presidency.

¹⁴ See Section 14 Subsections 2B of the 1999 Constitution. This provision particularly the "security" part in the provision is the most quoted by Nigeria's political operators in the executives and legislatures and by most learned Nigerians to justify the committal of endless fund in the unending bottomless "security" challenges. Nigeria's political operators do not bother about the "welfare" part of the provision. The "security" in question in the Section refers to the name and work of the military, intelligence and law enforcement.

What is "tsoro" or this "security"? Under what governance type did the concept of "tsoro" or "security" develop? From whose generic idea did the governance type develop its idea which then gave birth to the concept of "tsoro" or "security"? Does "tsoro" or "security" reflect the present governance system's idea i.e. civil rule democracy? Should the present governance system continue to use the previous governance idea i.e. military rule from which "tsoro" or "security" developed? Shouldn't the present governance system develop its conception from the same source like the previous governance system to pave way for the emergence of precise local equivalents of "tsoro" or "security" in indigenous cultures including the enabling of the reassessment of "tsoro" or "security"?

What is "tsoro" or "security" in each one of your languages? Do "tsoro" or "security" and your language equivalent truly capture the founding *etymologies*, *history* and *philosophy* of the word from which "tsoro" or "security" developed under the governance system in question? Should we continue to use this conception in the present governance system?

The answers to these questions is in understanding security, the governance idea from which "security" challenges develop, the viability of the retention of this conception in the prevailing governance system, the roles of the governments in the "security" challenges and where and what, if any, are the roles of administrators of schools.

In what follows, the paper will investigate and interrogate security, "security" challenges and the role of administrators in Nigeria's schools. This is in the belief that the government is not doing all that it takes to put security in the footing of CIVIL RULE and GOVERNANCE and thus burdening parents and administrators with responsibility whose solution should begin at the level of philosophy, legislation, policy and thus ministries, departments and agencies.

Unless the government takes up this challenge, "security" which at the moment is at the level of the military, intelligence and law enforcement (MILE) which failed so far will fail and continue to fail and school administrators will have little to contribute to the amelioration of the conditions in their schools.

Understanding Security from Security's Etymologies, History and Philosophy

It takes an understanding of security from its founding Etymologies, History and Philosophy to decipher the prevailing "security" narrative or perspective in Nigeria. Until the 15th century, there was no word called security in the lexicon of the world. Let's begin with the founding idea and ideal of security from which the genre called national security developed. The place

to open conversation on security is the etymologies of security. The etymologies of security also contain security's history and philosophy.

Security began as a word. As a word, security is a European creation or invention. The Latin language etymologies of security are *securus* and *securitas*. The English language etymology is *secure*. *Securus*, *Securitas* and *Secure* mean *free from care, something which secure or condition of being secure* and *feeling no apprehension*.

S e c u r i t y, the now famous and famed word in the world, began life from *securus*, *securitas* and *secure*. Arguably, security is one of the most important words, if not the single most important word, in the world of politics today. Security's founding meaning permeates every endeavour of human being. Security's founding meaning is central to the idea and ideal of humanity and being human. Security is the vision and mission of each and all of human enterprise.

There is a HISTORY behind the emergence of *Securus*, *Securitas* and *Secure* or "Free from Care", "Something which secure" or "Condition of being secure" and "Feeling no apprehension". The history began in 500 AD. This history ended in 1500 AD. The period was called the middle ages or dark ages. Europe entered the middle ages or dark ages following the collapse of Roman civilisation. With the collapse, darkness enveloped Europeans and Europe for the next five hundred years.

For five centuries or 500 hundred years, European civilisation collapse and barbarism overtook all spheres of lives of Europeans in Europe. This was the middle ages or medieval period of European history. Thomas Hobbes captured the condition of Europeans and Europe when he described life and living as having "no arts; no letters; no society and; which are worst of all, continual fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short". There was no state inside European communities. There were castle towns and walls where communities clustered around strong individuals for their livelihood and for their safety. Europeans and Europe returned to the state of nature where the mantra was the survival of the fittest. Consequently, Europeans yearned for the return of civilisation which *will free them from care, provide them with something which secure or condition of being secure* and reduce or eliminate the *feelings of apprehension* in their lives and affairs.

There is a PHILOSOPHY or nature, meaning and purpose of *securus*, *securitas* and *secure*. The philosophy is the desire of Europeans and Europe for *free from care, something which secure*

or *condition of being secure and feeling no apprehension* in all spheres of their lives. These terms embedded the aspirations of Europeans of the period. They continue to embed their individual and collective aspirations as peoples, cultures and countries. These were the conditions that gave birth to security.

Security is the aspirations of Europeans for *free from care, something which secure or condition of being secure and feeling no apprehension*. Since the emergence of this security philosophy, Europeans, in their individual countries, and as Europeans in different community platforms, have concentrated in working to fulfilling these aspirations in every sphere of their lives.

Europeans have used and are using platforms such as the European Union to drive *freeing their people from care, providing something which secure or condition of being secure for their people and reducing or eliminating the feeling of apprehension* in their quality and quantity of living. Europeans have used and are using other institutions in the social, cultural, military etc. spheres to free their people from care, provide something which secure, create conditions of being secure and/or reduce or eliminate feeling of apprehension in their people. European have used and are using institutions including a hand shake across the Atlantic or transatlantic alliances such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation to moderate and restrain their propensities for internecine quarrels with destabilising potentials for their peoples and cultures.

This foundational meaning embedded in the etymologies of security – *free from care, something which secure or condition of being secure and feeling no apprehension* – remained unchanged even as these have developed country-culture-specific context in the perspective of security found all around the world. What is equally universal, in spite of the country-culture-specific construct of security, is that issue(s) labelled security is/are designated as existential and received the highest prioritisation in the hierarchy of the use of human and material resources to addressing the issues. Thus there is a history, experience and reality (HER)¹⁵ to the perspective of security in each of the countries of the world. What is the Nigerian version of this?

On the Prevailing Conception of “Security” and “Security Challenges”

¹⁵ For the concept/tool/theory called history, experience and reality (HER), see Adoyi Onoja, “A Security Theory based on Nigeria’s History, Experience and Reality”, <https://www.adoyionoja.org.ng/A%20Security%20Theory%20based%20on%20Nigeria.pdf>

When Europe evolved its idea of security that formed the basis of other conceptions of security in the world including the United States national security – arguably the most popular and the most imitated genre of security in the world – Europe did not confine security to one area of its affairs and neither did America’s national security.

Europe’s and America’s security and national security covered all areas of their affairs including and especially their affairs beyond their shores. The American conception of national security gained popularity in its projection of the military, intelligence and law enforcement as one of the strategies for defending, protecting and advancing whatever the United States designate as its national security interest.

Arguably and in part, Nigeria’s “security” and/or “national security” narratives derived from this perspective of Europe and America couched in the name and work of the military, intelligence and law enforcement. The other part owed its origins to the illegal and immoral intervention of the military in political governance. With the military in power for the better part of Nigeria’s independence until 1999, “security” or free from care, something which secure/condition of being secure and/or feeling no apprehension was defined in the constitutionally assigned mandate of defence, intelligence and law enforcement of the military, intelligence and law enforcement. The military thus defined security using their professional calling and outlook and confined in name and practice their performative act of “security” to their professional mandates.

There are two perspectives that coalesced into Nigeria’s military narrative of security and/or national security. The first perspective was Europe and America’s designation of political and social instability-inspired crimes and criminalities in different parts of the world which negate their ability to access their economic and strategic resources/interests around the world. To these countries, these developments threatened and undermined the attainment of their national security to which they deployed their military, intelligence and law enforcement amongst other strategies to ameliorate the conditions. For Nigeria’s military regimes, this development became the be-all and end-all of security or national security in practice.

The second perspective arose from the *raison d’être* of their intervention in politics by overthrowing civil elected governments. The military painted conditions of lawlessness, anarchy and maladministration under civil rule and promised to restore law and order in the polity. Thus the origin of security for the military and for Nigeria’s military leadership – the two faces of insecurity and security – developed from these two perspectives.

Unlike the United States of America where national security construct developed out of its history, sociology and politics and enjoyed the legislative and policy backing as far back as 1947¹⁶ and from whence each administration develop its strategy to accomplishing the goals of national security, Nigeria's "security" and/or "national security" did not derive from a Nigerian philosophy, legislation and policy. Under military rule, there was never any need for strategy. However, with the return of democracy and the management of "security"/"national security" in the hands of the military, intelligence and law enforcement, the Office of the National Security Adviser (ONSA), as the defacto manager of this "security"/"national security", saw the need for a strategy which it compiled in 2014¹⁷ and reprinted/reviewed in 2019¹⁸ after the expiration of its lifeless¹⁹ life. Unlike the United States where there was a policy-legislation on national security which drives administrations strategies, there was none in Nigeria. Instead Nigeria possessed security cart – the *National Security Strategy* – without security horse – policy legislation on security.

What is "security" in Nigeria is the view of one (military) or few agencies (military, intelligence and law enforcement) of the executive arm of government derived from their professional mandates as prescribed by the relevant laws. This view of "security" was superimposed on the country when they illegally usurped political power. This was security in the image of the military and military rule. Their professional mandates and its translation into security is not representative of the yearnings and aspirations of most Nigerians for what is security or *free from care, something which secure, condition of being secure* and/or *feeling no apprehension* which I described as wellbeing in all of its forms. Their work description of defence on land, sea and air, intelligence gathering inside, outside Nigeria and of civil and military nature and law enforcement and their projection of crimes and criminalities including the high profile mostly orchestrated²⁰ political crimes of terrorism,

¹⁶ For the histories of national security, read Douglas T. Stuart, *Creating the National Security State: A History of the Law that Transformed America*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2008 and Michael J. Hogan, *A Cross of Iron: Harry S. Truman and the Origins of the National Security State 1945-1954*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2008

¹⁷ See Adoyi Onoja, *A Critique of the National Security Strategy* (Monograph 3), Jos, Eiwa Press, 2019

¹⁸ The five years life span of the *National Security Strategy* expires this year and a reprint/review would be done as was the case in 2019. See Adoyi Onoja, "Matters to Note and Matters Arising for the Impending "Review" of the *National Security Strategy* 2019" on

<http://www.adoyionoja.org.ng>, Facebook

(https://m.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=pfbid02W15tpbp2Drw8RbJo2gjiHcTgojUvcRSjAsOS?NNJS23p1oUG3w76XF5DyVqGgQfw6tI&id=562901497&mibextid=ZbWKwl), LinkedIn (<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/matters-note-arising-impending-review-national-security-adoyi-onoja-6sdcf/?trackingId=%2BVhECOVITJuW0sm23Wxcg%3D%3D>) and academia.edu

(https://www.academia.edu/118357073/Matters_to_Note_and_Matters_Arising_for_the_Impending_Review_of_the_National_Security_Strategy_2019?sm=b)

¹⁹ I described the *National Security Strategy* which was reviewed in 2019 after the expiration of the Strategy's shelf life (shelf life because this was where it was kept by those that have copies including the ONSA) as lifeless because the document was never used and has never guided programmes and projects on "security" or "national security" since it was compiled.

²⁰ I argued that there was a political economy of "security" in place that fed the insatiable appetite of the political class and their MILE class for fund which occasioned the continuation of these crimes.

insurgency, banditry and kidnapping which they described as “security” challenges are the EFFECTS and not the CAUSES of the lack of security or free from care, something which secure, condition of being secure and/or feeling no apprehension for most Nigerians.

Indeed the military’s narrative of “security” and/or “national security” outlived its usefulness with the return of democracy in 1999 causing the long overdue need for the construction of security in the image of civil rule with the mandate²¹ to govern each and every sphere of the lives of Nigerians and Nigeria. When Nigerians voted to return the country to civil rule system, it was a vote of no confidence on the military and its security type. To this extent, civil rule and governance conception of security cannot and should not be the same as the military and military rule conception of security. The constitution saddled civil rule operators with governing all areas of human endeavours. The constitution specifically singled out Nigeria’s legislatures as the content creators in any democracy. The legislatures need to construct and resource security in the image of civil rule and governance.

This is the crux of the matter with security under civil rule.

The Fourth Republic, “Security”, “Security” Challenges and the Emergence of a Political Economy of “Security”

As I noted in the preceding subsection, there was need for civil rule, through the legislatures, to construct and resource security in the image of civil rule and governance frameworks. To do this will define, going forward, what is security, whose security, what is a security issue and how can security be achieved in Nigeria.²² Once Nigeria’s legislatures answer these questions, they would have provided the philosophy/policy-legislation and strategy of security. This will guide programmes and projects of the public and private sectors.

This is because beyond the elevation of the military, intelligence and law enforcement professional mandates into “security” and the continuation of this “security” under civil rule, nothing in Nigeria’s statutes²³ supported this conception of “security”. What is the prevailing

²¹ The 1999 Constitution even in its orchestrated defective form still saddle civil rule operators with the mandate to govern the institutions and physical body of Nigeria and as such civil rule operators cannot and should not rely on the construct of security or national security that is narrow and focused on the affairs of few agencies of the executive.

²² These are the four fundamental questions (4fqs) of any policy issue which has not been asked and answered for security under civil rule system. For the idea of the four fundamental questions, read Paul D. Williams, “Security Studies: an Introduction” in Paul D. Williams(ed.), *Security Studies: An Introduction*, London and New York, Routledge, 2008

²³ There are fifteen mentions of security either as “security” or “national security” in the 1999 Constitution. There was nowhere in the constitution that this “security” or “national security” was defined. The readers are left to draw their conclusion of the meaning of this “security” or “national security”. Rather “security” and/or “national security” were used in associational and descriptive terms for the name and work of the military, intelligence and law enforcement. The first two mentions increased the confusion and ambiguity of this “security”. Section 5 subsection 5 mentioned “national security” and Section 14 subsection 2B mentioned “security”. The first mention was as “national security” and clearly it was in relation to the military’s defence work. The second mention as “security” was neither here nor there. Section

"security" has been unable to meet the expectation of civil rule in terms of their schedules unlike the military and thus failed and continue to fail. However, taking Nigeria on the road to the construct of security of the type that will be beneficial to most Nigerians will be difficult owing to the making and thriving of what I called a political economy of "security".²⁴

There are phases in the emergence of "security" challenges in the Fourth Republic which was inaugurated in 1999. These phases are important in the making of a political economy of "security" as the life-wire of the relationship between the elite of politics and the elite leadership of military, intelligence and law enforcement. This development is at the bottom of the unending "security" challenges in Nigeria.

In terms of the awareness of the difference between security and defence under civil rule governance type and thus the need for a security policy framework, only President Olusegun Obasanjo seemingly demonstrated this awareness. President Obasanjo produced the Grand National Security Strategy which guided his administration. Under his administration, all sectors were given considerable consideration as important in the overall development of the country. It was under his watch that Nigeria's middle class began to grow. The military, intelligence and law enforcement was subordinated to civil control, and the greed that developed subsequently and manifested in the "security" challenges, was checked.

This trend changed under the Presidencies of Umaru Yar'Adua and Goodluck Jonathan. These two leaders were not only the first non-military personnel to preside over the affairs of state in the Fourth Republic. They were the products of military rule "security" type socialisation. They had no security framework of their own. Their dispositions to issues of security emboldened the military and caused the unfolding of their held-up or suspended strategies that will leverage "security" and "national security" to secure their – the elite leadership of the MILE – place in the civil rule system.

The phenomenon of Boko Haram began under their watch, and provided the platform for the beginning of a political economy of "security". "Security" and "security" challenges became item number one on the plate of governance as the executives and legislatures at all levels and in partnership with the military, intelligence and law enforcement leveraged on the relevant sections of the Constitution to justify their prioritisation of addressing what they

14 subsections 2B has become the defining constitutional refrain exploited by elected officials at all levels to justify the disproportionate allocation of fund in their so-called bid to restore "security" by addressing "security" challenges.

²⁴ Read footnotes 6 and 9 above for perspectives on a political economy of "security". Read also Adoyi Onoja, *The Making of a Political Economy of "Security" in Nigeria's Fourth Republic* (Monograph 12), Unpublished papers, 2024; _____ *In Search of "Security" Vote in Nigeria* (Monograph 10), Jos, Eiwā Press, 2023

called “security” challenges. They did this by allowing the leadership of the military, intelligence and law enforcement the governance of this “security” and “security” challenges for their collective benefits.²⁵

What was an insidious quasi-official policy of using “security” and “security” challenges as avenues to access fund for the political and MILE bosses became open and official under the Presidency of Muhammadu Buhari GCFR. In the lead-up to the 2015 elections, the All Progressive Congress (APC) promised to win the elections at all costs or to make the country ungovernable.

In pursuant of this pledge, the APC mopped up Fulani from all over the Sahel and deployed them into different parts of Nigeria to achieving these objectives. They won the election and proceeded to use the mayhem of terrorism, banditry and kidnapping unleashed by the Fulani whom they subsequently abandoned to consolidate on their unparalleled records of impoverishing governance at all levels. The Buhari administration grew a one-of-a-kind unique form of “security” challenges in their eight years in power. The officials then proceeded to invoking Section 5 subsection 5 and especially Section 14 subsection 2B to commit fund to mitigating these challenges – funds that mostly ended in the pockets of the political and professional managers of this “security”. In the latest audit report of Price Water House Cooper Nigeria (PwC Nigeria), N14.8 trillion was spent during these eight years on mitigating these “security” challenges. This money, according to the columnist Lasisi Olagunju, did not yield any result.

In the eight years of the APC in power, most Nigerians were impoverished to the level they never attained under any regime in the Fourth Republic. The development increased the traditional crimes occasioned by governance inadequacies at all levels on the one hand and on the other hand the politically created crimes of terrorism, insurgency, banditry and kidnapping. These collectively summed up the “security” challenges that oil the political economy of “security” which has defied remedy essentially because as the late General Sani Abacha noted, they were government created “security” challenges and for a purpose.

Do School Administrators Really Have Roles in Combating “Security” Challenges?

The question begging for answer is: do school administrators really have roles to exercise in combating “security” challenges when they occur in their schools? What roles do school administrators think they have and can play in the midst of a carefully orchestrated scheme of

²⁵ See Adoyi Onoja, *In Search of “Security” Vote in Nigeria* in Ibid

"security" and "security" challenges in a chessboard where they are pawns amongst several others persons and institutions?

Arising from the foregoing facts, analyses and interpretations and in particular the statement credited to General Sani Abacha and my thesis of a political economy of "security" that has proved beneficial and rewarding for the elites of politics and the MILE, what role(s) do school administrators think they would be allowed to play to mitigate the outbreak of "security" challenges in the form of kidnapping of their school pupils?

When in the moment of deep anguish, impending personal loss and philosophical reflection Asiwaju Bola Tinubu uttered the *emi lokan* word as he presented his case to his folks, he unwittingly captured the essence of the personal and professional lives of most Nigerians in position of privilege amidst the failure of governance, the depth of corruption and thus overwhelming deprivations, inequality and injustice, in public affairs. The developments of the last fifteen years fit into the philosophy of *emi lokan* to which most Nigerians privileged to be in the position of service embraced and used to their benefits. Are the school administrators on the verge of capitalising on the so-called "security" challenges to unleash their own *emilokan*?

I didn't come here to tell school administrators to fence their schools as high as they can, if they can mobilise the resources to buy blocks, irons and cements, because fences cannot stop state orchestrated crimes; I did not come here to tell school administrators to employ more guards to guard the vicinities of their schools because guards can be compromised amidst their quest for their own *emi lokan*; I did not come here to tell school administrators to arm the guards with assorted weapons because the guards can use this weapon in their *emi lokan*; I did not come here to tell school administrators to procure and deploy drones and other high tech electronic gadgets to patrol the perimeters of the schools 24/7 because on the day of the kidnapping drones and other gadgets can and will fail to work; I did not come here to tell school administrators to put cameras in the vicinities of the schools and review developments every twenty four hours because cameras can fail when there is need for them to fail; I did not come here to tell school administrators to collect the phone numbers of the divisional police officer, civil defence commander, Department of State Service local official and/or the detachment of air force/army/navy commanders - the proverbial "security" - in their areas because these too cannot and will not be accessible when there is the most need for them and; I did not come here to tell school administrators to task the parent teachers association in order to address "security" challenges as best as they could. These are not the roles of school administrators or parent teachers association. The roles of school administrators are to

ensure that there are teaching and learning environments and that the teachers teach and the pupils' learn. This is their security objective. They should ensure this is fulfilled in their schools.

The school administrators are not to worry about these developments that created the "security" challenges. These worries belong first to the state,²⁶ should there be a properly constituted state, with a Nigerian philosophy and thus security in the image of civil rule and governance frameworks. And secondly to the governments and its ministries, departments and agencies where ministries, departments and agencies will come up with strategies to key into the state's security philosophy in order to enable the necessary environments including the physical safety of pupils and teachers that will cause teaching and learning to take place.

In the light of security's etymologies, history and philosophy on the one hand and on the other hand the genre described as "security" challenges including terrorism, insurgency, banditry and kidnapping which are outside the conventional crimes of thefts, stealing, burglary and in extreme cases armed robbery and rape, what can the school administrators do to ameliorate this situation should they arise unexpectedly as they usually do?

The school administrators' difficulties are heightened by the fact that these crimes are a political creation on one hand and on the other hand those with the responsibility to mitigate the development whenever it occurs – the military, intelligence and law enforcement – usually wait for nudges from the professional political bosses to act. Who and where would the school administrators turn to whenever it occurs?

Do the school administrators have the resources to develop their own intelligence network to observe and report? Who and which agencies would the school administrators report

²⁶ Under the present security narrative, the state is seen solely as the coercive arms which exclude the people or for now the nationalities whose consent creates and legitimises the state. Nigeria has never had a state as comprising the three components of idea, institutions and physical body. While there are the institutions and physical body, the idea has been missing since independence in 1960. The idea represents the collective resolves or the soul given to the state by most if not all the nationalities within the physical body or territorial areas called Nigeria which powers the state. What this means is that Nigeria has never had a philosophy or nature, meaning and purpose derived from most if not all of its nationalities. To this extent, the continuous survival of Nigeria is contingent on juridical sovereignty and not empirical sovereignty. The former was conferred by the recognition of other countries of the world. The latter that should precede the former should come from most if not all the nationalities of Nigeria. Thus and as far as legitimacy is concerned, the state or whatever is the state in Nigeria does not enjoy this from most of its nationalities. This explains the persistence of separatist agitations all over the country. In part the so-called insurgency is fueled by the state of the state in Nigeria. For idea, institutions and physical body, read chapter 2 National Security and the Nature of the State, in Barry Buzan, *People, states and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*, New York/London, Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991. For the idea of juridical and empirical sovereignty, read Robert H. Jackson and Carl C. Rosberg, "Why Africa's Weak States Persist: The Empirical and the Juridical in Statehood", *World Politics* 35 (1): 1-24, 1982.

incidences of the so-called “security” challenges knowing that what Senator Seriaki Dickson describe as the “official security system”²⁷ is not “ignorant and not innocent”²⁸ in this affairs?

Beyond sensitising students and parents, putting up a kind of caveat emptor and resorting to prayers (we are prayer devotees and warriors in Nigeria and how ironic this is) that the cup will pass your school over whenever it is coming, there is nothing the school administrators can do to deter the onslaught of a “criminal powerful system”²⁹ in the schedule called “security” and “security” challenges.

Conclusion

In the security type arising from the founding purpose of security as *free from care, something which secure, condition of being secure* and *feeling no apprehension*, every arm of government, every ministry, department and agency and the private sector should have its construct of security which asks and answers the questions what is security, whose security, what is a security issue and how can security be achieved. The Ministry of Education has its conception of security from this perspective.

To this extent and under civil rule and governance frameworks, there is need for the legislatures and the executives to come up with a central philosophy of security enshrined in legislation which will serve as policy framework to which the public and private sectors will use to develop their strategies in line with their statutory mandate in fulfilling the security policy of the state.

In other words, the first three questions of philosophy, legislation and policy i.e. what is security, whose security and what is a security issue is the responsibility of the legislatures to construct and resource. The last question – how can security be achieved – which addresses strategy should be left to ministries, departments and agencies in the public sector and their private sector counterparts to address.

Security, under civil rule and governance frameworks, is wellbeing in all of its forms. Thus security is a forest with different trees whose individual and collective health determines the health of the forest. One or few of the trees – the work of the military, intelligence and law enforcement – cannot and should not constitute the forest. Security, under military rule, is solely focused on these trees and their work. Security is not wellbeing in all of its forms in the

²⁷ Read “Abuja, Lagos Bigwigs Masterminds of Oil Theft in Niger Delta – Dickson” <https://www.channelstv.com/2024/03/29/abuja-lagos-bigwigs-masterminds-of-oil-theft-in-niger-delta-dickson/> accessed 10:04:2024

²⁸ Read Ibid

²⁹ Read Ibid

spheres of the schedules of the military, intelligence and law enforcement. In the event we are to apply the *hierarchy of security needs*,³⁰ security will prioritise other issues which will reduce the issues associated with the military, intelligence and law enforcement phase from developing thus confining the military, intelligence and law enforcement phase to the bottom of the *hierarchy*.

In the order I proposed I defined security first in tandem with security's founding etymologies, history and philosophy and second civil rule and governance frameworks and Nigeria's history, experience and reality (HER). Security should be wellbeing in all of its forms. This is opposed to the prevailing narrative of "security" in existence focused on the work of the agencies of the military, intelligence and law enforcement that serve as a political economic resource for the elites of politics and the military, intelligence and law enforcement.

The implication of security is wellbeing in all of its forms is that every ministry, department and agency in the public and private sectors has a role to play in bringing security or wellbeing. The role of school administrators is to create teaching and learning environment for the staff and pupils within the school premises and to ensure that teaching and learning occur in line with the Ministry of Education strategy to attaining the security objective of the state.

In the final analysis, ensuring physical safety of pupils and teachers from the onslaughts of terrorists, insurgents, kidnappers and bandits is NOT the role and place of school administrators in Nigeria.

Unless Nigerians demand that the leadership begins to take responsibility and do the right thing by doing things right, the lucrative business of "security" and "security" challenges which Senator Dickson argued has the knowledge of the "official security system" has no end in sight yet.

³⁰ Read Adoyi Onoja, *Hierarchy of SECURITY Needs (hSn)* (Monograph 9), Jos, Eiwā Press, 2023