CHALLENGES OF SECURITY GOVERNANCE IN AFRICA: THE 21ST CENTURY EXPERIENCE

*LADAN OZAYASHI NASIRUDEEN; **AHMED EGYE; & **ZHEBAGO EMMANUEL PETER ***AHMED GAMBO

*Department of Local Government Studies, Mustapha Agwai 1 Polytechnic, Lafia. **Department of Public Administration, Mustapha Agwai 1 Polytechnic, Lafia, Nasarawa State. **Central Bank of Nigeria, Abuja.

ABSTRACT

For several decades, security has been a major issue in Africa in view of the continued human brutality, pogroms, genocide, terrorism, civil wars, and inter-ethnic conflicts that have continued to be recorded in the continent. Since the 1980s, the continent has continued to record unprecedented violence of various kinds. The state in Africa has become incapacitated as it continues to find it difficult to generate the fundamental conditions for meaningful human survival. Generally, governance is described as the overall integrative efforts of individuals who have either been elected or appointed to carry out the aims

Introduction

The African state has continued to be confronted with myriads of challenges in her security governance. This development has partly contributed to the developmental crisis of the continent. In other words, despite some concerted efforts being made by some of the countries in Africa in this regard, it is disheartening to note that up till the 21st century, the little gains made over the years to improve security governance in Africa have hardly been sustained. For various reasons, the security network in Africa has remained contentious, a development that has made the continent to remain porous and weak in almost all criteria for the measurement of regional or national security. In Africa, security governance has remained a major issue in view of the various forms of carnage, brutality, pogroms as well as acts of genocide occasioned by the persistence of civil wars, communal clashes, and religious conflicts across the continent (Nnoli, 2006). Just before the 1980s and the year 2000, Africa has continued to record unprecedented violence of various dimensions in areas such as extra-judicial killings, political oppression and repression, ethnic massacres among others. The countries mostly engrossed in these include Somalia, Cote D'Ivoire, Congo (DRC), Rwanda, Congo (Brazzaville), Sudan, and Liberia. In the 21st century Africa for instance, the collapse of states has resulted to a situation whereby physical safety has become the primary pre-occupation of most

for which the modern state has been set up. Through governance, those who occupy the machineries of government are bound to the pursuit of those policies that can impact on the lives of the masses. The theoretical framework adopted for study is Booth's world system theory. Methodologically, the study adopted descriptive and analytic approach. Data for the study was sourced through the secondary means of data collection. The focus of the study is on challenges of security governance in Africa: the 21st century experience. The study reveals that bad governance, inter-ethnic conflicts, and corruption have remained major challenges to security governance in Africa. The study argues that the non-rethinking of security issues to significantly address the basic needs of the average African has remained a major threat to Africa's security. The study recommends a pragmatic change and refocusing on security issues in Africa to arrest the bottlenecks militating against security governance in Africa.

Keywords: Governance, Security, Africa, Leadership, Corruption.

Africans. The state had virtually failed to generate the fundamental conditions necessary for the protection of the life of its citizens. Over

the years, a good number of factors have led to the disintegration and shift in focus of the African security discourse to other considerations such as the satisfaction of basic needs, the right to a sustainable environment and protection of cultural and religious identity among many others (Nnoli, 2006).

Although these factors have impacted on the physical security of African citizens, they do not however actually constitute direct threats to physical safety. As Nnoli (2006:8) contended, "…African states are yet to realize that the best guarantee of state security is the security of their citizens and the willing acceptance by the latter of the political rules of the game on which the legitimacy of the state rests" Security governance addresses the entire gamut of state security as it covers virtually all aspects of security such as human security, environmental security, economic and social security, as well as the security of the ethnic group. In the 21st century therefore, there has been a reconceptualization of the security apparatus in view of the emerging challenges of the century in such areas as political change, high level of carnage, acts of terrorism, illegal arms trafficking, migration and climate change. In view of the militaristic and state-centric interest of the African state in physical survival, some other ingredients which forms the focus of security governance have arisen.

These include access to basic needs and social services in the areas of food, education, health, and shelter. The absence of these in certain quarters has heightened sectarian uprisings, various acts of violence, civil wars, citizens protests, armed rebellion and rise of ethnic militia across Africa. The nature of governance in Africa up till the 21st Century has led to the emergence of political elites that are not productive but relies on the control of state structure to access economic rewards (Seteolu, 2004). Similarly, governance in Africa has been grossly affected because of a political leadership that is parochial rather than national to the extent of corruptly converting national resources into its project of primitive accumulation (Ake & Onoge, 1995). This ugly development has significantly affected the realization of the various forms of security for the utmost

development of the African continent. This study is therefore poised to examine Africa and the challenges of security governance in the 21st Century.

World Security Theory

Ken Booth is Professor in the Department of International Politics at the University of Wales, Aberystwyth. He is a Fellow of the British Academy and current Editor of International Relations. Booth views security as an instrumental value. He also develops a global security/liberation theory to argue for politics and community in which promoting "emancipatory space" means promoting "security" and vice versa (Booth 2007:115). Its vivid fusion of protection and liberation goes so far as to claim universal liberty, and thus security through politics is possible. This aims at "a world security community of communities where war is practically unthinkable and global problems can be pursued as collectively as possible" (Booth 2007:427). Booth, the argument goes, has a very simplistic understanding of security and power. And the liberation he normatively defends has the potential to reignite the violence it seeks to eradicate.

World security theory is based on assumptions about what is real, what we can know and how we might act. The theory of world security attempts to answer these fundamental philosophical questions in a radical and original security theory for our time. According to Booth (2007), human society faces a series of converging historical crises. Drawing on critical social and radical international theories to develop a comprehensive framework for understanding the historical challenges facing global business-as-usual, he envisions a more cosmopolitan future. View of World Security challenges established ways of thinking about security and alternative approaches in critical security studies. Since emancipation is the spirit of our times, it is appropriate to place it at the heart of new security thinking. This century, the struggle for freedom of the colonial world, women, youth, the proletariat, various desires, homosexuals, consumers, and thoughts.

The struggle for emancipation is still going on in many places. Some groups have outperformed and continue to outperform others. There is a libertarian spirit in the world currently. In recent years, a notable feature of recent years in the fight against political oppression has been the remarkable success of nonviolence - "people's power" - in many countries, from Poland to the Philippines. The tradition of critical theory can be helpful here. His main potential contribution in the current state of the field is to recapture the idea that politics is open-ended and based on ethics. From this vantage point, the strategy no longer examines the technological variable in intergovernmental politics, but rather an insistence on moral philosophy at a stroke of arms. According to social theories, a person's decision to become a criminal is influenced by society.

Social learning theory, which holds that people learn criminal behaviour from their environment, and social conflict theory, which holds that crime is to blame for class warfare, are two examples. At the same time, radical approaches tend to see criminal law as a tool used by the powerful and the rich to coerce the poor into maintaining the status quo. Likewise, one of these views, the so-called "peace-making" theory, is based on the premise that violence breeds violence. The justification of the study for the world security theory is that Booth advocates a state focus on human emancipation as the only way to create adequate security. The approach was designed to "explain and advance a case for a specific theoretical framework that can be used to research and address the safety of real people in real places" (Booth 2007, p. xii).

Conceptual Classifications
Security

The word "Security" originated from the Latin word, "Se-curus". "Se", denotes, "without" and "curus", stands for "uneasiness" (Muhammed & Abdullahi, 2016:40). In this case therefore, security originally meant liberation from uneasiness or a peaceful situation free from risks or threats. Similarly, the English word "Security" is interpreted in several ways including, "to feel safe and to be protected". According to Mutiullah (2010:196) "security is used to describe a situation without any risk or worries." Generally, "Security" is regarded as a contested concept because it does not have a clinical definition. Despite its definitional flexibility, Ochoche (1998:105) maintains that security for all entities, organizations and especially nations remain a first order concern. Over the years, the concept of security has gone beyond the exclusive stress on national security to a greater emphasis on people's security, from security through armaments to security through human development, from territorial security to food, employment, and environmental security (Human Development Report, 2011).

For sovereign nation-states, the extent of militarization in each society is a function of historical, geographical, cultural, political, and strategic factors (Laurie, 1998). It is also derived from philosophical assumptions about state sovereignty, international relations, the domestic environment, and the use of force. Hitherto, the political conditions of the cold war had shaped the conventional approach to security. For about forty years, "the international system was characterized by acute tension between rival ideological blocs and the prospect of another world war" (Laurie, 1998:70). At that time, issues about security were centred on state and military stability (Booth, 1994). Greater attention was therefore focused on defending the sovereignty, territory, and political independence of the state especially using force which led states to building larger armies and arsenals in anticipation for any negative eventuality.

No doubt, this approach had serious short comings as it failed to address the root causes of conflict but emphasized on militarist ethos in civil society and paid lesser attention to the security of the people. Just like some other concepts in strategic studies, the concept of security has been viewed in different perspectives. In its normative view, security has to do with the orderly existence of things. That is, "a state of protective and subjective environment" (Aja, 2009:34). In strategic studies, security has both objective and subjective meanings. Security in the objective sense can be measured by the absence of threat to life, liberty, property, and core values. At the subjective level, security measures the absence of fear, anxiety, tension, or apprehension of being in danger of losing life, liberty, property and other core values (Nnoli, 2006). As Nnoli (2006:16) further contended:

> No matter how much safety there is in objective terms, unless there is confidence that such safety exists or will exist, there is no security. Even when no safety exists in objective terms, but there is confidence that it exists, then, there is likely to be security at least in the short term. In this case, one may speak of false security.

The subjective idea of security brings to fore its ambiguous and elastic meaning. Hence, individuals vary in what constitutes their security as one person's security may be another person's insecurity. Security therefore describes a state of mind not necessarily an objective state of being. The subjective view of security describes how people feel, not whether they are justified in feeling that

way. It all depends on the perception that people have of their environment, not necessarily on an objective view of that environment. Traditionally, security issues mainly centre on the physical danger to a state which manifests in imbalances in military power. In actual sense however, security matters cannot just be limited to military power. Aja (2009:35) corroborates this view when he submitted that "Security is not all about the gun as there is also security in bread, social harmony, good health and understanding of political order".

Viewed from an analytical and historical perspective, security is a holistic and all-encompassing concept that measures all policies, laws, and institutional set-up targeted at allowing the citizens an assured psychological feeling of internal and external vigilance and freedom from fear of losing core and cherished values. Security is further defined as every mechanism undertaken to ensure peaceful coexistence and development at large (Adedoyin, 2014). Security covers protection of human rights and provision of basic human needs which are necessary for social system transformation. Proper security guarantees stableness and orderliness of both animates and inanimate in their natural or artificial correlations. According to Lipman (1943:51) "a nation is secured to the extent that it is not in a position to lose her core values, lives, property, liberties and when it wishes, to deter aggression or win war." Security therefore provides an enabling environment or conducive atmosphere for good socio-political orderliness in a social system.

Generally, security is very important in life preservation, service renderings as well as being crucial or critical to human relationship. Security occupies a central focus in overall national and individual survival in the sense that:

> It serves as a protective measure, medium, substance, and shield or 'insulator' to life from dangers. No nation or reasonable society takes security for granted or carelessly. Security is highly sensitive to every social formation. It is a condition for freedom. Its classification reveals that it cannot be stereotyped or based on military activities only. It encompasses components of human wellbeing. It can be classified into traditional security (Institutionalized security operative) and human security, which could be sub-divided into political security, domestic security, economic security, industrial security, et cetera (Adedoyin, 2014:323).

Security is usually taken as the responsibility of every member of society. Security operative outfits include the military intelligence, police force, defence and other para-military agencies. For Africa, security occupies a topmost position in the primary interest of almost all the states in the continent. Holistically, security measures all policies, laws and institutional set up aimed at allowing the citizens an assured psychological feeling of internal and external vigilance and freedom from fear of losing core or cherished values. To a reasonable degree, the socio-psychological conceptual discourse of security acknowledges the military, political, economic, and cultural conditions which contribute to bringing about situations of security (BalTal & Jacobson, 1998). Security guarantees a state's survival, its territory, integrity, defence, protection of citizens' life and property, as well as protection of economic welfare and social stability (Haftendom, 1991).

According to Bakut (2006:235) "Security has to do with the defence, protection and preservation of a nation's values and the absence of threats to acquired values". In this vein, Eze & Hettman

(2005) submit that security denotes the defence, policing and intelligence functions of states and the management of threats to and breaching of the peace through multilateral and bilateral processes. Although security is usually conceived in military terms, its broader meaning also extends to another sector. For instance, Ogun Sanwo has cautioned that:

> *Security is more than military or security from external attacks. For many of the four billion inhabitants in the developing countries, security is concerned as the basic level of the struggle for survival. Therefore, to provide an integrated African security assessment, the non-military dimensions of security should be added. Henceforth, African security as a concept should be applied in its broadest sense to include economic security, social security, environmental security, food security, the equality of life security and technological security (Nwolise 2006:349).*

As security is a correlate of development, Mcnamara has rightly observed that:

> *Any society that seeks to achieve military security against the background of acute food shortage, population explosion, low level production and per capita income, low technological development, inadequate and inefficient public utilities, and chronic problem of unemployment has a false sense of security (Nwolise, 2006:350).*

From the array of views on the meaning of security, it could therefore be deduced that security generally denotes a condition of safety from fear, tension, and apprehension of losing life, property or other valued resources. Governance Generally, governance is used to describe the entire process or processes undertaken in the making and implementation of decisions that affect the affairs of men and women, resources as well as material environment of a given polity with a view to attaining an orderly and peaceful society (Okechukwu, 2016). The way and manner a state carries out its governance goes a long way to determining the extent to which the objectives of the state would be realized. According to Oni (2014:5):

> *Governance entails those processes, activities, events, and happenings in the society that can enhance or impede service delivery. It enhances all the methods that societies use to distribute power and manages public resources and problems with a view to enhancing the wellbeing of the people… The role of the state in governance process is crucial and therefore requires building institutions that are responsive to and responsible for societal actions.*

In its simple understanding, governance denotes, "the sum of the many ways through which individuals and institutions (public and private) manage their common affairs" (Sharma, Sadana & Harpreet, 2011: 65). Viewed in this way, governance therefore represents the entire gamut through which formal or informal authority, control or governmental power is exercised in the mobilization of a society's social and economic resources for the overall realization of state objectives. In public administration, governance is described as government in action. In this understanding,

governance represents the wheel that drives government. Governance is usually focused on formal and informal actors involved in the making and implementation of decisions. Actors involved in the act of governance include the media, governmental, non-governmental organizations, education providers, lobbyists, Multinational corporations, peasant groups, etcetera.

In addition, governance represents the process through which the government designs, formulates and implements development-oriented policies aimed at improving the quality of life of the people. It is therefore through the process of governance that the bureaucracy and the administrative system overcomes or addresses the ever-emerging challenges of the contemporary society. In this vein, Chazan (1992:122) contended that:

> Governance is the capacity to establish and sustain workable relations between individual actors to promote collective goals or as a process of organizing and managing legitimate power structures, entrusted by the people, to provide law and order, protect fundamental human rights, ensure the rule of law and due process of law, provide for their happiness or the capacity of entrenched authority of the central state and to regularize its relations with society.

According to Areo (2014:188) governance not only refers to the rules of the game but also to the underlying power relations and norms that are decisive of how rules are made and what the rules are, as well as how rules are applied in practice. Hence, Owoye & Bissessar (2010) contended that governance represents either a process through which a concerned authority exercises power, exerts influence and manages the country's social and economic resources to drive better development or the way those in positions of authority exercise power. In other words, governance deals with the traditions and institutions by which authority is exercised. This may include the process by which governments are selected as well as monitored and replaced, the capacity of government to effectively formulate policies and the respect of citizens' rights and the state institutions that govern economic and social interactions (Owoye & Bissessar, 2010).

The concept of governance is usually viewed in two ways, that is, good and bad governance. Good governance provides for the sustenance of participatory democracy, the rule of law, transparency, accountability, effectiveness, and equitable distribution of societal and national resources. Good governance is a sine qua non for the realization of the ideals for which the state is set up. On the other hand, bad governance is used to describe a government that is ineffective and inefficient, lacking transparency, not responsive to the people, not held accountable for its actions, inequitable and exclusive to the elites, non-participatory, not following the rule of law and lacking policies that are consensus-driven (Owoye & Bissessar, 2010).

Security Governance
The issue of security governance in Africa has remained a major challenge in the continent up till the 21st century in view of the various forms of carnage, brutality, pogroms, genocide, civil wars and acts of terrorism in various parts of the continent (Nnoli, 2006). Security governance has to do with the multifaceted approaches undertaken to address and improve various aspects of security

in Africa. Security governance emphasizes greatly that human security or physical security of the citizens should not be compromised with state or regime security. Traditionally, African security governance laid much premium on a militarized state. It used to be the boundless ambition of an African leader to utilize every instrumentality of the state power to sustain himself in office if he desired. As Nnoli (2006:2) contended:

> *In such circumstances, the leader's arbitrariness in the exercise of power replaces respect for the nation's laws, values, norms, and procedure. Still, he justifies his actions in the name of national security. He abandons the search for legitimacy and relies on naked force. Dissenters are imprisoned. Rivals are liquidated. Anyone that stands in his/her way is an enemy and must be destroyed. The society is divided into a small clique surrounding the ruler, which is intolerant of criticism, even from within its own class, and ruthless and utterly selfish in its political and socio-economic activities, on the one hand, and the rest of the people on the other.*

Similarly, in the guise of security governance, some African governments succeeded in building up enormous official bureaucracy, devoted secrecy, intelligence gathering and spying, surveillance, repression and behind the scenes operation. The influence of the bureaucracy on other aspects of government and the lives of the population was enormous in view of the "shadowy figures" it attracted. They could kill, maim, torture, kidnap, and destroy property without being called to account (Nnoli, 2006:2). For long, the African state relied on the traditional concept of security with the emphasis on protection from external attacks on nation states and neglecting the human aspect of security. As part of the reconceptualization of African Security, the United Nations Development Programme had pioneered the concept of human security where it had to identify seven aspects of security such as: economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community and political security.

To boost security governance in Africa, international actors have significantly increased their efforts to mitigate violent conflicts in Africa and create conditions for lasting peace. This engagement has been demonstrated in the number of peace keeping operations in Africa which increased from four, between, 1945 to 1990 to over thirty between 1991 and 2012. Of this number, 25 were United Nations led operation (Matthias & Berenike, 2012). Security sector governance in Africa has passed through several epochs. That is, from the colonial phase through the military and the current constitutional phase. Each of these phases however has shown much similarity in operational structure, politics, and manner of implementation. With the advent of democracy in Africa especially in the 21st century, the constitution has basically become the main source of power and framework for security governance.

The constitution has been so structured to the extent that each level of government exercises powers vested on it by the constitution. Irrespective of minor differences that exist among African countries, there has remained a careful balance between the powers of the executive and that of the legislative organs of the government. While the legislative powers reside in the National Assembly, executive powers lie with the presidency. In security governance in Nigeria for instance, the constitution has categorized security into three segments and assigned responsibility for each

advisory body. These are the public order, defence of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the country and public security (Ibeanu & Momoh, 2008). Provisions have been made in such a way that the council of State advises the President on public order. National defence council advises on defence of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the country whereas the Security Council advises on public security.

These bodies are made up of different compositions with the president and vice president as Chairman and deputy Chairman. Another major body, the Council of State is composed of the president, his vice and all former presidents and Head of governments, all former chief justices of Nigeria, the president of the Senate, the speaker of the House of Representatives, all state Governors, and the Attorney-General of the Federation. Similarly, the defence council is made up of the President and the Vice President, minister of defence, four service chiefs and other members appointed by the president. The body plays advisory role to the defence of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the nation. The security council is also composed of the president and the relevant ministers, defence chief and Inspector General of Police. The body also advices the president on public security and other matters relating to the security of the nation. Just like every other country in Africa with similar security networks, the Nigerian constitution established two security agencies which are the Nigerian Armed forces (Section 217 of the 1999 Constitution) and the Nigerian Police (Section 214 of the 1999 constitution).

Within these agencies are internal governance institutions such as the Police Service Commission and the Councils of the different Armed forces. Other subsidiary security outfits have also been put in place such as: the Prison Service, Customs, immigration, Department of State Security (DSS) and other intelligence outfits. In view of the re-occurring security challenges in Nigeria, there has been much hue and cry over the establishment of state police as Nigeria's security governance is almost centralized and influenced by the federal government. The state and local government have limited authority or no control over security forces such as the army and the Police. The predicament and dilemma faced by these states in the face of daunting security challenges have led them to establishing some internal security arrangements which they can control. These go by different names across the states such as: Vigilante group, Operation flush, Security network, Hisbah (Kano and Zamfara), LASMA (Lagos) and Neighbourhood watch (Rivers State).

In Africa, the end of the cold war marked a major challenge in the redefinition of security sector governance. Putting a good number of factors into consideration, some African countries have come up with different security sectors with minor variations to improve security governance. In Nigeria for instance, in a bid to boost and shape the direction of her security governance, the following group of actors have been set up as highlighted by Bryden, N'Daiye & Olanisakim in Adedoyin (2014):

(a) Organizations that are legally empowered to use force, that is, the Armed forces which comprises of the Army, Navy and Air Force, the Police, Prison service, Department of State Security, Customs, immigration and other uniformed agencies.

(b) Justice and law enforcement organizations, which include the Judiciary, the Court System, Prisons, Criminal Investigation and Prosecution Services, Customary and traditional Justice bodies. `

(c) Governance and oversight bodies which comprises of the President of the federation, national security advisory bodies, legislature and the legislative Committees, ministry of defence and justice, police affairs, foreign affairs, finance, and the budget office. Others are local authorities, state governments, National Human Rights Commission, Police Service Commission, etcetera.

(d) Non-statutory Security organizations which include militia groups, Vigilante groups, Private Security Companies and related informal armed groups in different parts of the country.

(e) Civil society organizations which comprises of non-governmental organizations, professional associations, and trade unions. Others include religious groups, and other membership organizations. Challenges of security governance in Africa in the 21st century

There have been myriads of challenges confronting security governance in Africa in the 21st century. This study shall examine the following.

i. Poor Conception of security Several years after the political independence of most African states, there has remained a continued hangover of the traditional idea of security as inherited from the colonial state and military era. Hitherto, the state understood the issue of security to be limited to the mere defence of the state against external and internal threats, neglecting the vital aspect of human security. With the entrenchment of democratic rule in the 21st century, some African states are yet to embrace the democratic culture of welfarism, human security, justice, rule of law and equity. Experience in most parts of Africa has shown that instead of taking pro-active steps in addressing the underlying causes of conflict to forestall the explosion of such conflicts, the state often adopt a tit for tat approach. This has created a culture of militarization in Africa with the consequence of exacerbating the tendency for the reliance on arms and armed confrontations to achieve goals rather than dialogue and consensus building (Nnoli, 2006).

In the 21st Century Africa, issues such as political exclusion, economic marginalization and social discrimination have risen to threaten the security of the citizens to the extent that they now regard the state as the primary threat to their survival. According to Nnoli (2006:9):

> In desperation, the victimized citizens take the laws into their own hands as a means of safeguarding their fundamental values from the threat of unacceptable government policies. People who believe that the government no longer represent their interests seek to overthrow it or otherwise establish an alternative state. The decline of the state as the guarantor of protection and human security is serious; but its role as the creator of insecurity is more serious…. It is wrong to see security from the point of view of external enemies of the state. Now, it is the internal enemies of the people that matter.

ii. Illegal proliferation of arms and ammunition for furious reasons, Africa has continued to witness illegal proliferation of arms and ammunition which has made security governance a problematic and thorny issue. Often, this is perpetrated by desperate armed robbers, kidnappers, assassins, and terrorists with the collaboration of corrupt border or security agents. This development has

subjected the entire populace to live in fear and apprehension of possible attacks or other forms of aggression from unsuspecting criminals, robbers, or terrorists (Adedoyin, 2014). Most of the arms and ammunition used by criminals, militant or terrorist groups in Africa are often smuggled through the borders, which is a real act of unpatriotic and economic sabotage. A good number of weapons such as AK47s, light automatic rifles, pistols, bazookas, charms and other dangerous and system destabilizing weapons illegally get into the hands of criminals and merchants of death.

Besides, many of the weapons used by terrorists in Africa or those used by rebels across Africa and the ones used during inter and intra-ethnic or religious conflicts and wars were acquired illegally through illicit arms trafficking. The control of these weapons and ammunition across Africa has been quite difficult and challenging. This ugly development has worsened the problem of security in Africa, more so, given the guerilla nature of the terrorist operations.

iii. Poor border monitoring and surveillance: The problem of border porosity and extensiveness has remained a security threat to many nations of the world especially developing countries whose border problems partly worsened following the arbitrary boundary demarcation during the Berlin conference of 1884 – 1885. The problems generated by the arbitrary boundary demarcation by the European powers has continued to affect efforts being made towards effective border management and control in Africa. The porosity of many borders coupled with the heterogeneous nature of border community members in terms of ethnoreligious cleavage cannot be underestimated on how borders. The division of the same ethnic group into two or more countries along the borders make things difficult in knowing those who are citizens of a particular country. This situation makes trans-border communities composed of the same kinsmen very difficult to identify (Adedoyin, 2014).

The level of conspiracy among most members of border communities often makes it difficult for them to volunteer necessary information to security agents as themselves often collaborate or collude with the criminals at the borders in aiding or abating crime.

iv. Persistence of armed political movements and sectarian groups. State violence in Africa which has a historical character has up till the 21st century continued to manifest. From every consideration, "the colonial origin of the African state ensured that power was the defining attribute of statehood" (Nnoli, 2006:78). There was virtually the absence of the other non-coercive elements such as morality norms, values, customs, and traditions, contractual obligations and historically derived checks and balances that to an extent diluted such power over the years both in pre-colonial Africa and elsewhere in the world (Nnoli, 2006). Specifically, the unalloyed power of the African colonial state was targeted at holding down a conquered people. Quite unfortunately, the post-colonial state of Africa merely inherited the authoritarian, antidemocratic, domineering, and repressive structure of the colonial state. In almost all cases, the colonial powers used their expeditionary forces to crush dissident groups physically and violently.

The rule of law, justice, equity, transparency, and fair play were compromised in a bid for the colonialists to actualize their mission in Africa. The colonial legacy of a very powerful and violent state (often a leviathan) has ended up making African politics a do or die affair and sometimes insensitive to the basic needs of the masses. The inability of the state to make peaceful changes

possible has therefore made revolutionary changes inevitable. The exclusive and elitist nature of African politics has turned to a situation where the state has developed a lack luster attitude towards addressing the citizens socio-economic contradictions. In several states in Africa, this has resulted to armed violence. Frustrated individuals and victims of injustice arising from certain state actions are no longer left with any other option but to fight for their survival and demands. The Horn of Africa has demonstrated a typical case of confrontation between political movements, ethnic militia, social classes, and the state.

Table 1 shows the large number of armed political movements in some countries of the region.

Table 1: Armed Political Movements in the Horn of Africa, 1999

Country Movements:

Eritrea: Eritrean Jihad Movement (EJM); Eritrean National Forces Alliance (ENFA)

Ethiopia: Ogaden National Liberation Front (ONLF); Oromo Liberation Front (OLF).

Somalia: Somali National Alliance (SNA); Somali Salvation Democratic Front (SSDF); Somali Peoples Movement (SPM); Somali Salvation National Movement (SSNM); Somali Democratic Movement (SDM); Somali National Democratic Union (SNDU); Somali National Front (SNF).

Sudan: Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM); Sudan People's Liberation Movement-United (SPLM-U); South . Sudan Independent Movement (SSIM); National Democratic Alliance (NDA).

Uganda: Lord's Resistance Army (LRA); West Nile Bank Front (WNBF); Allied Democratic Forces (ADF); Uganda Salvation. Front (USF); Uganda Muslim Salvation Front (UMSF); National Army for the Liberation of Uganda (NALU).

Source: Samson S.W. (2002). Conflict and State Security in the Horn of Africa. African Journal of Political Science, (2)7, 44.

Similar groups have also arisen in the African sub region. In Nigeria for instance, the Boko Haram terrorist group emerged in 2009 and radicalized its activities in 2002 following the murder of its founder, Mohammed Yusuf by state security agents. Apart from series of violent attacks against the Nigerian state and its institutions, the insurgents have also been carrying out cross border attacks and recruitments in Nigeria's neighbouring countries. Despite Nigeria's internal efforts and assistance from foreign countries, the sect till date has continued changing tactics in its violent attacks, abductions and kidnapping against the state, persons, and institutions. The latest of Boko Haram's abductions on the 19th of February, 2018 was the abduction of 110 female students of Government Girls Technical Science College, Dapchi, Yobe state. Boko Haram has facilitated the emergence of the Islamic State of West Africa (ISWA). Similar groups also exist in Syria, Libya, Iraq, etcetera. Other sectarian groups that are making agitations in Nigeria for genuine democracy, equity, restructuring, justice, and the rule of law, include The Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB), the Movement for the actualization of the sovereign state of Biafra (MASSOB), both situated in South-East, Nigeria, the Shirks (Moslem Islamic sect), the Arewa Youths (Northern Nigeria), the Egbesu boys and the Afenifere (Yoruba based).

iv. Poor security information and intelligence gathering network State security is not just a function of military sophistication and superiority alone. Effective security governance

requires the collaborative efforts of the various security agencies to volunteer necessary information and work together to fight crimes. Hoarding of intelligence information and misinformation does a great disservice to security management. In Africa, the level of sabotage and corruption among some security agencies and officers has remained a major setback to security governance. Appropriate and timely information management usually helps to forestall security challenges especially the identification of criminals' hideout and the circulation or proliferation of small arms and light weapons. Unfortunately, the plight of Africa is made worse in view of the absence of the needed modern gadgets and sophisticated intelligence and technological equipment, such as electronic communication facilities, scanners, digital fingerprint machines, radios, computerized gadgets, and vehicles. Proper intelligence gathering enable security agencies to be pro-active on checking the possible causes of crime and their prevention. It also helps in raising awareness or giving information on security consciousness.

vi. Defective political leadership One major challenge that appears to confront Africa and which almost cut across the continent is the issue of poor, non-visionary and defective political leadership which for years has remained the lot of the continent (Eramus, 2013). The importance attached to leadership has led scholars to express divergent views on it. Burns (1978) defined leadership as the reciprocal process of mobilizing by persons with certain motives and values various economic, political, and other resources in a context of competition and conflict in a bid to realize goals independently held by both leaders and followers. Bryman (1992) contended that leadership is a process of social influence whereby someone in a leadership position steers members of a group towards realizing some set goals. Similarly, Olusanya (2002) submitted that positive leadership involves influencing people and institutions towards well defined goals which contributes to the betterment or greater wellbeing of the society.

The major ingredients here include marginalization, creativity, discipline, courage, and integrity. Okolie (2010:6) situates the source of Africa's "development curse" situation in the circulation of incompetent leadership whose Achilles heel include low capacities for initiating development agenda as well as unquenchable crave for power which is deployed to corrupt ends. Hence, the political and socio-economic crises that have given rise to the fragility of African states are rooted in the mindless appropriation and deployment of state power for the satiation of personal and group interest rather than people-centric development-oriented programmes (Agaptus, 2014). In the same vein, Ngwube (2014:174) had argued that:

> *From West to North and East to Southern parts of Africa, hopes and aspirations have been dashed, owing largely to the insensitive nature and the desperation by these self-imposed leaders to cling to power. Poverty, hunger, illiteracy, endemic disease, crime and hopelessness have replaced what supposed to be the much-deserved dividends of democratic rule for the masses. The principal contributory factor to this is simply attributed to the continuous absence of security and other critical infrastructures and social amenities that are supposed to drive society's development and growth.*

Africa's political leadership has failed to demonstrate the needed vision and authentic leadership. Ngwube (2014:174) further argued that "this lack is expressed in three fundamental areas: lack of servant leaders, Lack of impeccable leaders; and massive manifestation of mediocrity". Overall, there is a seemingly misplacement of mission and vision among most African leaders. Over the years, African political leadership has been beclouded with corruption, selfishness, unresponsiveness, and insensitivity to the human security needs of the people. Even when appropriate strategies of improving security governance are proposed, such may not be implemented unless the leadership stands to gain in doing so. Jim Collins while defining successful leaders who lead good to great organizations, observed that these kinds of people are not high profile leaders with big personalities who make headlines and become celebrities, the good to great leaders seem to have come mars (which means that they are not like the usual leaders we know of today). They are self-effacing, quiet, reserved, even shy, these leaders are a paradoxical blend of personal humility and professional will (Collins, 2001). In all, the unfocused and lack of visionary and defective political leadership in Africa has made African political leadership to remain myopic, short sighted and exclusive on issues of effective security governance. Hence, a greater quantum of state resources is spent on their personal security, state or regime security with little or no attention at all to human security, a development that has remained a contributory factor to the incessant security breaches and violence across Africa.

Recommendations
Arising from the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proffered:
   a. Addressing socio-economic challenges among Africans the increasing threat posed to human security in Africa which has reduced citizen's confidence on the state should be concretely addressed. In most African states, the failure of the state to address the problems posed by hunger, youth unemployment, malnutrition, diseases, inflation, food shortages, environmental pollution, and climate change has continued to exacerbate the potency of civil unrest, sectarian uprising, armed revolts, and civil wars.
   b. Use of dialogue or constructive engagement in conflict resolution as democracy has gained global currency as a form of government (which has also been embraced in Africa) its basic tenets should be allowed to thrive in the African environment. Every anti-democratic culture inherited from the colonial state which persist in Africa such as the quick resort to use force in resolving civil matters, suppression of the opposition, politics of violence and exclusionism (do or die) which have become part of African governance should be discarded in view of the negative consequences this has continued to generate among the populace.
   c. Effective border surveillance and monitoring as the porous and improperly demarcated nature of African boundaries had continued to encourage cross border crimes, proliferation and trafficking of arms and ammunition, there is now a dire need to properly demarcate, computerize and enforce strict surveillance on African borders to checkmate the persistence of criminal activities and smuggling across the borders.

d. Collaborative peace building and preventive measures Greater awareness on threats to African security and overall security consciousness need to be pursued by the African state. Peace building which prevents internal and external security threats must be intensified. Security awareness, consciousness and alertness must be seen as the business of every member of society. As insecurity is an ill wind that blows no one any good, every citizen must develop a sense of patriotism, eschew sabotage and report people of dubious character or their hideouts to the appropriate government agencies.

e. Restriction or limitation of weapons in circulation There has to be genuine government policy and strategies to drastically restrict or limit to the bearest minimum the circulation of weapons across the African continent. The unlawful and unregulated illicit circulation of arms and ammunition in Africa has made such weapons to enter into the wrong hands. At the slightest provocation, these weapons are usually used either against the state or during communal conflicts, intra and inter-state disputes and civil wars.

Conclusion

This study has examined Africa and the challenges of security governance in the 21st century. The increasing threats posed by insecurity globally and in the African continent has made security governance a major issue of state, national and continental discourse. Security has therefore become an essential component of governance as no meaningful development can take place in an atmosphere of insecurity. To a reasonable degree, insecurity frustrates developmental efforts and have adverse consequences on state or national development. In the re-defining of African security governance in the 21st century, the traditional or institutionalized form of security has been found defective and short sighted as it essentially focuses on fundamental military protection of territory and sovereign independence of a state. The neglect or minimal attention given to human security in Africa has resulted to severe consequences.

The seemingly loss of confidence of the people on the state has therefore resulted to political armed violence against the African state by some dissatisfied groups. Other consequences have been the rise of sectarian and militant groups and civil wars. Africa can only be saved from its present dilemma and predicament only if the leadership can pursue a responsive and accountable governance that would be inclusive, not exclusive.

References

Adedoyin, A. (2014). Peace, security and development studies, global system in search of social security and improvement, Ibadan: John Archers Publishers.

Agaptus, N. (2014) Political leadership, poverty and the failed state syndrome in Africa. In M.A., Okolie, O.A., Eke & P.A., Areo (eds.) Politics and Law in Africa, Current and emerging issues (pp. 151-173). Abakaliki: Willy Rose & Appleseed Publishers.

Aja, A.A. (2009) Policy and strategic studies, uncharted waters of war & peace in international relations. Revised edition, Abakaliki: Willy Rose & Appleseed Publishers.

Ake, C. & Onoge, O. (1995). The theories and conception of leadership in Nigeria. Afrika Spectrum (43), 7.

Areo, P.A. (2014). Corruption and governance in Africa. In M.A., Okolie; O.A., Eke, & P.A. Areo (eds). Politics and Law in Africa. Current and emerging issues (pp. 188-199). , Abakaliki: Willy Rose & Appleseed Publishers.

Bakut, B. (2006). The environment, peace & conflict in Africa. In G.B., Shadrack (ed.) Introduction to peace and conflict studies in West Africa. Ibadan: Spectrum.

Bal – Tal, D. & Jacobson, D. (1998). Psychological perspective on security, Applied psychology. International review, 4 (1), 59 – 71.

Boothe, K. (1994). A security regime in southern Africa, theoretical consideration. Southern African perspective, No. 30. Centre for Southern African studies, University of the western cape.

Bryman, A. (1992). Charisma and leadership in organization, London: Sage.

Burns, J.M (1978). Towards a general theory in leadership, New York: Harper.

Chazan, N. (1992). Liberation, governance and political space in Ghana, Achimota: Prempre Press. Collins, J. (2001). Good to great. Harper business: USA.

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999, Sections 214 and 217.

Eze, O.E. & Hettman, J. (2005). Security sector governance in West Africa. A case study of Benin, Cote D'Ivoire, Ghana, Mali, Nigeria and Senegal. Lagos: Friendrich Ebert Stiftung.

Haftendom, H. (1991). The security puzzle; theory building and discipline building in international security. International Studies Quarterly (35), 3 – 17.

Human development report, 2011.

Ibeanu, O. & Momoh, A. (2008). State responsiveness to public security needs: The politics of security decision making – Nigerian case, (SDG Studys, Kings College, London).

Laurie, N. (1998). Good governance, security, and disarmament in Africa. African Journal of political science 3 (2), 69 – 79.

Lipman, W. (1943). United States of America's Foreign policy in Boston, P.51

Matthias, D., Jorg, K., & Berenikes, S. (2012). Towards effective security governance in Africa... African and European actors in peacekeeping and peace building: Partners or competitors? PRIF – Report No. 115.

Muhammed, B.B, & Abdullahi, M.A. (2016). The role of security agencies in the management of conflict and peace process in Nigeria: An appraisal. Governance, economy, and national security in Nigeria. Nigerian political science association publication (pp. 40 – 48). Enugu: TIMEX.

Mutiullah, A.O. (2010). The imperative and challenges of agenda setting in Nigeria: Roadmap to vision 20: 2020, Abuja: Marvellous Mike Press.

Ngwube, A. (2014). Political leadership and state failure in Africa: Lessons from the central African republic. In A.M. Okolie, O.A., Eke, & A.P. Areo (eds). Politics and law in Africa, current and emerging issues (pp. 174-187) Abakaliki: Willy Rose & Appleseed Publishers.

Nnoli O. (2006). National security in Africa, a radical new perspective, pacrep book series No. 2, Enugu: SNAPP PRESS.

Nwolise O.C. (2006). National security and sustainable democracy. In E. Ojo (ed) Challenges of sustainable democracy in Nigeria, Ibadan: John Archers.

Ochoche, S.A. (1998). Counter-terrorism strategy for Nigeria in the 21st Century: A study delivered to participants of senior executive course No. 27, NIPSS, Kuru.

Okolie, A.M. (2010). African states ideologization of development and recycling of poverty. Retrieved on 2nd June, 2017 from: http://www.nai.uusc/ecas/4/panels/1-20panel-9/pdf.

Okechukwu, G.P. (2016). Governance and resources conflicts: the Nigerian experience. South East Journal of political science 2 (2), 120-137.

Olusanya, G. (2002). Leadership of the organized private sector in Nigeria: A historical perspective. Centre for social science research and development, positive leadership monograph series No. 1.

Oni, E.O. (2014). The challenges of democratic consolidation in Nigeria, 1999-2007. International Journal of politics and good governance 5 (1), 1 – 28.

Owoye, O.E. & Bissessar, N. (2010). Bad governance and corruption in Africa. Symptoms of leadership and institutional failure. Retrieved on 20th January, 2018 from: http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index/.asp.

Samson, S.W. (2002). Conflict and state security in the Horn of Africa. African Journal of Political Science. 2 (7), 44.

Seteolu, D. (2004). The challenge of leadership and governance in Nigeria. In S. Odion-Akhaine (ed). Governance: Nigeria and the world, Lagos: CENCOD.

Sharma, M.P., Sardana, B.L., & Harpreet, K. (2011). Public administration in theory and practice, 4th edition, Allahabad: Kitab Mahal